1387

A DISCOURSE CONCERNING THE IDOLATRY PRACTISED in the CHURCH OF ROME,

AND

The Hazard of Salvation in the Communion
of it: In Anſwer to ſome PAPERS of
a Revolted Proteſtant.

WHEREIN

A Particular Account is given of the *Fanaticiſms* and
Diviſions of that CHURCH.

The Fifth Volume.

By the Right Reverend Father in God
Edward Stillingfleet, D. D. Late Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*.

LONDON, Printed for *Henry* and *George Mortlock*, at the Sign
of the *Phœnix* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*, MDCCIX.

A

DISCOURSE

CONCERNING THE

IDOLATRY

PRACTISED in the

CHURCH

OF

ROME

AND

The Hazard of Salvation in the Communion
of it: In Answer to ſome PAPERS of
a Revolted Proteſtant.

WHEREIN

A Particular Account is given of the Fanaticiſms and
Diviſions of that CHURCH.

The Fifth Volume.

By the Right Reverend Father in God
Edward Stillingfleet, D. D. Late Lord Biſhop of Worceſter.

LONDON: Printed for Henry and George Mortlock, at the
Phœnix in St. Paul's Church-yard, MDCCX.

THE

PREFACE.

Sect. 1. *The neceſſity of writing in theſe Controverſies.*

ALthough I ſee no great effect of the Courtſhip commonly uſed towards the *Candid and Ingenuous Reader*, unleſs it be in diverting the cenſure from the Book to the Preface: Yet in ſome caſe it looks like a Breach of the *Reader*'s Privilege, not to give him an account of the occaſion and deſign of a Book. Eſpecially, when the matter handled therein, hath been thought to have been ſo throughly diſcuſſed before, and is of ſo general concernment, that every Pretender thinks he knows as much already, as is to be known in it. Whereas nothing hath been more to the advantage of our Adverſaries than this, that the things in Diſpute between us were generally no better underſtood, by the Perſons they have had their deſigns upon. For aſſoon as *they* have baffled their Ignorance and Miſtakes, *theſe* have been ready to yield up themſelves and the *Cauſe*, imagining nothing more could be ſaid for it, than they could ſay for themſelves. Whereby our *Church* hath not only ſuffered in its Reputation, as far as that is concerned in the weakneſs of ſome of its Members; but ſtrange boaſts and triumphs have been made by thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, when ſuch who underſtood not their own *Religion* have embraced theirs. While theſe Diſputes were freſh in the World, every one thought himſelf concerned to enquire into them; but ſince our *Church* hath been ſo long eſtabliſhed on the Principles of the *Reformation*, and other unhappy Controverſies have riſen up; the moſt have taken this cauſe for granted, and thought it needleſs to enquire any farther into the Grounds of it.

The preſent arts uſed by our Adverſaries to gain Proſelytes.

Which our Adverſaries perceiving, they have found far greater ſucceſs in their attempts upon particular Perſons, than in publick Writings: For theſe have only provoked others to lay open the palpable weakneſs of their Cauſe; whereas in the other by their ways of Addreſs, and all the arts of Inſinuation, they have inſtilled their Principles into the minds of ſome leſs judicious Perſons, before they were aware of it. Thence it is eaſy to obſerve, that the greateſt Miſchief they have done, hath been like the *Peſtilence*, by *walking in darkneſs*, and ſpreading their Infection by whiſpers in corners. All their hopes and ſtrength lie in the weakneſs and credulity of the Perſons they deal with; but if they meet with any who truly underſtand the differences between us, they ſoon give them over as untractable. But to ſuch, whoſe Employments have not given them leave to enquire, or whoſe capacity hath not been great enough to diſcern their *Sophiſtry*, their firſt work is, to make a falſe Repreſentation both of the Doctrines and Practice of their *Church*; and if they be of ſuch eaſy Faith to believe them, they from thence perſwade them into an ill Opinion of their Teachers, who poſſeſſed them with ſo bad thoughts of ſuch a *Church* as theirs. A *Church* of ſo great *Holineſs* (as may be ſeen by the Saint-like Lives of their Popes and Converts) a *Church* of ſo great *Antiquity* (bating only the Primitive times) a *Church* of ſo admirable *Unity* (ſaving the diviſions in it) a *Church* ſo free from any *Fanatick* heats (as any one may believe that will.) If this firſt aſſault doth not make them yield, but they deſire at leaſt time to conſider, and adviſe in a Matter of ſo great Importance; then they tell them, there is not a Man of our *Church* dares give any of them a Meeting; if they offer to put it to a Trial, they will appoint a Day which they foreſee will be moſt inconvenient for the Perſons they are to meet with. If upon that Account, it be declined or deferred, this is ſpread abroad for a *Victory*; if it be accepted, then one thing or other happens that they cannot come; either the Perſon goes out of Town unexpectedly, or his Superiors have forbidden him, or ſuch Conferences are not ſafe for them (they are ſo ſorely perſecuted) or at laſt, what good can an Hours Talk do to ſatisfy any one in Matters of *Religion?* But if there be no Remedy, which they are ſeldom without; and a Conference happen, (which they ſcarce ever yield to, but when they have already gained the Perſon for whoſe ſake it is,) then whoſoever was baffled, they are ſure to go away with the Triumph; and as an Evidence of it, ſuch a Perſon went off from our *Church* upon it, when he was made ſure of their ſide before. If this Way take not, then a Set of Queſtions is ready to be ſent; if another be returned to them to be anſwered at the ſame time, this is declined, and complained of as hard Dealing; as though they had only the Privilege of putting Queſtions, and we the Duty of anſwering them. If Anſwers be given to them, after a Paſs or Two they put an end to the Trial of their Skill in that Place, and ſeek for another to ſhew it in. But if the Papers chance to be ſlighted, or Buſineſs hinders a preſent Anſwer, or there be a reaſonable Preſumption, that the Perſon concerned hath already forſaken our *Church*, this becomes the Occaſion of a new Triumph, the Papers are accounted unanſwerable (as the *Spaniſh Armado* was called *invincible*, which we thank God we found to be otherwiſe) and it may be are demanded again as *Trophies*, to be preſerv'd for the Glory of the *Catholick Cauſe*.

Sect. 3. The occaſion of this preſent writing.

All theſe ſeveral ways I have had experience of in the Compaſs of a few Years, ſince by Command I was publickly engaged in the Defence of ſo excellent a *Cauſe*, as that of our *Church* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*. I confeſs it ſeemed ſomewhat hard to me, to be put to anſwer ſo many ſeveral Papers, which I have received upon their tampering with particular Perſons of our *Church*, while my Book it ſelf remained unanſwered by them, after ſo many years of trying their Strength about it. (For thoſe Two who in ſome ſmall Meaſure have attempted it, have performed it in the Way that Rats anſwer Books, by gnawing ſome of the Leaves, for the Body and Deſign of it remains wholly untouched by them.) But for the Satisfaction of any Perſon who deſired it, I was not willing to decline any Service, which tended to ſo good an end, as the preſerving any Member of our *Church* in the Communion of it: Which was the occaſion of this preſent Writing. For ſome time ſince the Perſon concerned, after ſome Diſcourſes with her, brought me the Two *Queſtions* mentioned in the beginning of the Book; to which I returned a ſpeedy Anſwer, in the midſt of many other Employments; not long after, I received the Reply ; but hearing for a great while no further of the Perſon for whoſe ſake this Diſcourſe began, and having Affairs more than enough, to take up my time, I laid aſide the Papers, ſuppoſing that Buſineſs at an end. But about *Chriſtmas* laſt, they were called for by a near Friend of the Party concerned, and a perſonal Conference being declined, an Intimation was given me, that the Papers were thought unanſwerable. I began to fear ſo too, for at firſt I could not find them ; but aſſoon as I did, I found the great improvement they had made by lying ſo long, for what at firſt I looked on as inconſiderable, was in that time thought to be too ſtrong to be medled with ; and I could not tell what they might come to in time, if I let them alone any longer. And I was informed, by a worthy Perſon, that *I. S. the Man of Confidence and Principles*, had expreſſed great wonder I had not anſwered them ; as though we had no cauſe to wonder that the *noble Science of Controverſy* ſhould be ſo abandoned by him, and that a Man of ſuch metal ſhould all this while leave his poor *Demonſtrations* alone to defend themſelves ? Upon theſe ſuggeſtions I reſolved, as faſt as other Employments would give leave (for we are not thoſe happy Men to have only one thing to mind) to give a full and punctual Anſwer to them. Which I have now made publick, and printed the Papers themſelves at large, that my Adverſary may not complain of any Injury done him by miſ-repreſenting his Words or Meaning. And beſides other Reaſons, I the rather choſe to appear in publick, to draw them from their preſent way of *pickeering* and lying under Hedges, to take advantage of ſome ſtragling Members of our *Church*, not ſo able to defend themſelves, and whom they rather ſteal from us than conquer, being blinded with their Smoak more than overcome by any ſtrength of Argument. If they have any thing to ſay, either againſt our *Church*, or in Defence of their own, let them come into the open *Field*, from which they have of late ſo wiſely withdrawn themſelves, finding ſo little ſucceſs in it.

Sect. 4. Of the manner and deſign of the writing.

And ſince theſe Diſputes muſt be, I am very well pleaſed, that the Adverſary I have now to deal with, hath the Character of a Learned and Ingenuous Man ; and I do not deſire he ſhould loſe it, in the Debate between us ; hoping that nothing ſhall proceed from me, but what likewiſe becomes a fair and ingenuous Adverſary. If I were not fully ſatisfied that we have Truth and Reaſon on our ſide, I ſhould never have been engaged in theſe Combats ; I am ſo great a Friend to the Peace of the *Chriſtian* World, that I could take more Pleaſure in ending one Controverſy, than in being able to handle as many as the moſt Voluminous *School-men* have ever done : For however *Noble* ſome may think, *the Science of Controverſy* to be, I am not fond of the *Practice of it* ; eſpecially, being managed with ſo much Heat and Paſſion, ſuch Scorn and Contempt of Adverſaries, ſo many Reproaches and perſonal Reflections (as they commonly are) as if Men forgot to be *Chriſtians*, when they began to be Diſputants. I do not think it ſuch a mighty matter to throw Dirt in a Man's Face, and then to laugh at him, or (rather to take a Metaphor now from dry weather) to raiſe ſuch a Duſt as may endanger the Eye-ſight of weaker Perſons. I think it no great Skill to make things appear either ridiculous or dark, but to give them their due Colours, and ſet them in the cleareſt Light, ſhews far more Art and Ingenuity.

And even that Smartneſs of Expreſſion, without which Controverſy will hardly go down with many, ſeems but like the throwing Vinegar upon hot Coals, which gives a quick Scent for the preſent, but vaniſhes immediately into Smoak and Air. In Matters of Truth and Religion, Reaſon and Evidence ought to ſway Men, and not Paſſion and Noiſe; and though Men cannot command their Judgments, they may and ought to do their Expreſſions. And although this looks as like an Apology for a dull Book as may be, yet I had much rather it ſhould ſuffer for want of Wit and Smartneſs, than of good Nature and *Chriſtianity*. My Deſign is to repreſent the Matters in difference between us truly, to report faithfully and to argue cloſely; and by theſe to ſhew that no Perſon can have any pretence of reaſon to leave our *Church*, to embrace the Communion of the *Church* of *Rome*; becauſe the Danger is ſo much greater there, in the *Nature* of their *Worſhip* and *Tendency* of their *Doctrine*; and what they object moſt againſt us in point of *Fanaticiſm* and *Diviſions*, will equally hold againſt them; ſo that they have no advantages above us, but have many apparent Dangers which we have not.

Sect 5. *Of the charge of Idolatry againſt the Church of* Rome.

Among the chiefeſt Dangers in the Communion of that *Church*, I have inſiſted on that of *Idolatry*; not to make the Breach wider than ſome others have done, but to let Perſons firſt underſtand the Greatneſs of the Danger before they run into it. I wiſh I could acquit them from ſo heavy a Charge, but I cannot force my Judgment: And while I think them guilty, it would be Unfaithfulneſs in me, not to warn thoſe of it, whom it moſt concerns to underſtand it. And where other things are ſubtle and nice, tedious and obſcure, this lies plain to the Conſcience of every Man; if the *Church* of *Rome* be guilty of *Idolatry*, our Separation can be no *Schiſm* either *before God* or *Man*, becauſe our Communion would be a Sin. And although it may be only an Exceſs of Charity in ſome few learned Perſons, to excuſe that *Church* from *Idolatry*, (although not *all* who live in the Communion of it:) Yet upon the greateſt Search I can make, I think there is more of Charity than Judgment in ſo doing. For the Proof of it, I muſt refer the Reader to the following Diſcourſe. And that I may not be thought in ſo ſevere a Cenſure to contradict the Senſe of our *Church*, (which I have ſo great a regard to) I ſhall here ſhew that this Charge of *Idolatry* hath been managed againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, by the greateſt and moſt learned Defenders of it ever ſince the *Reformation*.

Artic. 35.

Homil.part. 2. *p.* 75.

What greater Diſcovery can be made of the Senſe of our Church, than by the Book of Homilies, not barely allowed, but ſubſcribed to as *containing godly and wholeſome Doctrine, and neceſſary for theſe times?* And nothing can be more plainly deliver'd therein, than that the *Church* of *Rome* is condemned for *Idolatry*. So the Third Part of the *Sermon againſt the Peril of Idolatry* concludes, *Ye have heard it evidently proved in theſe Homilies againſt Idolatry, by God's Word, the Doctors of the Church, Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories, Reaſon and Experience, that Images have been and be worſhipped, and ſo Idolatry committed to them, to the great Offence of God's Majeſty, and Danger of infinite Souls,* &c. Who the Author of theſe *Homilies* was, is not material to enquire, ſince their Authority depends not on the Writer, but the *Churches* Approbation of them; but Dr. *Jackſon* not only calls him *the worthy and learned Author of the Homilies concerning the Peril of Idolatry*, but ſaith, *he takes him to be a Reverend Biſhop of our Church*: And no wonder ſince the moſt eminent *Biſhops* in that time of Queen *Elizabeth*, (wherein theſe Homilies were added to the former) did all aſſert and maintain the ſame thing. As *Biſhop Jewel* in his excellent *Defence* of the *Apology of the Church of* England, *and anſwer to* Harding, wherein he proves, *that to give the Honour of God to a Creature, is manifeſt Idolatry, as the Papiſts do,* ſaith he, *in Adoration of the Hoſt, and the Worſhip of Images*: And his Works ought to be look'd on with a higher Eſteem than any other private Perſons, being commanded to be placed in *Churches* to be read by the People. Of all Perſons of that *Age* none could be leſs ſuſpected to be *Puritanically* inclined, than Archbiſhop *Whitgift*; yet in his *learned Defence of the Church of* England *againſt* T C. he makes good the ſame Charge in theſe Words; *I do as much miſlike the Diſtinction of the Papiſts, and the Intent of it as any Man doth, neither do I go about to excuſe them from wicked, and without Repentance and God's ſingular Mercy, damnable Idolatry. There are*, ſaith he, *three Kinds of Idolatry; one is, when the true God is worſhipped by other Means and Ways, than he hath preſcribed, or would be worſhipped*, i. e. againſt his expreſs Command, which is certainly his meaning: *the other is, when the true God is worſhipped with falſe Gods: The Third is, when we worſhip falſe Gods either in Heart, Mind, or in external Creatures living or dead, and altogether forget the Worſhip of the true God. All theſe three kinds are deteſtable, but the firſt is the leaſt, and the laſt is the worſt. The Papiſts worſhip God otherwiſe than his Will is, and otherwiſe than he hath preſcribed, almoſt in all Points of their Worſhip; they alſo give to the Creature, that which is due to the Creator, and ſin againſt the firſt Table; yet are they not, for all that I can ſee or learn, in the Third kind of Idolatry; and therefore if they repent unfeignedly, they are not to be caſt either out of the Church, or out of the Miniſtry. The Papiſts have little Cauſe to thank me, or fee me for any thing I have ſpoken in their Behalf as yet, you ſee that I place them among wicked and damnable Idolaters.* Thus far that Wiſe and Learned Biſhop. After him we may juſtly reckon Biſhop *Bilſon*, than whom none did more learnedly in that time defend the *perpetual Government of Chriſt's Church by Biſhops*, (nor it may be ſince:) who in a ſet Diſcourſe, at large proves the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry*. 1. *In the Worſhip of Images; the having of which*, he ſaith was never Catholick, *and the Worſhipping of them was ever wicked by the Judgment of Chriſt's Church; and that the Worſhip even of the Image of Chriſt, is Heatheniſm and Idolatry; and to worſhip it makes it an Idol, and burning Incenſe to it is Idolatry*, which he there proves at large; *and that the Image of God made with Hands, is a falſe God, and no Likeneſs of his, but a lewd Imagination of theirs, ſet up to feed their Eyes with the Contempt of his ſacred Will, Diſhonour of his holy Name, and open Injury to his Divine Nature. 2. In the Adoration of the Hoſt*, of which he treats at large. After theſe it will be leſs needful to produce the Teſtimonies of Dr. *Fulk*, Dr. *Reynolds*, Dr. *Whitaker*, who all aſſerted and proved the *Church* of *Rome*, guilty of *Idolatry*: and I cannot find one Perſon, who owned himſelf to be of the *Church*

of

Dr. Jackſon *Original of Unbelief, Sect.* 4. *Ch.* 34.

Defence of the Apology, Ch. 7. *div.* 2 *p.* 552. *Anſwer to* Harding 8. *Artic. p.* 283. *Art.* 14 *p.* 368. *p.* 382.

*Defence of the Anſwer to the Admonition, tr.*8.*p.*152.

Biſhop Bilſon *Diſp. of Chriſtian ſubjection, part.* 4. *p.* 319. *p.* 321. *p.* 324.

p 530, &c. Dr. Fulks *Confutation of an Idolatrous Treatiſe of* Nicol. Sanders.

Dr. Reyof *England*, in all Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, who did make any doubt of it. Let us now come to the Reign of King *James*. And here in the firſt Place, we ought to ſet down the Judgment of that *learned Prince* himſelf, who ſo throughly underſtood the Matters in Controverſy between us and the *Church* of *Rome*, as appears by his *Premonition* to all *Chriſtian Princes*; wherein after ſpeaking of other Points, he comes to that *of Reliques of Saints. But for the Worſhipping of either of them, or Images, I muſt*, ſaith he, *account it damnable Idolatry*; and after adds, *that the Scriptures are ſo directly, vehemently, and punctually againſt it, as I wonder what Brain of Man, or Suggeſtion of Satan durſt offer it to Chriſtians: And all muſt be ſalved with nice and philoſophical Diſtinctions*———*Let them therefore that maintain this Doctrine, anſwer it to Chriſt at the latter Day, when he ſhall accuſe them of Idolatry: and then I doubt if he will be paid with ſuch nice Sophiſtical Diſtinctions.* And when *Iſaac Caſaubon* was employed by him to deliver his Opinion to *Cardinal Perron*, mentioning the Practices of the *Church* of *Rome* in *Invocation of Saints*, he ſaith, *that the Church of* England *did affirm, that thoſe Practices were joyned with great Impiety. Biſhop Andrews*, whom no Man ſuſpects of want of Learning, or not underſtanding the Doctrine of our *Church*, was alſo employed to anſwer *Cardinal Bellarmin* who had writ againſt the *King*: And doth he decline charging the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*? No, ſo far from it, that he not only in plain Terms charges them with it, but ſaith, *that* Bellarmin *runs into Hereſy, nay, into Madneſs to defend it*: And in his Anſwer to *Perron* he ſaith, *it is moſt evident, by their Breviaries, Hours, and Roſaries, that they pray directly, abſolutely, and finally to Saints; and not meerly to the Saints, to pray to God for them, but to give what they pray for themſelves.* In the ſame time of King *James*, Biſhop *Abbot* writ his *Anſwer* to *Biſhop*; in which he ſaith, *that the Church of* Rome *by the Worſhip of Images, hath matched all the Idolatries of the Heathens, and brought all their jugling Devices into the Church, abuſing Ignorance and Simplicity of the People as groſly and damnably as ever they did.* Towards the latter end of his *Reign* came forth Biſhop *White*'s *Reply to Fiſher*, and he calls *the Worſhipping of Images, a Superſtitious Dotage, a palliate Idolatry; a remainder of Paganiſm, condemned by Sacred Scripture, cenſured by Primitive Fathers, and a Seminary of direful Contention and Miſchief in the Church of Chriſt.* Dr. *Field* chargeth the *Invocation of Saints with ſuch Superſtition and Idolatry as cannot be excuſed. We charge the Adherents of the Church of* Rome *with groſs Idolatry*, (ſaith Biſhop *Uſher* in his *Sermon* preached before the *Commons*, A. D. 1620.) *becauſe, that contrary to God's expreſs Commandment they are found to be Worſhippers of Images. Neither will it avail them here to ſay, that the Idolatry forbidden in the Scripture is that only which was uſed by the Jews and Pagans: For as well might one plead, that Jewiſh or Heatheniſh Fornication was here only reprehended as Jewiſh or Heatheniſh Idolatry. But as the one is a foul Sin, whether it be committed by Jew, Pagan, or Chriſtian: So, if ſuch as profeſs the Name of Chriſt ſhall practice that which the Word of God condemneth in Jews or Pagans, for Idolatry, their Profeſſion is ſo far from diminiſhing, that it augmenteth rather the hainouſneſs of the Crime.* About the ſame time came forth Biſhop

Down-

nolds de Idolat. Eccleſ. Rom. *Dr.* Whitaker, c. Duræum, *l.* 5 *p.* 133. *K.* James *his Works. p.* 303.

Iſ. Caſaub. Ep. ad Cardin. Perron, ad quartam Inſtant.

Ad Torti librum reſponſ. *p.* 312. *Anſwer to* Perron. 20. *chap. p.* 58. *Biſh.* Abbot *againſt* Biſhop, Tom. 2. *p.* 1106.

White's *Reply to* Fiſher, *p.* 209

Dr. Field *of the Church l.* 3. *ch.* 20. *p.* 109. *Biſhop* Uſher's *Sermon before the Commons p.* 50.

Downham's Book of *Antichriſt*, wherein he doth at large prove, *That to give Divine Honour to a Creature, is Idolatry*; *and that the Papiſts do give it in the Worſhip of Saints, the Hoſt and Images:* which is likewiſe done, nearer our own Times, by *Biſhop Davenant*, and Dr. *Jackſon*.

Downam de Antichriſt. *l.* 5. c. 1, 2. &c.
Davenant. deter. quæſt. 18.
D. Jackſon's *Original of Unbelief*, ſect. 4.

I ſhall conclude all (although I might produce more) with the Teſtimony of Archbiſhop *Laud*, who in his *Conference*, ſaith, *the ancient Church knew not the Adoration of Images*; *and the modern Church of* Rome *is too like to Paganiſm in the Practice of it, and driven to ſcarce intelligible Subtilties in her Servants Writings that defend it*; *and this without any Care had of Millions of Souls unable to underſtand Subtilties, or ſhun her Practice*: And in his Marginal Notes upon *Bellarmin* (written with his own hand, now in my Poſſeſſion) where *Bellarmin* anſwers the Teſtimony of the *Council* of *Laodicea* againſt the *Worſhip* of *Angels*, by ſaying, *That it doth not condemn all Worſhip of Angels, but only that which is proper to God*; he replies, *That* Theodoret *who produced that Teſtimony of the Council, expreſly mentions the praying to Angels*; *therefore*, ſaith he, *the praying to them was that Idolatry which the Council condemns.* By this we ſee, that the moſt eminent and learned Defenders of our Church, of greateſt Authority in it, and Zeal for the Cauſe of it againſt Enemies of all Sorts, have agreed in the Charge of *Idolatry* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*.

Archbiſhop Laud's *Conferen.* p. 277.
Bell. de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 20.

And I cannot ſee why the Authority of ſome *very few Perſons*, though of great Learning, ſhould bear ſway againſt the conſtant Opinion of our *Church* ever ſince the *Reformation*. Since our *Church* is not now to be formed according to the *ſingular Fancies* of ſome few (though learned Men;) much leſs to be modelled by the *Caprichio*'s of *Superſtitious Fanaticks*, who prefer ſome odd Opinions and Ways of their own, before the received Doctrine and Practice of the *Church* they live in. Such as theſe, we rather pity their Weakneſs, than regard their Cenſures; and are only ſorry when our Adverſaries make ſuch *Properties* of them, as by their Means to beget in ſome a Diſaffection to our *Church*. Which I am ſo far from (whatever Malice and Peeviſhneſs may ſuggeſt to the contrary) that upon the greateſt Enquiry I can make, I eſteem it the beſt *Church* of the *Chriſtian World*; and think my Time very well employed (whatever *Thanks* I meet with for it) in defending its *Cauſe*, and preſerving Perſons in the Communion of it.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Of the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of Rome, *in the Worſhip of Images.*

THE *Introduction, concerning the Occaſion of the Debate. The Church of* Rome *makes its Members guilty of Hypocryſy or Idolatry: Firſt, Of the Worſhip of God by Images: Some Propoſitions for*

for clearing the Notion of Divine Worſhip. It is in God's Power to determine the Way of his Worſhip, which being determined, God's Law, and not our Intention, is to be the Rule of Worſhip. The main Queſtion is, whether God hath forbidden the Worſhipping of himſelf by an Image, under the Notion of Idolatry? Of the meaning of the Second Commandment, from the Terms therein uſed; the large Senſe and Importance of them, which cannot be underſtood only of Heathen Idols. Of the Reaſon of that Law, from God's infinite and inviſible Nature: How far that hath been acknowledged by Heathens? The Law againſt Image Worſhip no ceremonial Law, reſpecting meerly the Jews; the Reaſon againſt it made more clear by the Goſpel: The wiſer Heathen did not worſhip their Images as Gods, yet their worſhip condemned as Idolatry. The Chriſtian Church believed the Reaſon of this Law to be immutable. Of the Doctrine of the ſecond Council of Nice; *the Oppoſition to it in* Greece, Germany, France *and* England. *Of the Scripture Inſtances of Idolatry contrary to the Second Commandment, in the Golden Calf, and the Calves of* Dan *and* Bethel. *Of the Diſtinctions uſed to excuſe Image Worſhip from being Idolatry: The Vanity and Folly of them. The Inſtances ſuppoſed to be parallel anſwer'd.* p. 48.

CHAP. II.

Of their Idolatry in Adoration of the Hoſt, and Invocation of Saints.

The Argument propoſed, concerning the Adoration of the Hoſt; the Inſufficiency of the Anſwer to it manifeſted: Suppoſing equal Revelation for Tranſubſtantiation as for Chriſt's Divinity, yet not the ſame Reaſon for worſhipping the Hoſt, as the Perſon of Chriſt; the great Diſparity between theſe Two at large diſcovered; the Controverſy truly ſtated, concerning Adoration of the Hoſt: And it is proved, that no Man on the Principles of the Roman Church, can be ſecure he doth not commit Idolatry in it. The Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, that the ſame Principles will juſtify the Worſhip of any Creature. No ſuch Motives to believe Tranſubſtantiation as the Divinity of Chriſt. Biſhop Taylor's *Teſtimony anſwer'd by himſelf. To worſhip Chriſt in the Sun, as lawful as to worſhip him in the Hoſt. The groſſeſt Idolatry excuſable on the ſame Grounds. The Argument propoſed and vindicated, concerning the Invocation of Saints practiſed in the Church of* Rome. *The Fathers Arguments againſt the Heathens, hold againſt Invocations of Saints; the State of the Controverſy about Idolatry, as managed by them. They make it wholly unlawful to give divine Worſhip to any Creature, how excellent ſoever. The Worſhip, not only of Heathen Gods, but of Angels condemned. The Common Evaſions anſwered. Prayer more proper to God, than Sacrifice. No ſuch Diſparity as is pretended, between the Manner of Invocating Saints, and the Heathens Invocating their Deities. In the Church of* Rome, *they do more than pray to Saints to pray for them, proved from the preſent moſt Authentick Breviaries. Suppoſing that were all, it would not excuſe them.* St. Auſtin *no Friend to Invocation of Saints. Practices condemned by the Church pleaded for it. Of Negative Points being Articles of Faith.* p. 106.

The Contents.

CHAP. III.

Of the Hindrances of a good Life, and of Devotion in the Roman Church.

The Doctrines of the Roman Church prejudicial to Piety. The Sacrament of Penance, as taught among them, deſtroys the Neceſſity of a good Life. The Doctrine of Purgatory takes away the Care of it; as appears by the true ſtating it, and comparing that Doctrine with Proteſtants. How eaſy it is, according to them, for a rich Man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Purgatory dreadful to none, but poor and friendleſs. Sincerity of Devotion hindred, by Prayers in an unknown Tongue. The great Abſurdity of it manifeſted. The Effects of our Anceſtors Devotion had been as great, if they had ſaid their Prayers in Engliſh. The Language of Prayer proved to be no indifferent Thing from St. Paul's Arguments. No univerſal Conſent for Prayers in an unknown Tongue, by the Confeſſion of their own Writers. Of their Doctrine of the Efficacy of Sacraments; that it takes away all Neceſſity of Devotion, in the Minds of the Receivers. This complain'd of by Caſſander and Arnaud; but proved againſt them, to be the Doctrine of the Roman Church, by the Canons of the Council of Trent. The great eaſineſs of getting Grace by their Sacraments. Of their diſcouraging the reading the Scriptures. A ſtanding Rule of Devotion neceſſary. None ſo fit to give it, as God himſelf: This done by him in the Scriptures. All Perſons therefore concern'd to read them. The Arguments againſt reading the Scriptures, would have held againſt the publiſhing them in a Language known to the People. The Dangers as great then, as ever have been ſince. The greateſt Prudence of the Roman Church is wholly to forbid the Scriptures, being acknowledged by their wiſeſt Men, to be ſo contrary to their Intereſt. The Confeſſion of the Cardinals at Bononia, to that purpoſe. The avowed Practice of the Roman Church herein, directly contrary to that of the Primitive: Although the Reaſons were as great then, from the Danger of Hereſies. This confeſſed by their own Writers.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Fanaticiſm of the Roman Church.

The unreaſonableneſs of objecting Sects and Fanaticiſms to us, as the effects of reading the Scriptures. Fanaticiſm countenanced in the Roman Church, but condemned by ours. Private Revelations made among them the grounds of believing ſome Points of Doctrine; proved from their own Authors. Of the Revelations pleaded for the immaculate Conception. The Revelations of St. Brigitt, and St. Catharine directly contrary in this point, yet both owned in the Church of Rome. The large approbations of St. Brigitts, by Popes and Councils; and both their Revelations acknowledged to be Divine, in the Leſſons read upon their days. St. Catharines wonderful faculty of ſmelling Souls, a Gift peculiar to her and Philip Nerius. The vain attempts of reconciling thoſe Revelations. The great number of female Revelations approved in the Roman Church. Purga-

tory, Tranſubſtantiation, Auricular Confeſſion proved by Viſions and Revelations. Feſtivals appointed upon the credit of Revelations: the Feaſt of Corpus Chriſti *on the Revelation made to* Juliana, *the Story of it related from their own Writers: No ſuch things can be objected to our Church. Revelations ſtill owned by them; proved from the Fanatick Revelations of Mother* Juliana *very lately publiſhed by Mr.* Creſſy: *Some inſtances of the blaſphemous Non-ſenſe contained in them. The Monaſtick Orders founded in Enthuſiaſm. An account of the great Fanaticiſm of St.* Benedict, *and St.* Romoaldus: *their hatred of Humane Learning, and ſtrange Viſions and Revelations. The Carthuſian Order founded upon a Viſion. The Carmelites Viſion of their Habit. The Franciſcan and Dominican Orders founded on Fanaticiſm, and ſeen in a Viſion of* Innocent *the third to be the great Supporters of the* Roman *Church. The* Quakeriſm *of St.* Francis *deſcribed from their beſt Authors. His Ignorance, Ecſtaſies and Fanatick Preaching. The Viſion of* Dominicus. *The blaſphemous Enthuſiaſm of the Mendicant Fryers. The Hiſtory of it related at large. Of the* Evangelium æternum, *and the Blaſphemies contained in it. The Author of it ſuppoſed to be the General of the Franciſcan Order, however owned by the Fryers, and read and preached at* Paris. *The Oppoſition to it by the Univerſity: But favoured by the* Popes. Gul. S. Amour *writing againſt it, his Book publickly Burnt, by order of the* Court *of* Rome. *The* Popes *horrible partiality to the Fryers. The Fanaticiſm of the Franciſcans afterwards. Of the Followers of* Petrus Johannis de Oliva. *The Spiritual State began (ſay they) from St.* Francis. *The ſtory of his Wounds, and* Maria Viſitationis *parallel'd. The canting Language uſed by the ſpiritual Brethren, called* Beguini, Fraticelli, *and* Begardi. *Of their Doctrines about Poverty, Swearing, Perfection, the Carnal Church and Inſpiration: By all which, they appear to be a Sect of Quakers, after the Order of St.* Francis. *Of the Schiſm made by them. The large ſpreading, and long continuance of them. Of the* Apoſtolici *and* Dulciniſtæ. *Of their numerous Conventicles. Their Zeal againſt the Clergy, and Tythes; their Doctrine of Chriſtian Liberty. Of the* Alumbrado's *in* Spain: *their Diſobedience to Biſhops; obſtinate adhering to their own fancies, calling them Inſpirations, their being above Ordinances.* Ignatius Loyola *ſuſpected to be one of the* Illuminati, *proved from* Melchior Canus. *The Jeſuits Order founded in Fanaticiſm, a particular Account of the Romantick Enthuſiaſm of* Ignatius *from the Writers of his own Order. Whereby it is proved, that he was the greateſt Pretender to Enthuſiaſm, ſince the Days of* Mahomet *and St.* Francis. Ignatius *gave no reſpect to Men by Words, or putting off his Hat; his great Ignorance and Preaching in the Streets: his glorying in his Sufferings for it; his pretence to Mortification; the ways he uſed to get Diſciples. Their way of reſolution of difficulties by ſeeking God; their itinerant Preaching in the Cities of* Italy. *The Sect of Quakers a new Order of Diſciples of* Ignatius, *only wanting Confirmation from the Pope, which* Ignatius *obtained. Of the Fanatick way of Devotion in the* Roman *Church. Of Superſtitions and Enthuſiaſtical Fanaticiſm among them. Of their myſtical Divinity. Mr.* Creſſy's *canting in his Preface to* Sancta Sophia. *Of the Deiform fund of the Soul; a ſupereſſential*

eſſential Life, and the way to it. Of contemplating with the will. Of paſſive Unions. The method of Self-annihilation. Of the Union of nothing with nothing. Of the feeling of not being. The miſchief of an unintelligible way of Devotion. The utmoſt effects of this way is groſs Enthuſiaſm. Mr. Creſſy's *Vindication of it examined. The laſt ſort of Fanaticiſm among them, reſiſting Authority under pretence of Religion. Their Principles and Practices compared with the Fanaticks. How far they are diſowned at preſent by them. Of the Vindication of the* Iriſh Remonſtrance. *The Court of* Rome *hath always favoured that Party, which is moſt deſtructive to civil Government, proved by particular and late Inſtances.* p. 231.

CHAP. V.

Of the Diviſions of the Roman Church.

The great pretence of Unity in the Church *of* Rome *conſidered. The* Popes *Authority the Fountain of that Unity; what that Authority is which is challenged by the* Popes *over the* Chriſtian *World; the Diſturbances which have happened therein, on the account of it. The firſt revolt of* Rome *from the Empire, cauſed by the* Popes; Baronius *his Arguments anſwered. Rebellion the Foundation of the greatneſs of that* Church. *The cauſe of the ſtrict League between the* Popes *and the poſterity of* Charles Martel. *The Diſturbances made by* Popes, *in the new Empire: Of the quarrels of* Greg. 7. *with the Emperor and other Chriſtian Princes, upon the pretence of the* Pope's *Authority. More Diſturbances on that account in Chriſtendom, than upon any other matter of Religion. Of the Schiſms which have happened in the* Roman *Church: particularly thoſe after the time of* Formoſus, *wherein his Ordinations were nulled by his Succeſſors; the* Pope's *oppoſition to each other in that Age: the miſerable ſtate of that Church then deſcribed. Of the* Schiſms *of latter times, by the* Italick *and* Gallick *Factions; the long Continuance of them. The miſchief of thoſe* Schiſms, *on their own Principles. Of the Diviſions in that Church about the matters of* Order *and Government. The differences between the Biſhops and the Monaſtick Orders, about exemptions and privileges; the Hiſtory of that Controverſie, and the bad ſucceſs the* Popes *had in attempting to compoſe it. Of the quarrel between the* Regulars *and* Seculars *in* England. *The continuance of that Controverſy here, and in* France. *The* Jeſuits *enmity to the Epiſcopal* Order *and Juriſdiction: the hard caſe of the* Biſhop *of* Angelopolis *in* America. *The* Popes *ſtill favour the* Regulars, *as much as they dare. The* Jeſuits *way of converting the* Chineſe, *diſcovered by that* Biſhop. *Of the Differences in matters of Doctrines in that* Church. *They have no better way to compoſe them than we. The* Pope's *Authority never truly ended one Controverſy among them. Their ways to evade the Deciſions of* Popes *and Councils. Their Diſſenſions are about matters of Faith. The ways taken to excuſe their own Differences will as well take away thoſe between them and us, manifeſted by* Sancta Clara's *Expoſition of the* 39 *Articles. Their Diſputes not confined to their* Schools, *proved, by a particular inſtance, about the immaculate Conception; the infinite ſcandals, confeſſed by their own Authors, to have*

have been in their Church *about it. From all which it appears, that the* Church *of* Rome *can have no advantage in point of Unity, above ours.*

CHAP. VI.

An Anſwer to the Remainder *of the* Reply.

The miſ-interpreting Scripture doth not hinder its being a Rule of Faith. Of the Superſtitious Obſervations of the Roman Church. *Of Indulgences; the Practice of them, in what Time begun; on what Occaſion, and in what Terms granted. Of the Indulgences in Jubilees, in the Churches at* Rome, *and upon ſaying ſome Prayers. Inſtances of them produced. What opinion hath been had of Indulgences, in the Church of* Rome: *Some confeſs they have no Foundation in Scripture, or Antiquity; others that they are pious Frauds: The miſerable ſhifts the Defenders of Indulgences were put to: Plain evidences of their Fraud from the Diſputes of the Schools about them. The treaſure of the Church invented by* Aquinas, *and on what occaſion. The wickedneſs of Men increaſed by* Indulgences, *acknowledged by their own Writers: and therefore condemned by many of that Church. Of* Bellarmin's *prudent Chriſtians opinion of them.* Indulgences *no meer relaxations of Canonical Penance. The great abſurdity of the Doctrine of the Churches Treaſure, on which Indulgences are founded, at large manifeſted. The tendency of them to deſtroy Devotion, proved by experience, and the nature of the Doctrine. Of Communion in one kind: no Devotion in oppoſing an Inſtitution of Chriſt. Of the* Popes *Power of diſpenſing contrary to the Law of God, in Oaths and Marriages. The ill conſequence of aſſerting Marriage in a Prieſt to be worſe than Fornication, which is done in the Church of* Rome. *Of the uncertainty of Faith therein. How far Revelation to be believed againſt Senſe. The Arguments to prove the uncertainty of their Faith defended. The caſe of a Revolter and a bred Papiſt compared, as to Salvation: and the greater Danger of one than the other proved. The Motives of the* Roman Church *conſidered; thoſe laid down by* Biſhop Taylor, *fully anſwered by himſelf. An account of the Faith of Proteſtants, laid down in the way of Principles: wherein the grounds and nature of our certainty of Faith are cleared. And from the whole concluded, that there can be no reaſonable cauſe to forſake the Communion of the Church of* England, *and to embrace that of the Church of* Rome.

Two *Queſtions* propoſed by one of the Church of R*ome*.

1. W*Hether a* Proteſtant *having the ſame Motives to become a* Catholick, *which one bred and born, and well grounded in the* Catholick Religion, *hath to remain in it, may not equally be ſaved in the Profeſſion of it?*

2. *Whether it be ſufficient to be a* Chriſtian *in the* abſtract, *or in the* whole latitude, *or there be a neceſſity of being a Member of ſome diſtinct* Church, *or Congregation of* Chriſtians?

Anſwer.

4.2.8.Th.

ANSWER.

THE firſt *Queſtion* being ſuppoſed to be put concerning a *Proteſtant*, yet continuing ſo, doth imply a contradiction, *viz.* That a *Proteſtant* continuing ſo, ſhould have the ſame Motives to become a *Catholick* (taking that *term* here only as ſignifying one of the Communion of the *Church* of *Rome*) which thoſe have, who have been born or bred in that Communion. But ſuppoſing the meaning of the Queſtion to be this, Whether a *Proteſtant* leaving the Communion of our *Church*, upon the Motives uſed by thoſe of the *Roman Church*, may not be equally ſaved with thoſe who are bred in it? I anſwer,

1. That an equal capacity of Salvation of thoſe Perſons being ſuppoſed, can be no Argument to leave the Communion of a Church, wherein Salvation of a Perſon may be much more ſafe, than of either of them: No more, than it is, for a Man to leap from the plain ground into a Ship, that is in danger of being wrackt, becauſe he may equally hope to be ſaved with thoſe who are in it. Nay, ſuppoſing an equal capacity of Salvation in Two ſeveral *Churches*, there can be no reaſon to forſake the Communion of the one for the other. So that to perſwade any one to leave our *Church* to embrace that of *Rome*, it is by no means ſufficient to ask, whether ſuch a one may not as well be ſaved as they that are in it already: But it is neceſſary, that they prove, that it is of neceſſity to Salvation to leave our Church, and become a Member of theirs: And when they do this, I intend to be one of their number.

2. We aſſert, that all thoſe, who are in the Communion of the *Church* of *Rome*, do run ſo great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their Souls, ought to embrace it, or continue in it. And that upon theſe grounds.

1. *Becauſe they muſt by the terms of Communion with that Church, be guilty either of Hypocriſy or Idolatry*; either of which are Sins inconſiſtent with Salvation. Which I thus prove.

That *Church* which requires the giving the *Creature* the Worſhip due only to the *Creator*, makes the Members of it guilty of Hypocriſy or Idolatry: For if they do it, they are guilty of the latter; if they do it not, of the former: But the *Church of* Rome *in the Worſhip of God by Images, the Adoration of the Bread in the Euchariſt, and the formal Invocation of Saints*, doth require the giving to the Creature the Worſhip due only to the Creator: Therefore it makes the Members of it guilty of Hypocriſy or Idolatry.

That the *Church* of *Rome*, in theſe particulars, doth require the giving the Creature the honour due only to *God*, I prove thus concerning each of them.

1. Where the Worſhip of *God* is terminated upon a Creature, there, by their own Confeſſion, the Worſhip due only to *God* is given to the Creature; but *in the Worſhip of God by Images*, the Worſhip due to God is terminated wholly on the Creature; which is thus proved, the Worſhip which *God* himſelf denies to receive, muſt be terminated on the Creature; but God himſelf, in the *Second Commandment* not only denies to receive it, but threatens ſeverely to puniſh them that

give it; Therefore it cannot be terminated on *God*, but only on the Image.

2. The ſame Argument which would make the groſſeſt Heathen Idolatry Lawful, cannot excuſe any act from *Idolatry*; but the ſame Argument, whereby the *Papiſts* make the Worſhip of the Bread in the *Euchariſt* not to be Idolatry, would make the groſſeſt Heathen *Idolatry* not to be ſo. For if it be not therefore *Idolatry*, becauſe they ſuppoſe the Bread to be *God*, then the Worſhip of the Sun was not *Idolatry* in them who ſuppoſed the Sun to be *God*; and upon this ground, the groſſer the *Idolatry* was, the leſs it was *Idolatry*: For the groſſeſt *Idolaters* were thoſe, who ſuppoſed their *Statues* to be *Gods*. And upon this ground their Worſhip was more lawful, than of thoſe, who ſuppoſed them not to be ſo.

3. If the Suppoſition of a middle excellency between *God* and *us*, be a ſufficient ground for *formal Invocation*, then the Heathen Worſhip of their inferior *Deities* could be no *Idolatry*: For the Heathens ſtill pretended, that they did not give to them the Worſhip proper to the Supreme God; which is as much as is pretended by the devouteſt *Papiſt*, in juſtification of the *Invocation of Saints*. To theſe I expect a direct and punctual Anſwer, profeſſing as much Charity towards them, as is conſiſtent with Scripture and Reaſon.

2. *Becauſe the Church of* Rome *is guilty of ſo great Corruption of the Chriſtian Religion by ſuch Opinions and Practices which are very apt to hinder a good Life:* Such are, *the* deſtroying the neceſſity of a good Life, *by making the Sacrament of Penance joyned with Contrition, ſufficient for Salvation*; the taking off the care of it, *by ſuppoſing an expiation of Sin (by the Prayers of the Living) after Death.* And the ſincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed in it, *by Prayers in a Language which many underſtand not; by making the efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the bare Adminiſtration, whether our Minds be prepared for them or not; by diſcouraging the reading the Scripture, which is our moſt certain Rule of Faith and Life; by the multitude of Superſtitious Obſervations, never uſed in the* Primitive *Church, as we are ready to defend; by the groſs abuſe of* People *in* Pardons *and Indulgences; by denying the Cup to the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the ſolemn Celebration of the Euchariſt, for a thouſand Years after Chriſt; by making it in the power of any* Perſon *to diſpenſe, contrary to the Law of God, in Oaths and Marriages; by making diſobedience to the Church, in diſputable Matters, more heinous than diſobedience to the Laws of Chriſt, in unqueſtionable Things; as Marriage in a* Prieſt, *to be a greater Crime than Fornication.*

By all which Practices, and Opinions we aſſert, that there are ſo many hinderances to a good Life, that none who have a care of their Salvation, can venture their Souls, in the Communion of ſuch a *Church*, which either enjoyns or publickly allows them.

3. *Becauſe it expoſeth the Faith of Chriſtians, to ſo great uncertainty: By making the Authority of the Scriptures to depend on the Infallibility of the Church, when the Churches Infallibility muſt be proved by the Scripture:* by *making thoſe things neceſſary to be believed, which if they be believed overthrow all Foundations of Faith,viz.* That we are not to believe our Senſes, in the plaineſt Objects of them; as that Bread which we ſee is not Bread: upon which it follows, that Tradition

being a continued kind of Senſation, can be no more certain, than Senſe itſelf; and that the Apoſtles might have been deceived in the Body of Chriſt after the Reſurrection; and the *Church* of any Age, in what they ſaw or heard. By *denying to Men the uſe of their Judgment and Reaſon, as to the matters of Faith propoſed by a Church*, when they muſt uſe it in the choice of a *Church*; by *making the Churches power extend to make new Articles of Faith, viz.* by making thoſe things neceſſary to be believed, which were not ſo before. By *pretending to Infallibility, in determining Controverſies, and yet not determining Controverſies which are on foot among themſelves.* All which, and ſeveral other things, which my deſigned brevity will not permit me to mention, tend very much to ſhake the Faith of ſuch, who have nothing elſe to rely on, but the Authority of the *Church* of *Rome*.

3. I anſwer, *That a Proteſtant leaving the Communion of our Church, doth incurr a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *and continues therein by invincible Ignorance*; and therefore cannot equally be ſaved with ſuch a one. For a *Proteſtant* is ſuppoſed, to have ſufficient convictions of the Errors of the *Roman Church*, or is guilty of willful Ignorance, if he hath not; but although we know not, what allowances God will make for invincible Ignorance, we are ſure that willſul Ignorance, or chooſing a worſe Church before a better, is a damnable Sin, and unrepented of deſtroys Salvation.

7.1.6. To the ſecond *Queſtion* I anſwer, 1. I do not underſtand what is meant by a *Chriſtian in the Abſtract, or in the whole Latitude*; it being a thing I never heard, or read of before: And therefore may have ſome meaning in it, which I cannot underſtand. 2. But if the Queſtion be, as the laſt words imply it, whether a *Chriſtian* by virtue of his being ſo, be bound to joyn in ſome *Church* or *Congregation* of *Chriſtians*? I anſwer affirmatively; and that he is bound to chooſe the Communion of the pureſt *Church*, and not to leave that for a corrupt one, though called never ſo *Catholick*.

The Propoſer's of the Queſtions Reply to the Anſwer.

Madam,

I Did not expect that two bare Queſtions could have produced ſuch a ſuper-fœtation of Controverſies, as the Paper you ſent me is fraught with; But ſince the Anſwerer hath been pleaſed to take this Method, (for what end himſelf beſt knows) I ſhall not refuſe to give a fair and plain return, to the ſeveral points he inſiſts upon, and that with as much brevity, as the matter and circumſtances will bear.

The Queſtions propoſed were: 1. *Whether a* Proteſtant *having the ſame Motives to become a* Catholick, *which one bred and born, and well grounded in* Catholick *Religion hath to remain in it, may not equally be ſaved in the profeſſion of it?*

The 2. *Whether it be ſufficient to be a Chriſtian in the Abſtract, or in the whole Latitude, or there be a neceſſity of being a Member of ſome diſtinct Church or Congregation of Chriſtians?*

The firſt, *he ſaith*, being ſuppoſed to be put concerning a Proteſtant continuing ſo, implies a contradiction; *but where it lies I cannot ſee; for a* Proteſtant *may have the ſame Motives, and yet out of willfulneſs or paſſion not acquieſce to them. He ſaw no doubt this Suppoſition to be impertinent to the Queſtion, and therefore in the ſecond part of the* 1. § *ſtates it thus:* Whether a Proteſtant leaving the Communion of the Proteſtant Church, upon the Motives uſed by thoſe of the R*oman* Church, may not be equally ſaved with thoſe who were bred in it.

The Queſtion thus ſtated, in its true ſuppoſition, he anſwers firſt, § 2. That an equal capacity of Salvation of thoſe Perſons being ſuppoſed, can be no Argument to leave the Communion of a Church, wherein the Salvation of a Perſon may be much more ſafe than either of them. *But before I reply, I muſt do both him and my ſelf right in matter of fact; and it is,* Madam, *that when you firſt addreſſed to me, you profeſſed your ſelf much troubled, that he had told you, a* Perſon *leaving the* Proteſtant Communion, *and embracing the* Catholick, *could not be ſaved. That we ſhould deny Salvation to any out of the* Catholick Church, *you lookt upon as uncharitable, and this Aſſertion of his had ſtartled you in the* Opinion *you had before of the* Proteſtant Charity. *Whereupon you deſired to know my* Opinion *in the caſe, and I told you I ſaw no reaſon, why the ſame Motives which ſecured one born and bred, and well grounded in the Catholick Religion, to continue in it, were not ſufficient alſo to ſecure a Proteſtant, who convinced by them, ſhould embrace it.* This, Madam, *your ſelf can witneſs, was the true occaſion of your propoſing the Queſtion, and not as the Anſwerer ſuppoſes, that I uſed the meer Queſtion it ſelf as a ſufficient Argument to perſwade you to embrace the Catholick Communion. This premiſed, I reply; that the Anſwer he gives, is altogether foreign to the matter in hand, the Controverſy not being between a bred and a converted Catholick on the one ſide, and a* Perſon *ſuppoſed to be in a ſafer* Church *than either of them on the other: Nor yet between two ſeveral Churches, ſuppoſed to have in them an equal* Capacity *of Salvation; but between a* Perſon *bred in the* Catholick Religion *on the one ſide, and another converted to it from* Proteſtantiſm *on the other, whether the latter may not be equally ſaved with the former? Nor is it to the purpoſe of the preſent Queſtion, to prove* that it is of neceſſity to Salvation to leave the Proteſtant Church, and become a Member of the Catholick, *becauſe the Queſtion is only of the poſſibility, not of the neceſſity of Salvation. I ſay, it is not neceſſary, to the preſent Queſtion, to prove this; but rather belongs to the ſecond, where I ſhall ſpeak to it; whether there be a neceſſity of being a Member of ſome diſtinct Church? Which being reſolved affirmatively by both parts, it follows then in order to inquire which this true Church is. As for the example of* a Man leaping from the plain ground into a Ship that is in danger of being wrackt, *meaning by that Ship (as I ſuppoſe he does) the Catholick Church: Some will be apt to think he had come nearer the Mark if he had compared the* Proteſtant *to a Ship, which by often knocking againſt the* Rock *on which the* Catholick *Church is built, had ſplit it ſelf into innumerable Sects, and was now in danger of ſinking; his compariſon was grounded only on his own ſuppoſition, but this is grounded on the truth it ſelf of too ſad an experience. But to leave words, and come to the matter. His ſecond*

cond anſwer is, § 3. *that* all thoſe, who are in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, do run ſo great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their Souls ought to embrace or continue in it. *The firſt Anſwer, as I have ſhewed, was nothing pertinent to the preſent Queſtion; nor comes this ſecond any nearer the matter; for though it be ſuppoſed, that none ought to embrace or continue in the Catholick Church, by reaſon of the great hazard, he ſaith, they run of their Salvation, yet if they do embrace or continue in it, why may they not be equally ſaved, that is, with equal capacity? But this Aſſertion, however beſide the Queſtion, he makes it his main buſineſs to prove, Firſt,* § 4. Becauſe thoſe who embrace, or continue in the Catholick Church, are guilty either of Hypocriſy, or Idolatry; either of which, are Sins inconſiſtent with Salvation. *And here he muſt give me leave to return upon him a more palpable contradiction, than that he ſuppoſed to have found in the Queſtion,* viz. *to aſſert only, that thoſe of the Catholick Communion run a great hazard of their Salvation, and yet affirm at the ſame time that they are guilty either of Hypocriſy, or Idolatry, Sins inconſiſtent with Salvation: Which reduced into plain terms is no other, but that they may be ſaved, though hardly; and yet cannot be ſaved. But to the Argument;* The Church of *Rome*, by the Worſhip of God by Images, by the Adoration of Bread in the Euchariſt, and the formal Invocation of Saints, doth require the giving to the Creature the Worſhip due only to the Creator; Therefore it makes the Members of it guilty of Hypocriſy or Idolatry. *The Charge is great, but what are the Proofs?*

Concerning the firſt he ſaith, § 5. *that* in the Worſhip of God by Images, the Worſhip due to God is terminated wholly on the Creature. *And ſurely this implies another contradiction, that it ſhould be the Worſhip of God by Images, and yet be terminated wholly on the Creature; Nevertheleſs he proves it thus:* The Worſhip which God himſelf denies to receive, muſt be terminated upon the Creature; but God himſelf in the ſecond Commandment, not only denies to receive it, but threatens ſeverely to puniſh them that gave it, *that is, that Worſhip him by an Image:* Therefore it cannot be terminated on God, but only on the Image. *To this Argument, which to be juſt to the Author, I confeſs I have not ſeen any where propoſed in theſe terms, I anſwer, the firſt Propoſition is built on a great miſtake of the Nature of humane acts, which though they ought to be governed by the Law of God, yet when they ſwerve from it, ceaſe not to tend to their own proper Objects. God's Prohibition of ſuch or ſuch a kind of Worſhip, may make it to be unlawful, but hinders not the act from tending, whither it is intended; and conſequently if it be intended or directed by the underſtanding to God, though after an unlawful manner, it will not fail to be terminated upon God: Thus, when a Thief or a Murderer prays to God, to give him good ſucceſs in the Theft or Murder he intends; though God denies to hear any ſuch Prayer, yet is the Prayer truly directed to him: And thus when the Jews offered to God in Sacrifice the Blind and the Lame, though he had forbidden it, yet was the Oblation terminated on him, and therefore he reproves them for having polluted him,* Mal. 1. 8. *and to convince them the more of their evil doings, offer it now, ſays he, to thy Governor, will he be pleaſed with thee, or accept thy Perſon? Though the Governor deny to accept what is preſented to him, yet it is truly offered to him*

by

by the Preſenter: And ſo, although God deny to accept ſuch or ſuch Sacrifice, yet it is truly offered to him: though the offering of it, after a forbidden manner, make it to be ſin: Did not God refuſe to accept the Sacrifice of Cain, *and yet the Scripture,* Gen. 4. 3. *ſays expreſly, that he brought an offering to the Lord? God had not reſpect to* Cain *nor his Offering, but this did not hinder, but that* Cain's *Offering had reſpect to God, and was terminated on him. In like manner, though God deny ſuch or ſuch a kind of Worſhip; if it be offered, though unlawfully, by the Creature, yet is it terminated on him. The Propoſition therefore which aſſerts,* that the Worſhip which God denies muſt be terminated on the Creature, *I deny as abſolutely falſe, and ſo will you too,* Madam, *when you ſhall ſee the ſenſe of it to be no other, but that a wicked Man cannot Pray to God, or Worſhip him in an unlawful or forbidden manner, who is therefore a wicked Man becauſe he does ſo. What follows from hence is, that though God ſhould have forbidden Men to Worſhip him by Images, yet it does not follow but the Worſhip ſo given, would be terminated on him. But now to ſpeak to his ſecond Propoſition in which the main force of this Argument conſiſts.*

We utterly deny that God in the ſecond Commandment, forbids himſelf to be worſhipped by a Crucifix, for example, or ſuch like Sacred Image; for ſuch only are the Subject of the preſent Controverſy. What he forbids there, is to give his Worſhip to Idols: and this is clear from the Circumſtances of the Text: Firſt, becauſe this Commandment, if St. *Auſtin's judgment be to be followed, is but a part or explication of the firſt, Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me: Secondly, becauſe the Hebrew word* Peſel, *in Latin* Sculptile, *is uſed in Scripture to ſignify an Idol: Let them be confounded who adore* Sculptilia, *that is, Idols, ſaith the Pſalmiſt; and ſo the Septuagint tranſlate it in this very place* εἴδωλον, *an Idol, Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf an Idol; ſo that it was an artifice of the Proteſtants, to make their Aſſertion ſeem plauſible, to tranſlate Image inſtead of Idol; and not a certain kind of Image neither, but any whatſoever. Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image. Now what is all this to Catholicks, who neither make to themſelves, nor yield Soveraign honour or acknowledgment of Deity to any but God? We give indeed a veneration to Images, but the Image of God is not another God beſides him; nor is the Worſhip of it, the Worſhip of another God, but of him who is repreſented by it: for* St. Baſil *ſaith, The Worſhip of an Image ſtays not there, but is referred or carryed to the Prototype, or thing repreſented.*

We give therefore an inferior, or relative Honour only to the Sacred Images of Chriſt, and his bleſſed Mother, and Saints; not Latriam, *the Worſhip due to God, but* Honorariam adorationem, *a certain honorary Worſhip, expreſſed by kiſſing them, or putting off our Hats, or kneeling before them, much like the Worſhip given to the Chair of State, or the King's Picture, or his Garment by the like Actions: or to come nearer to the Subject, ſuch as was commanded to be given by* Moſes, *and* Joſhua *to the Ground whereon they ſtood, by putting off their Shooes, becauſe it was holy; and by the Jews, in adoring the Footſtool of God, or falling down before it,* Pſal. 98. 5. *and in Worſhipping (as* St. Jerom *teſtifies they did) that part of the Temple called the Holy of Holies, becauſe there were the Cherubims (ſacred Images ordered by God himſelf to be placed there) the propitiatory (repreſenting God's Throne)*

Ep 17. ad Marcellam.

and the Ark, (his Footſtool.) In a word, ſuch as the Proteſtants themſelves give to the Name of Jeſus, when they hear it ſpoken, by putting off their Hats, and bowing at it; or to the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Supper, by kneeling before them, as Figures repreſenting the Death of Chriſt; If condeſcendence to the Conſcience of weaker Brethren, will permit to own they have any honour or veneration for them, or for the Altar before which they bow. To conclude this point; the Objector brings a Text, which forbids us to give the Soveraign honour due to God, to an Idol; but let us hear out of Scripture an expreſs Text that it is not lawful to give to holy Images, and other things relating to God, an inferior or relative Worſhip, ſuch as we have declared, and that will be to the purpoſe.

§. *He aims to conclude the Catholick Church guilty of Idolatry, from the Adoration of the Bread (as he believes it) in the Euchariſt. Now to do this he ought to prove, that what we adore in the Euchariſt, is Bread indeed. But inſtead of that, he brings a compariſon between* our *Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, and the Heathens Adoration of the Sun:* viz. That the Papiſts by the ſame Argument, make the Worſhip of the Bread in the Euchariſt not to be Idolatry, which would excuſe the Heathens Worſhip of the Sun and of their Statues from Idolatry; For if it be not therefore Idolatry, *ſays he,* becauſe they ſuppoſe the Bread to be God, then the Worſhip of the Sun was not Idolatry in them, who ſuppoſed the Sun to be God. *I ſhall not complain here of the unhandſomneſs of the expreſſion, that Catholicks ſuppoſe the Bread to be God, juſt as the Heathens ſuppoſed the Sun to be God; whereas he knows, that the Catholicks believe, that the ſubſtance of the Bread is changed into Chriſt's Body; but ſhall anſwer to the Argument, that the Worſhip of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, is not Idolatry, becauſe we only ſuppoſe him to be really preſent under the form of Bread, but becauſe we know and believe this upon the ſame grounds and motives upon which we believe (and thoſe motives ſtronger than any Proteſtant hath (if he have no other than the Catholick) to believe) that Chriſt is God, and conſequently to be adored. And therefore that you may the better ſee the inefficaciouſneſs of the Argument, ſuppoſe it dropt from the Pen of an* Arrian *againſt the Adoration of Chriſt as God, and it will be of as much force to evince that to be Idolatry, as it is from the Objection to prove the Adoration of him in the Euchariſt to be ſo; ſee there how an* Arrian *might argue in the ſame form. The ſame Argument which would make the groſſeſt Heathen Idolatry lawful, cannot excuſe any act from Idolatry: But the ſame Argument, whereby the Proteſtants make the Worſhip of Chriſt (a pure Man, ſays the* Arrian*) not to be Idolatry, would make the groſſeſt Heathen Idolatry not to be ſo: For if it be not therefore Idolatry, becauſe they ſuppoſe Chriſt to be God, then the Worſhip of the Sun was not Idolatry, by them who ſuppoſed the Sun to be God,* &c. *Now the ſame Anſwer which ſolves the* Arrians *Arguments againſt the Adoration of Chriſt as God, ſerves no leſs to ſolve the Objectors Argument againſt the Adoration of him in the Euchariſt, ſince we have a like Divine Revelation for his real Preſence under the Sacramental Signs, as we have for his being true God and Man.*

But what if Catholicks ſhould be miſtaken in their Belief? Would it then follow, that they were Idolaters? Dr. Taylor *an eminent and leading Man amongſt the Proteſtants, denies the Conſequence.*

His Words are theſe, in the Liberty of Prophecying, *Sect.* 20. *Numb.* 26. Idolatry, *ſays he*, is a forſaking the true God, and giving Divine Worſhip to a Creature, or to an Idol, that is, to an Imaginary God, who hath no Foundation in Eſſence or Exiſtence: And this is that kind of Superſtition, which by Divines is called the Superſtition of an undue Object: Now it is evident, that the Object of their (that is, the Catholicks) Adoration (that which is repreſented to them in their Minds, their Thoughts and Purpoſes, and by which God principally if not ſolely, takes eſtimate of human Actions) in the bleſſed Sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, hypoſtatically joyned with his holy Humanity, which Humanity they believe actually preſent under the Veil of the Sacramental Signs; and if they thought him not preſent, they are ſo far from worſhipping the Bread in this Caſe, that themſelves profeſs it Idolatry to do ſo; which is a Demonſtration (*mark that*) that their Soul hath nothing in it, that is Idolatrical. If their Confidence and fanciful Opinion (ſo he terms the Faith of Catholicks) hath engaged them upon ſo great a Miſtake (as without doubt, *he ſays*, it hath) yet the Will hath nothing in it, but what is a great Enemy to Idolatry. *Et nihil ardet in inferno niſi propria Voluntas*; that is, nothing burns in Hell, but proper Will. *Thus Dr.* Taylor; *and I think it will be a Task worthy the Objector's Pains, to ſolve his Argument, if he will not abſolve us from being Idolaters.*

§. 7. He proceeds to prove, that Catholicks are guilty of Idolatry by their Invocation of Saints: And his Argument is this; If the SupPoſition of a middle Excellency between God and us, be a ſufficient Ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathen's Worſhip of their inferior Deities, could be no Idolatry, for the Heathens ſtill pretended, that they did not give to them the Worſhip proper to the Supream God, which is as much as is pretended by the devouteſt Papiſts in Juſtification of the Invocation of Saints. *To anſwer this Argument, I ſhall need little more than to explicate the hard Words in it; which thus I do. By Perſons of a middle Excellency, we underſtand Perſons endowed with ſupernatural Gifts of Grace in this Life, and Glory in Heaven, whoſe Prayers by Conſequence are acceptable and available with God; what he means by formal Invocation, I underſtand not well; but what we underſtand by it, is deſiring or praying thoſe juſt Perſons to pray for us. The Supream Deity of the Heathens is known to be* Jupiter, *and their inferior Deities*, Venus, Mars, Bacchus, Vulcan, *and the like Rabble of Devils, as the Scripture calls them, The Gods of the Heathens are Devils. The Terms thus explicated, 'tis eaſy to ſee the Inconſequence of the Argument, that becauſe the Heathens were Idolaters in worſhipping* Mars *and* Venus, *their inferior Deities, or rather Devils, though they pretended not to give them the Worſhip proper to* Jupiter *their Supream God: Therefore the Catholicks muſt be guilty of Idolatry, in deſiring the Servants of the true God, to pray for them to him; upon this Account, we muſt not deſire the Prayer of a juſt Man, even in this Life, becauſe this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferior Deity.*

But if ſome Sect of Heathens, as the Platoniſts, *did attain to the Knowledge of the true God, yet St.* Paul *ſays, they did not glorify him*

him as God; but changed his Glory into an Image made like to corruptible Man, adoring and offering Sacrifice due to God alone, to the Statues themſelves, or the inferior Deities they ſuppoſed to dwell or aſſiſt in them. Which inferior Deities, St. Auſtin, *upon the Ninety Sixth Pſalm, proves to be Devils or evil Angels, becauſe they required Sacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worſhipped as Gods. Now what Compariſon there is between this Worſhip of the Heathen's inferior Deities, and Chriſtian's Worſhip of Saints and Angels, let the ſame St.* Auſtin *declare in his Twentieth Book againſt* Fauſtus *the* Manichæan, *Chap.* 21. Fauſtus *there calumniates the Catholicks (the Word is St.* Auſtin's) *becauſe they honoured the Memories or Shrines of Martyrs, charging them to have turned the Idols into Martyrs, whom they worſhip* (ſaid he) *with like Vows. The Objection you ſee is not new, that Catholicks make inferior Deities of their Saints.* Fauſtus *long ago made it, and St.* Auſtin's *Anſwer will ſerve as well now as then.* Chriſtian People, *ſays he*, do with Religious Solemnity celebrate the Memory of Martyrs, both to excite to the Imitation of them, and to become Partakers of their Merits, and be holpen by their Prayers, but to that we erect Altars, not to any of the Martyrs, but to the God of Martyrs, although in Memory of the ſaid Martyrs; for what Biſhop officiating at the Altar, in the places where their holy Bodies are depoſited, does ſay at any time we offer to thee *Peter*, or *Paul*, or *Cyprian*? But what is offered to God, who crown'd the Martyrs, at the Memories or Shrines of thoſe whom he crowned; that being put in Mind by the very Places, a greater Affection may be raiſed in us to quicken our Love, both to thoſe whom we may imitate, and towards him by whoſe Aſſiſtance we can do it. We worſhip therefore the Martyrs with that Worſhip of Love and Society, with which even in this Life alſo holy Men of God are worſhipped, whoſe Heart we judge prepared to ſuffer the like Martyrdom for the Truth of the Goſpel. But we worſhip *them* ſo much the more devoutly, becauſe more ſecurely, after they have overcome all the Incertainties of this World; as alſo we praiſe them more confidently, now reigning Conquerors in a more happy Life, than whilſt they were fighting in this; but with that Worſhip, which in Greek is called *Latria* (and cannot be expreſſed by one Word in Latin) for as much as it is a certain Service properly due to the Divinity, we neither worſhip them, nor teach them to be worſhipped, but God alone. Now whereas the offering of Sacrifice belongs to this Worſhip (of *Latria*) from whence they are called Idolaters, who gave it alſo to Idols, by no means do we ſuffer any ſuch thing, or command it to be offered to any Martyr, or any holy Soul, or any Angel: And whoſoever declines into this Error, we reprove him by ſound Doctrine, either that he may be corrected or avoided------ *And a little after.* It is a much leſs Sin for a Man to be derided by the Martyrs for Drunkenneſs, than ever faſting to offer Sacrifice to them. I ſay to ſacrifice to Martyrs, I ſay not to ſacrifice to God in the Memories (or Churches) of the Martyrs, which we do moſt frequently, by that *Rite* alone, by which, in the Manifeſtation of the New Teſtament, he hath commanded Sacrifice to be offered to him, which belongs to that Worſhip, which is called *Latria*, and is due only to God. *This was the Doctrine and Practice of Chriſtian People in St.* Auguſtine's *Time, and that he himſelf*

himſelf held formal Invocations a Part of the Worſhip due to Saints, is evident from the Prayer he made to St. Cyprian *after his Martyrdom.* Adjuvetque nos Beatus Cyprianus Orationibus ſuis; *&c.* Let Bleſſed *Cyprian* therefore help us, (*who are ſtill encompaſſed with this mortal Fleſh, and labour as in a dark Cloud*) with his Prayer, *that by God's Grace we may, as far as we are able, imitate his good Works. Thus St.* Auſtin, *where you ſee he directs his Prayers to St.* Cyprian, *which I take to be formal Invocation; and for a further Confirmation of it, we have the ingenuous Confeſſion of* Calvin *himſelf, Inſtit. l.* 3. *c.* 20. *n.* 22. *where ſpeaking of the Third Council of* Carthage, *in which St.* Auſtin *was preſent, he acknowledged it was the Cuſtom at that time to ſay,* Sancta Maria, aut Sancte Petre ora pro nobis; *Holy* Mary, *or holy* Peter *pray for us.*

Lib. 3 *de Bapt. Cont. Donat. c.* 1.

But now, Madam, *what if after all this, he himſelf ſhall deny, that any of the oppoſite Tenets are Articles of his Faith, viz.* That Honour is not to be given to the Images of Chriſt and his Saints: That what appears to be Bread in the Eucharist, is not the Body of Chriſt: That it is not lawful to invocate the Saints to pray for us. *Preſs him cloſe, and I believe you ſhall find him deny, that he believes any one of theſe negative Points to be Divine Truths; and if ſo, you will eaſily ſee his Charge of Idolatry againſt us, to be vain and groundleſs.*

Having thus given a direct and punctual Anſwer to his Argument, I muſt now expect as much Charity from him, as is conſiſtent with Scripture and Reaſon. *How much that is, you will ſee in his Third Anſwer to the firſt Queſtion. But to proceed.*

§. 8. He brings a Miſcellany of ſuch Opinions *and* Practices (*as he calls them*) which are very apt to hinder a good Life; and therefore none, who have a Care of their Salvation, can venture their Souls in the Communion of ſuch a Church, which either enjoyns, or publickly allows them, *He reckons up no leſs than Ten.* 1. *That we* deſtroy the Neceſſity of good Life, by making the Sacrament of Penance (*that is, Confeſſion and Abſolution*) joyned with Contrition, ſufficient for Salvation. *And do not Proteſtants make Contrition alone, which is leſs, ſufficient for Salvation? But perhaps the joyning of Confeſſion and Abſolution with Contrition, makes it of a malignant Nature: If ſo, certainly when the Book of Common Prayer in the Viſitation of the Sick, enjoyns the ſick Man, if he find his Conſcience troubled with any weighty Matter, to make a ſpecial Confeſſion, and receive Abſolution from the Prieſt in the ſame Words the Catholick Church uſes, it preſcribes him that as a means to prepare himſelf for a holy Death, which in the Judgment of the Objector, deſtroys the Neceſſity of good Life.*

2. Catholicks, *he ſays,* take off the Care of good Life, by ſuppoſing an Expiation of Sin (by the Prayer of the living) after Death: *But certainly the belief of Temporal Pains to be ſuſtained after Death, if there be not a perfect Expiation of Sin in this Life, by Works of Penance, is rather apt to make a Man careful not to commit the leaſt Sin, than to take off the Care of a good Life. And though he be aſcertained by Faith, that he may be holpen by the charitable Suffrages of the faithful Living, yet this is no more Encouragement to him to ſin, than it would be to a Spendthrift to run into Debt, and*

be caſt into Priſon, becauſe he knows he may be relieved by the Charity of his Friends. If he were ſure there were no Priſon for him, that would be an Encouragement indeed to play the Spendthrift. And this is the Caſe of the Proteſtants in their Denial of Purgatory.

The Sincerity of Devotion, *he ſays,* is much obſtructed by Prayers in a Language which many underſtand not. *If he ſpeak of private Prayers, all Catholicks are taught to ſay them in their Mother Tongue: If of the publick Prayers of the Church, I underſtand not why it may not be done with as much Sincerity of Devotion, the People joining their Intention and particular Prayers with the Prieſt, as their Embaſſador to God, as if they underſtood him: I am ſure the Effects of ſincere Devotion, for Nine Hundred Years together, which this manner of Worſhip produced in this Nation, were much different from thoſe we have ſeen ſince the reducing of the publick Liturgy into Engliſh, as is manifeſt from thoſe Monuments, which yet remain of Churches, Colledges, Religious Houſes,* &c. *with their Endowments, and in the Converſion of many Nations from Heatheniſm to Chriſtianity, effected by the Labours and Zeal of Engliſh Miſſionaries in thoſe Times,* &c. *But this is a Matter of Diſcipline, and ſo not to be regulated by the Fancies of private Men, but the Judgment of the Church; and ſo univerſal hath this Practice been both in the Primitive Greek and Latin Churches, and is ſtill (by the Confeſſion of the (Proteſtant) Authors themſelves of the Bible of many Languages, printed at* London, Anno 1655.) *in moſt of the Sects of Chriſtians, to have not only the Scripture, but alſo the Liturgies and Rituals in a Tongue unknown, but to the learned among them; that who will diſpute againſt it, muſt prepare himſelf to bear the Cenſure of St.* Auſtin, Ep. 118. *where he ſaith,* That it is a Point of moſt inſolent Madneſs, to diſpute whether that be to be obſerved, which is frequented by the whole Church through the World.

4. *He ſays,* The Sincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed, by making the Efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the bare Adminiſtration, whether our Minds be prepared for them or not. *In what Council this Doctrine was defined, I never read; but as for the Sacrament of Penance, which I ſuppoſe he chiefly aims at, I read in the Council of* Trent, Seſſ. 14. *Falſo quidam calumniantur,* That ſome do falſly calumniate Catholick Writers, as if they taught the Sacrament of Penance did confer Grace without the good Motion of the Receiver, which the Church of God never taught nor thought. *But I am rather inclined to look upon this as a Miſtake, than a Calumny in the Objector.*

5. *He ſays,* The Sincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed by diſcouraging the reading of Scriptures, which is our moſt certain Rule of Faith and Life. *Here he calls the Churches prudential diſpenſing the reading of Scripture to Perſons, whom ſhe judges fit and diſpoſed for it, and not to ſuch whom ſhe judges in a Condition to receive, or do harm by it, a diſcouraging the reading of the Scriptures; which is no other than whereas St.* Paul, Coloſſ. 3. 21. *enjoyns Fathers not to provoke their Children, leaſt they be diſcouraged; one ſhould reprove a Father for diſcouraging his Child, becauſe he will not put a Knife or Sword into his Hands, when he foreſees he will do Miſchief with it to himſelf or others; the Scriptures in the Hands of a*

meek and humble Soul, who ſubmits its judgment in the Interpretation of it to that of the Church, is a Sword to defend it: But in the hands of an arrogant and preſumptuous Spirit, that hath no Guide to interpret it, but its own fancy or paſſion, it is a dangerous weapon, with which he will wound both himſelf and others. The firſt that permitted promiſcuous reading of Scripture in our Nation, was King Henry *the Eighth; and many Years were not paſſed, but he found the ill conſequences of it, for in a Book ſet forth by him in the Year* 1542. *he complains in the Preface,* That he found entred into ſome of his Peoples hearts an inclination to ſiniſter underſtanding of it, preſumption, arrogancy, carnal liberty and contention; which he compares to the ſeven worſe Spirits in the Goſpel, with which the Devil entred into the Houſe that was purged and cleanſed. Whereupon he declares that for that part of the Church ordained to be taught (that is, the Lay People) it ought not to be denied certainly, that the reading of the Old and New Teſtament is not ſo neceſſary for all thoſe Folks, that of duty they ought and be bound to read it; but as the Prince and Policy of the Realm ſhall think convenient, ſo to be tolerated or taken from it. Conſonant whereunto, *ſaith he,* the Politick Law of our Realm, hath now reſtrained it from a great many. *This was the judgment of him, who firſt took upon him the Title of Head of the Church of* England; *and if that ought not to have been followed in after times, let the dire effects of ſo many new Sects and Fanaticiſms, as have riſen in* England *from the reading of it, bear witneſs. For as St.* Auſtin *ſays,* Neque enim natæ ſunt Hæreſes; Hereſies have no other Origin but hence, that the Scriptures which in themſelves are good, are not well underſtood, and what is underſtood amiſs in them, is raſhly and boldly aſſerted, *viz.* to be the ſenſe of them. *And now whether the Scriptures left to the private interpretation of every fanciful Spirit, as it is among Proteſtants, be a moſt certain Rule of Faith and Life, I leave to your ſelf to judge.*

Tract 18. in Joh.

6. *He ſays,* The ſincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed by the multitude of ſuperſtitious Obſervations never uſed in the Primitive Church, as he is ready to defend, *he ſhould have ſaid to prove; for we deny any ſuch to be uſed in the Church.*

7. *By the groſs abuſe of People in Pardons and Indulgencies. Againſt this I can aſſert as an Eye-witneſs, the great Devotion cauſed by the wholſome uſe of Indulgencies in Catholick Countries: There being no Indulgence ordinarily granted, but enjoyns him that will avail himſelf of it, to confeſs his ſins, to receive the Sacraments, to pray, faſt, and give alms, all which Duties are with great Devotion performed by Catholick People, which without the incitement of an Indulgence, had poſſibly been left undone.*

8. *He ſays,* The Sincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed, by denying the Cup to the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the ſolemn Celebration of the Euchariſt for a Thouſand Years after Chriſt. *This Thouſand Years after Chriſt makes a great noiſe, as if it were not as much in the power of the Church a Thouſand Years after Chriſt, as well as in the firſt or ſecond Century, to alter and change things of their own nature indifferent; ſuch as the communicating under one or both kinds, was ever held to be by Catholicks. But although the Cup were not then denied to the Laity, yet that the cuſtom*

of receiving but under one kind was permitted, even in the primitive Church, in private Communions, the Objector ſeems to grant, becauſe he ſpeaks only of the Adminiſtration of it in the ſolemn Celebration; and that it was alſo in uſe in publick Communions, is evident from Examples of that time, both in the Greek Church, in the time of St. Chryſoſtome; *and of the Latin, in the time of* St. Leo *the great. As for the pretended obſtruction of Devotion, you muſt know Catholicks believe that under either ſpecies or kind, whole Chriſt true God and Man is contained and received; and if it be accounted an hindrance to Devotion to receive the total refection of our Soul, though but under one kind, what muſt it be to believe that I receive him under neither, but inſtead of him have Elements of Bread and Wine? Surely nothing can be more efficacious to ſtir up Reverence and Devotion in us, than to believe, that God himſelf will perſonally enter under our Roof.*

Sozomen. l. & *Hiſt.* c. 5. & *Niceph.* l. 13. c 11. S. *Leo Ser.* 4 *de Quad.*

The ninth Hindrance of the Sincerity of Devotion is, that we make it in the power of a Perſon to diſpenſe in Oaths and Marriages contrary to the Law of God. *To this I anſwer, That ſome kind of Oaths, the condition of the Perſon and other circumſtances conſidered, may be judged to be hurtful, and not fit to be kept, and the Diſpenſation in them is no more than to judge or determine them to be ſo: And conſequently to do this cannot be a hinderance, but a furtherance to Devotion, nor is it contrary to the Law of God, which commands nothing that's hurtful to be done. As for Marriages, we acknowledge the Church may diſpenſe, in ſome degrees of Conſanguinity and Affinity, but in nothing contrary to the Law of God.*

His tenth pretended Obſtruction of Devotion is, that we make Diſobedience to the Church in diſputable matters, more hainous than Diſobedience to Chriſt in unqueſtionable things, as Marriage, *he ſaith,* in a Prieſt to be a greater Crime than Fornication. *I Anſwer, That whether a Prieſt may Marry or no (ſuppoſing the Law of the Church forbidding it) is not a diſputable matter; but 'tis out of Queſtion, even by the Law of God, that Obedience is to be given to the Commands or Prohibitions of the Church: The Antitheſis therefore between Diſobedience to the Church in diſputable matters, and Diſobedience to the Laws of Chriſt in unqueſtionable things, is not only impertinent to the Marriage of Prieſts which is unqueſtionably forbidden; but, ſuppoſing the matter to remain diſputable after the Churches Prohibition, deſtroys all Obedience to the Church. But if it ſuppoſe them only diſputable before, then why may not the Church interpoſe her judgment, and put them out of diſpute?*

But ſtill it ſeems ſtrange to them, who either cannot or will not take the Word of Chriſt, that is, his Counſel of Chaſtity, That Marriage in a Prieſt ſhould be a greater Sin than Fornication. *But he conſiders not, that though Marriage in it ſelf be honourable, yet, if it be prohibited to a certain order of Perſons, by the Church to whom Chriſt himſelf commands us to give Obedience, and they oblige themſelves by a voluntary Vow to live in perpetual Chaſtity, the Law of God commanding us to pay our Vows, it loſes its honour in ſuch Perſons, and if contracted after ſuch Vow made, is in the Language of the Fathers no better than Adultery. In the primitive Church it was the cuſtom of ſome Younger Widows to dedicate themſelves to the Service of the Church, and in order thereunto to take upon them a* *peculiar habit, and make a Vow of Continency for the future. Now in caſe they Married after this, St.* Paul *himſelf,* 1 Tim. 1. 12. *ſaith, That they incurred Damnation, becauſe by ſo doing, they made void their firſt Faith, that is, as the Fathers expound it, the Vow they had made. And the Fourth Council of* Carthage, *in which were* 214. *Biſhops, and among them St.* Auſtin *gives the Reaſon in theſe Words;* If Wives, who commit Adultery, are guilty to their Huſbands, how much more ſhall ſuch Widows, as change their Religious State, be noted with the Crime of Adultery? *And if this were ſo in Widows, much more in Prieſts, if by marrying they ſhall make void the firſt Faith given to God, when they were conſecrated in a more peculiar Manner to his Service.*

Thus much may ſuffice for Anſwer to the Argument, which with its intricate Terms may ſeem to puzzle an unlearned Reader; let us now ſpeak a Word to the true State of the Controverſy, which is, whether Marriage or ſingle Life in a Prieſt be more apt to obſtruct or further Devotion. And St. Paul *himſelf hath determined the Queſtion,* 1 Cor. 7. 32. *where he ſaith, He that is unmarried careth for the Things that belong to our Lord, how he may pleaſe our Lord; But he that is marry'd careth for the Things that are of the World, how he may pleaſe his Wife. This is the Difference he putteth between the marry'd and ſingle Life, that this is apt to make us care for the Things that belong to God;* and that *to divert our Thoughts from him to the Things of the World. Judge therefore which of theſe States is moſt convenient for Prieſts, whoſe proper Office it is to attend wholly to the Things of God?*

Having thus cleared Catholick Doctrines from being any ways obſtructive to good Life or Devotion, I ſhall proceed to his Third Argument, by which he will ſtill prove that Catholicks run a great Hazard of their Souls, in adhering to the Communion of the Church of Rome, becauſe it exposeth the Faith of Chriſtians to ſo great Uncertainty. *This is a ſtrange Charge from the Pen of a Proteſtant, who hath no other Certainty for his Faith but every Man's Interpretation of the Letter of the Scriptures. But, firſt he ſaith it doth this,* By making the Authority of the Scriptures to depend upon the Infallibility of the Church, when the Churches Infallibility muſt be proved by the Scriptures.

To this I anſwer, That the Authority of the Scriptures not in it ſelf, for ſo it hath its Authority from God; but in Order to us and our Belief of it, depends upon the Infallibility of the Church. And therefore St. Auſtin *ſaith of himſelf,* That he would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Catholick Church did move him. *And if you ask him what moved him to ſubmit to that Authority; he tells you,* That beſides the Wiſdom he found in the Tenets of the Church, there were many other things which moſt juſtly held him in it: As the Conſent of People and Nations, an Authority begun by Miracles, nouriſhed by Hope, increaſed by Charity, and eſtabliſhed by Antiquity, the Succeſſion of Prieſts, from the very Seat of St. *Peter*, to whom our Lord commended the Feeding of his Sheep, unto the preſent Biſhoprick. Laſtly, The very Name of Catholick, which this Church alone, among ſo many Hereſies hath not without Cauſe obtained ſo particularly to her ſelf; that whereas all Hereticks would be called Catholicks, yet if a Stranger demand where the Catholicks go to Church, none of theſe Hereticks dares to ſhow either his own Houſe or Church. Theſe (*ſaith St.* Auſtin) ſo many and great, moſt dear Bonds of the Name of Chriſtians, do juſtly hold a believing Man in the Catholick Church. *Theſe were the Grounds which moved that great Man to ſubmit to her Authority: And when Catholick Authors prove the Infallibility of the Church from Scriptures, 'tis an Argument* ad hominem *to convince Proteſtants, who will admit nothing but Scripture, and yet when they are convinced, quarrel at them as Illogical Diſputants, becauſe they prove it from Scripture.*

Next he ſaith we overthrow all Foundation of Faith, becauſe we will not believe our Senſes in the plaineſt Objects of them. *But what if God have interpoſed his Authority, as he hath done in the Caſe of the Euchariſt, where he tells us, that* it is his Body, *muſt we believe our Senſes rather than God? Or muſt we not believe them in other Things, becauſe in the particular Caſe of the Euchariſt we muſt believe God, rather than our Senſes? Both theſe Conſequences you ſee are abſurd: Now for the Caſe it ſelf, in which he inſtances,* Dr. Taylor *above-cited confeſſes, that they,* (viz. *Catholicks*) have a Divine Revelation (viz. *Chriſt's Word, this is my Body*) whoſe Literal and Grammatical Senſe, if that Senſe were intended, would warrant them to do Violence to all the Sciences in the Circle; *but, I add, it would be no Preſident to them not to believe their Senſes, in other the plaineſt Objects of them, as in the Matter of Tradition, or Chriſt's Body after the Reſurrection.*

3. *He ſaith that* we expoſe Faith to great Uncertainty, by denying to Men the Uſe of their Judgment and Reaſon, as to the Matters of Faith propoſed by a Church, *that is, we deny particular Men's Judgment, as to Matters of Faith, to be as good, if not better than the Churches, and to infer from hence, that we make Faith uncertain, is juſt as if on the contrary one ſhould ſay, that Proteſtants make Faith certain by expoſing Matter of Faith determined by the Church, to be diſcuſſed and reverſed by the Judgment and Reaſon (or rather Fancy) of every private Man. We have good ſtore of this kind of Certainty in* England. *But as for the Uſe of our Judgment and Reaſon, as to the Matters themſelves propoſed by the Church, it is the daily Buſineſs of Divines and Preachers, not only to ſhew them not to be repugnant to any natural Truth, but alſo to illuſtrate them with Arguments drawn from Reaſon. But the Uſe, he would have of Reaſon, is, I ſuppoſe, to believe nothing but what his Reaſon can comprehend, and this is not only irrational in it ſelf, but contrary to the Doctrine of St.* Paul, *where he commands us to captivate our Underſtandings to the Obedience of Faith.*

4. *He adds,* We expoſe Faith to Uncertainty, by making the Churches Power extend to making new Articles of Faith. *And this, if it were true, were ſomething indeed to this purpoſe. But the Church never yet owned any ſuch Power in her General Councils, but only to manifeſt and eſtabliſh the Doctrine received from her Fore-fathers; as is to be ſeen in the Proœms of all the Seſſions of the Council of* Trent, *where the Fathers before they declare what is to be believed, ever premiſe that what they declare, is the ſame they have received by Tradition from the Apoſtles. And becauſe it may happen, that ſome particular Doctrine was not ſo plainly delivered to each*

each Part of the Church, as it happened in St. Cyprianus *Caſe, concerning the Non-rebaptization of Hereticks, we acknowledge it is in her Power,* to make that neceſſary to be believed which was not ſo before, *not by inventing new Articles, but by declaring more explicitely the Truths contained in Scripture and Tradition.*

Laſtly, he ſaith, We expoſe Faith to great Uncertainty, *becauſe the Church pretending to Infallibility, does not determine Controverſies on foot among our ſelves. As if Faith could not be certain, unleſs all Controverſies among particular Men be determined, what then becomes of the Certainty of Proteſtants Faith, who could yet never find out a ſufficient Means to determine any one Controverſy among them? For if that Means be plain Scripture, what one judgeth plain, another judgeth not ſo, and they acknowledge no Judge between them to decide the Controverſy. As for the Catholick Church, if any Controverſies ariſe concerning the Doctrine delivered (as in St.* Cyprian*'s Caſe) ſhe determines the Controverſy by declaring what is of Faith. And for other Controverſies which belong not to Faith, ſhe permits, as St.* Paul *ſaith, every one to abound in his own Senſe. And thus much in Anſwer to his Third Argument, by which, and what hath been ſaid to his former Objections, it appears that he hath not at all proved what he aſſerted in his Second Anſwer to the firſt Queſtion, viz.* That all thoſe who are in the Communion of the Church of *Rome,* do run ſo great a Hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a Care of their Souls ought to embrace or continue in it. *But he hath a Third Anſwer for us, in caſe the former fail; and it is,*

§. 10. *That* a Proteſtant leaving the Communion of the Proteſtant Church, doth incur a greater Guilt, than one who was bred up in the Church of *Rome,* and continues therein by invincible Ignorance. *This is the directeſt Anſwer he gives to the Queſtion, and what it imports is this, That invincible Ignorance (and* he doth not know what Allowance God will make for that neither) *is the only Anchor which a Catholick hath to ſave himſelf by. If by diſcourſing with Proteſtants, and reading their Books, he be not ſufficiently convinced, whereas he ought in the Suppoſition of the Anſwerer, to be ſo; that the Letter of the Scripture as interpretable by every private Man's Reaſon is a moſt certain Rule of Faith and Life, but is ſtill over-ruled by his own Motives (the ſame which held St.* Auſtin *in the Boſom of the Catholick Church) he is guilty of wilful Ignorance and conſequently a loſt Man; there is no Hope of Salvation for him. Much leſs for a Proteſtant who ſhall embrace the Catholick Communion, becauſe* he is ſuppoſed *(doubtleſs from the ſame Rule)* to have ſufficient Conviction of the Errors of the Roman Church, or is guilty of wilful Ignorance, if he have it not, which is a damnable Sin, and unrepented of deſtroys Salvation. *So that now the Upſhot of the Anſwer to the Queſtion, whether a Proteſtant embracing the Catholick Religion upon the ſame Motives, which one bred and well grounded in it, hath to remain in it, may be equally ſaved with him, comes to this, that they ſhall both be damned, tho' unequally, becauſe the converted Catholick more deeply than he that was bred ſo. And now who can but lament the ſad Condition of that great Doctor and Father of the Church, and hitherto reputed Saint,* Auſtin, *who rejecting the* Manichees *pretended Rule of Scripture,* *upon the aforeſaid grounds, left their Communion to embrace the Communion of the Church of* Rome? *And what is become now of their Diſtinction of Points Fundamental from not Fundamental, which heretofore they thought ſufficient to ſecure both Catholicks and Proteſtants Salvation, and to charge us with unconſcionable Uncharitableneſs in not allowing them to be ſharers with us? The Abſurdneſs of theſe Conſequences may ſerve for a ſufficient Conviction of the Nullity of his Third and laſt Anſwer to the firſt Queſtion.*

As for what he ſaith to the Second, I agree ſo far with him, that every Chriſtian is bound to chooſe the Communion of the pureſt Church, but which that Church is, muſt be ſeen by the Grounds it brings to prove the Doctrines it teaches, to have been delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. That Church is to be judged pureſt which hath the beſt Grounds: And conſequently, it is of Neceſſity to Salvation to embrace the Communion of it.

What then you are bound to do in Reaſon and Conſcience is, to ſee which Religion of the Two hath the ſtrongeſt Motives for it, and to embrace that as you will anſwer the contrary to God and your own Soul. To help you to do this, and that the Anſwerer may have the leſs Exception againſt them, I will give you a Catalogue of Catholick Motives (though not all neither) in the Words of the forecited Dr. Taylor, *advertiſing only for Brevity ſake, I leave out ſome mentioned by him, and that in theſe I ſet down, you alſo give Allowance for ſome Expreſſions of his, in which he hath miſrepreſented them: Thus then he,* Liberty of Proph. Sect. 20. *Speaking, of Catholicks.* The Beauty and Splendour of their Church, their pompous (he ſhould have ſaid, ſolemn) Service; the Statelineſs and Solemnity of the Hierarchy, their Name of Catholick, which they ſuppoſe (he ſhould have ſaid, their very Adverſaries give them) as their own due, and to concern no other Sect of Chriſtians; the Antiquity of many of their Doctrines, (he ſhould have ſaid, all) the continual Succeſſion, of their Biſhops, their immediate Derivation from the Apoſtles; their Title to ſucceed St. *Peter*, the flattering (he ſhould have ſaid, due) Expreſſion of Minor Biſhops (he means, acknowledging the Pope Head of the Church) which by being old Records, have obtained Credibility; the Multitude and Variety of People which are of their Perſwaſion; apparent Conſent with Antiquiy in many Ceremonials, which other Churches have rejected; and a pretended and ſometimes (he ſhould have ſaid, always) apparent Conſent with ſome elder Ages in Matters Doctrinal; the great Conſent of one Part with another in that which moſt of them affirm to be *de Fide* (of Faith) The great Differences which are commenced among their Adverſaries, abuſing the Liberty of Prophecying into a very great Licentiouſneſs; their Happineſs of being Inſtruments in converting divers (he ſhould rather have ſaid, of all) Nations. The Piety and Auſterity of their Religious Orders of Men and Women; the ſingle Life of their Prieſts and Biſhops, the Severity of their Faſts, and their exterior Obſervances, the great Reputation of their firſt Biſhops for Faith and Sanctity; the known Holineſs of ſome of thoſe Perſons, whoſe Inſtitutes the religious Perſons pretend to imitate; the oblique Arts and indirect Proceedings of ſome of thoſe who departed from them, and amongſt many other things, the Names of Heretick and Schiſmatick which they with infinite pertinacity (he ſhould have ſaid, upon the ſame grounds the Fathers did) faſten upon all that diſagree from them. Theſe Things, *ſaith he*, and divers others may very eaſily perſwade Perſons of much Seaſon, and more Piety to retain that which they know to have been the Religion of their Fore-fathers, which had actually Poſſeſſion and Seizure of Men's Underſtandings, before the oppoſite Profeſſions (to wit, of Proteſtant, Preſbyterian, Anabaptiſt, *&c.*) had a Name.

Thus Dr. Taylor, *an eminent and leading Man amongſt the Proteſtants; and if* he *confeſs that theſe Motives were ſufficient for a Catholick to retain his Religion, they muſt be of like Force to perſwade a diſintereſſed Proteſtant to embrace it, unleſs the Proteſtants can produce Motives for their Religion of greater, or at leaſt equal Force, with theſe, which ſo great a Man among them confeſſeth, that Catholicks have for theirs. Here therefore you muſt call upon the Author of the Paper you ſent me to produce a Catalogue of grounds, or at leaſt ſome one ground for the Proteſtant Religion of greater or equal Force with all theſe: And as Dr.* Taylor *ſaith, divers others which he omitted,* viz. *The Scripture interpreted by the Conſent of Fathers, the Determination of General Councils, the known Maxim of Catholicks, that nothing is to be believed of Faith, but what was received from their Fore-fathers, as handed down from the Apoſtles. The Teſtimony of the preſent Church, of no leſs Authority now, than in St.* Auſtin'*s Time, both for the Letter and the Senſe of the Scripture,* &c. *Do this, and the Controverſy will quickly be at an end. Particular Diſputes are endleſs, and above the Underſtanding of ſuch, as are not learned; but in Grounds and Principles, 'tis not ſo hard for Reaſon and common Senſe to judge. That you may the better do it in your Caſe, I ſhall deſire you to take theſe two Cautions along with you.*

Firſt, that the Subject of the preſent Controverſy, are not thoſe Articles in which the Proteſtants agree with us, and for which they may pretend to produce the ſame Motives, we do: But in thoſe in which they diſſent from us, ſuch as are no Tranſubſtantiation, no Purgatory, no Honour due to Images, no Invocation to Saints, and the like, *in which the very Eſſence of Proteſtant, as diſtinct from Catholick conſiſts. What Motives they can or will produce for theſe, I do not foreſee: The Pretence of Scriptures being ſufficiently plain hath no Place here, becauſe then the foreſaid Negatives would be neceſſary to be believed as Divine Truths. And for their own Reaſon and Learning, it will be found too light when put into the Scale againſt that of the Catholick Church for ſo many Ages.*

The Second Caution is, That you be careful to diſtinguiſh between Proteſtants producing grounds for their own Religion, and finding Fault with ours. An Atheiſt can cavil and find Fault with the Grounds which Learned Men bring to prove a Deity, ſuch as are the Order of this viſible World, the general Conſent of Nations, &c. *In this an Atheiſt thinks he doth ſomewhat. But can he produce as good or better grounds for his own Opinion? No; you ſee then 'tis one thing to produce Grounds for what we hold, and another to find Fault with thoſe which are produced by the contrary Part. The latter hath made Controverſy ſo long, and the former will make it as ſhort; let the Anſwerer therefore inſtead of finding Fault with our Motives produce his own*

own for the Articles in Controverſy, and I am confident you will quickly diſcern which carry the moſt weight, and conſequently which are to be preferred.

6.

A *Defence* of the foregoing Anſwer to the Queſtion.

129:1:E.
53:1:D

CHAP. I.

Of the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of Rome, *in the Worſhip of Images.*

The Introduction, concerning the occaſion of the debate. The Church of Rome *makes its Members guilty of Hypocriſy or Idolatry: Firſt, Of the Worſhip of God by Images: Some Propoſitions for clearing the notion of Divine Worſhip. It is in Gods power to determine the way of his Worſhip, which being determined, God's Law, and not our Intention, is to be the rule of Worſhip. The main Queſtion is, whether God hath forbidden the worſhipping of himſelf by an Image, under the notion of Idolatry? Of the meaning of the ſecond Commandment, from the* terms *therein uſed; the large ſenſe and importance of them, which cannot be underſtood only of Heathen Idols. Of the reaſon of that Law, from God's infinite and inviſible nature: How far that hath been acknowledged by Heathens? The Law againſt Image Worſhip no ceremonial Law, reſpecting meerly the Jews; the reaſon againſt it made more clear by the Goſpel: The wiſer Heathen did not worſhip their Images as Gods, yet their worſhip condemned as Idolatry. The Chriſtian Church believed the reaſon of this Law to be immutable; Of the Doctrine of the ſecond Council of* Nice; *the oppoſition to it in* Greece, Germany, France *and* England. *Of the Scripture Inſtances of Idolatry contrary to the ſecond Commandment, in the Golden Calf, and the Calves of* Dan *and* Bethel. *Of the diſtinctions uſed to excuſe Image worſhip from being Idolatry: The Vanity and Folly of them. The inſtances ſuppoſed to be parallel anſwered.*

Madam,

§. 1. THat increaſe of *Controverſies* in my Anſwer, which the Propoſer of the *Queſtions*, calls a *ſuperfœtation*, was but the natural iſſue of his own *Queſtions*. To which I could not give a juſt anſwer, without mentioning the hazards a Perſon runs of his Salvation in the Communion of the *Roman Church*: And if he thinks theſe too many (as in truth they are) he ought to condemn that *Church* for it, which hath been the cauſe of them. And, I know *no other end I had herein*, but to let you ſee, there can be no reaſon to forſake the Communion of our *Church*, wherein the way of Salvation is the ſame with that of the *Apoſtolical* and *Primitive Church*, for another, which hath degenerated ſo much from it; as I hope will appear in the following Diſcourſe. *The Introduction.*

To wave therefore any farther debate, *concerning the terms or ſenſe of the Queſtions: As to the occaſion of them,* I could not but ſuppoſe it to relate to your own Condition; and I dare appeal to himſelf, Whether the Queſtion of the poſſibility of the Salvation of a *Proteſtant* turn'd to the *Church* of *Rome* were moved for any other end, than thereby the eaſier to draw Perſons of our *Church* into their Communion; which being ſo common, and yet ſo weak an Artifice, I had reaſon to premiſe an Anſwer to that purpoſe: And I do ſtill affirm, that ſuch a poſſibility being granted, it is no ſufficient Motive to any one to leave the Communion of one *Church* for another. And whether this be to his Queſtion or no, I am ſure it is very much to the purpoſe, for which this Controverſy was firſt ſtarted. I beſeech you therefore, *Madam,* do not ſo much diſparage your own Judgment, and the *Church* you have been bred up in, as to forſake it, till ſome better reaſon be offered, than the Propoſer pretends that his *Queſtions* imply: Which, if not for your own ſake, yet for mine I deſire you to inſiſt upon, that I may know one reaſon at leaſt, from them, (which I cannot yet procure, although I have often requeſted it) why the believing all the ancient *Creeds* and leading a good life, may not be ſufficient to Salvation, unleſs one be of the Communion of the *Church* of *Rome*? But leſt I ſhould be thought to digreſs, I return to his Papers, and am willing to paſs over his unhandſom reflection on our *Church as in a ſinking condition,* which God hath hitherto preſerved, and I hope will do, to the Confuſion of its Enemies. But why he ſhould call my Compariſon a Suppoſition, and his own a Truth, before he proved their *Church* to be the *Catholick Church,* I am yet to ſeek. And ſo I come to the main Buſineſs.

§. 2. My ſecond Anſwer was, *That all thoſe who are in the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *do run ſo great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their Souls, ought to embrace it, or continue in it;* which I am amazed he ſhould ſay, *was not pertinent to the Queſtion,* if the *Queſtion* were propounded for any ones ſatisfaction, that doubted which *Churches* Communion it were beſt to embrace? This I proved,

Of the Idolatry of the Roman Church.

1. Becauſe, *They muſt by the terms of that Communion, be guilty either of Hypocriſy or Idolatry;* either of which, are Sins inconſiſtent with Salvation. Here *he charges me with a Contradiction,* becauſe I over-prove what I intended; but he may eaſily excuſe me from it, if he will allow the poſſibility of Salvation to any one who commits any wilful Sins; for in the caſe of any ſuch Sins, it is true, that they are inconſiſtent with Salvation, and yet he that doth commit them, doth but run the hazard of Salvation, becauſe he may repent of them. *But if it be a Contradiction to ſay, that ſome Sins are inconſiſtent with Salvation, yet thoſe who commit them, may be ſaved, tho' hardly;* he muſt make all who commit any wilful Sin to be unavoidably damned; and then it is to no purpoſe, what Church we are of. The meaning therefore was this, That Hypocriſy and Idolatry, are Sins inconſiſtent with a ſtate of Salvation; and there is no way to eſcape being damned, but by the Repentance of thoſe who are guilty of them. (But of this more at large in the Vindication of my third Anſwer.) And thoſe who are in the Communion of the Church of *Rome,* muſt be guilty either of the one or the other of theſe, I proved by this Argument, *That Church which requires giving to the Creature the*

the Worſhip due only to the Creator, makes the Members of it guilty of Hypocriſy and Idolatry; *but the Church of* Rome *in the Worſhip of God, by Images, the Adoration of Bread in the Euchariſt, and the formal Invocation of Saints,* doth require giving to the Creature the Worſhip due only to the Creator; therefore it makes the Members of it guilty of Hypocriſy or *Idolatry*. Which I did prove by parts.

Of the Worſhip of Images.

1. §. 3. Concerning the *Worſhip* of *God* by Images, I proved that it could not be terminated on *God*, becauſe in the ſecond Commandment he not only denies to receive it, but threatens to puniſh thoſe who give it. To this he Anſwers, 1. *That it is a Contradiction to ſay, that it is the Worſhip of God by an Image, and yet be terminated wholly on the Creature.* 2. *That this is built on a miſtake of the Nature of humane Acts, which though they ought to be governed by the Law of God, yet when they ſwerve from it, ceaſe not to tend to their own proper objects: And that God's Prohibition of ſuch or ſuch a kind of Worſhip, may make it to be unlawful, but hinders not the Act from tending, whither it is intended*; which he proves *by the Prayers of Thieves and Murderers, to God for good ſucceſs*; *the Jews offering to God in Sacrifice the Blind and the Lame, which he hath forbidden*; Cain'*s offering a Sacrifice to God, which he refuſed to accept of*; from hence he concludes, *that though God ſhould have forbidden Men to Worſhip him by Images, yet it doth not follow, but the Worſhip ſo given, would be terminated on him.* 3. *That the ſecond Commandment only forbids the Worſhip of Idols, or the giving the Soveraign honour due to God to an Idol*; *but this doth not forbid the Worſhip of Images, becauſe they give to them only an inferior and relative Honour, and not that Worſhip which is due to God.* This is the ſubſtance of his Anſwer; but to let you *ſee* the inſufficiency of it, I ſhall prove theſe two things: 1. That where God hath prohibited any particular way or means of giving Worſhip to himſelf, that Worſhip ſo given, cannot be ſaid to be terminated on him. 2. That God in the ſecond Commandment hath expreſly prohibited the giving any Worſhip to himſelf by an Image; and not barely the Worſhip of Idols.

1. That where God hath prohibited any particular way or means of giving Worſhip to himſelf, that Worſhip ſo given, cannot be ſaid to be terminated on him: And however *new* this way of propoſing this Argument ſeems to him, I do not queſtion to make it good, notwithſtanding his ſo peremptory denying it, as abſolutely falſe. But in order to the clearing of it, I ſhall lay down theſe Propoſitions.

1. That Worſhip is nothing elſe but an external ſignification of Honour and Reſpect. For we do not here ſpeak concerning the bare internal acts of the Mind; but of the way whereby the eſteem we have in our Minds, is expreſſed in ſuch a manner as to give honour to that which we ſo eſteem.

2. That the ſignification of Honour, which is due to *God* is not to be meaſured by the intentions of Men, againſt the declared will of *God*. For, it being in his power to determine in what way he will be worſhipped, we are not to enquire, whether Men do intend any act of theirs for his Honour; but whether God doth allow it or no? And herein lies his great miſtake in thinking, *That Mens Intentions are to be the rule of Divine Worſhip:* So that what they

deſign for the Honour of God, muſt needs end in it. Whereas, if *God* hath the power of making a Rule for his own Worſhip, he cannot be honoured by Mens doing any thing againſt his declared Will, what ever their Intention be. For, then *God* might be honoured by the moſt palpable Acts of Diſobedience; which is a plain Contradiction; for what can be greater Diſhonour to *God*, than to break his Laws for his *Honour*?

3. The Divine Law being the Rule of Worſhip, all prohibited ways of Worſhip muſt receive that *Denomination* which *God* himſelf gives them. As if a Prince ſhould declare it by his Laws, to be *Treaſon* for any Man to bow down to a *Sign-Poſt* with his Head upon it, under pretence of giving the greater Honour to his Prince; I deſire to know, whether a Man's Intentions of honouring his Prince thereby, excuſe him from Treaſon or no? So it is in our caſe, if God abſolutely prohibits the Worſhip of himſelf by an Image (whatever the Intention of the Perſon be) and calls this by the Name of *Idolatry*, no Mans directing the Intention of his Mind beyond the Image, can excuſe him from it. For whitherſoever this Worſhip may finally be directed by the Intention of the Worſhipper, it is plain that God (who certainly is the beſt Judge in this caſe) does interpret it to be terminated on the Image: And therefore the *Scripture* ſays, that the *Iſraelites* when they worſhipped the *Calf*, *offered Sacrifice to an Idol*, and that *they worſhipped the molten Image*, not God by it, though they ſo intended. From whence it neceſſarily follows, that the Worſhip of God by an Image, when himſelf hath prohibited it, and declared it *Idolatry*, (as I ſhall prove he hath done in the ſecond Commandment) ought not to be ſaid to be terminated on God, but only on the Image; for no Man will be ſo abſurd, as to ſay, that an Act of Idolatry is terminated upon God. By which we ſee, how far it is *from the appearance of a Contradiction*, to ſay that the Worſhip of God by an *Image* being declared to be *Idolatry* by himſelf, ſhould be terminated wholly on the Creature, (which are but other Words explaining the Nature of Idolatry) and what an eaſy Anſwer will take off all his other Inſtances. For thoſe do not ſuppoſe, *any prohibited object* or *means* of Worſhip, which is the only thing we ſpeak of; but either praying to the true God for bad ends, *as in the caſe of Thieves and Murderers praying for good ſucceſs*; or bringing ſomething in Sacrifice to him which he had forbidden, *as the Jews offering the Blind and the Lame*; or ſome miſcarriage in the Minds of them that Sacrifice or Pray to him, as in *Cain's Oblation, and wicked Mens Prayers*; but all theſe are very remote from the preſent debate, concerning an *object* or *means of Worſhip* prohibited by God himſelf under the notion of *Idolatry*. This being cleared, I come to prove the ſecond, in which (as he truly obſerves) the main force of this Argument conſiſts.

Acts 7.41. 42. Pſal. 106. 19.

Of the meaning of the ſecond Commandment.

§. 4. 2. That God in the Second Commandment hath expreſly prohibited the giving any Worſhip to himſelf by an Image; and not meerly *giving the Worſhip of God to Idols*, as he aſſerts. Our Controverſy now being about the Senſe of a Law, the beſt ways we have to find out the meaning of it, are either, from the *Terms* wherein it is expreſſed, or from the *Reaſon* annexed to it, or from the *Judgment* of thoſe, whom we believe beſt able to underſtand, and interpret it. I ſhall therefore prove that to be the meaning of this

Law of God which I have ſet down, from every one of theſe ways.

1. From the *Terms* wherein the Law is expreſſed: This I the rather inſiſt upon; becauſe it is the way himſelf hath choſen: For he ſaith, *The Hebrew Word* Peſel, *in Latin* Sculptile *is uſed in Scripture to ſignify an Idol, and ſo the LXX. tranſlate it in this Place by* εἴδωλον; and therefore ſaith, *it was an Artifice of the Proteſtants to tranſlate it Image inſtead of Idol, and not any certain kind of Image neither, but any whatſoever; Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image, inſtead of thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf an Idol.* By his own Acknowledgment then, we are to judge the Senſe of the *Law*, by the Importance of the Words therein uſed; but I ſhall prove, Firſt, that ſuppoſing *Peſel* did ſignify only an *Idol*, yet that were not enough. Secondly, That *Peſel* is very properly rendred by the *Proteſtants*, and that it doth not ſignify barely an *Idol*.

1. Suppoſing that were the Signification of *Peſel* which he contends for, that were not enough, unleſs there had been no other Word but that uſed in the Law: but another Word is added, to prevent a Miſtake of that Nature, of as large a Signification as may be to this purpoſe: Which is, *Themuna*, which they render *Similitude* as well as we; and is never uſed, in the whole Scripture, to ſignify ſuch an *Idol* as he ſuppoſes this Law intends. To what purpoſe then, are Words of the largeſt Signification put into a *Law*; if the Senſe be limited according to the moſt narrow Acception of one Word mentioned therein? For there is no kind of Image, whether graven or painted, whether of a real or imaginary Being, but is comprehended under the Signification of the Words ſet down in the Law: for not only making a *Similitude* in general, is forbidden, but *any kind of Similitude whether of Things in Heaven, or Earth, or under the Earth, to bow down to them, or worſhip them.* I confeſs it cannot enter into my Mind, how *God* ſhould have forbidden the Worſhip of Images by more expreſs and emphatical Words than he hath done; and if he had uſed any Other Words, their Senſe might as well have been perverted as theſe are. If a Prince ſhould under a very ſevere Penalty forbid all his Subjects making any *Image* or *Reſemblance*, with an Intent to give Honour to him by kneeling before it; would not that Man be thought very ridiculous who ſhould go about to interpret the *Law thus*, that the Prince did not forbid them to make any *Picture* of *himſelf* or his *Son*, or any of his *Favourites* (for the Worſhip of theſe could not but redound to his own *Honour*) but only forbad them to make the Image of an *Ape*, or an *Aſs*, or a *Tyger*, thinking to honour their Prince thereby? Much ſuch an Expoſition is that here given of the Law; *God* forbids any Image or Similitude to be made with Reſpect to his Worſhip (for it is ridiculous to imagine the *Law* means any thing elſe) but, he ſaith, *This Law muſt not be underſtood to exclude a Crucifix*, nor I ſuppoſe any Image of *God* himſelf: (at leaſt as he appeared of old;) nor *of his Saints or Angels, with an Intention to worſhip God by them*; but only they ſhould not worſhip *Apis* or *Dagon*, an *Ichneumon* or a *Crocodile*, or any of the moſt ridiculous Follies of the Heathen. If this had been the meaning of the Law, why was it not more plainly expreſſed? Why where none of the Words elſewhere uſed, by way of Contempt of the *Heathen Idols* here mentioned, as being leſs liable to Ambiguity?

Why in ſo ſhort a Comprehenſion of *Laws*, is this *Law* ſo much enlarged above what it might have been, if nothing but what he ſaith were only meant by it? For then the Meaning of the Two firſt Precepts might have been ſummed up in very few Words: *You ſhall have no other Gods but me*; and *you ſhall worſhip the Images of no other Gods but me.* This is his meaning, but far enough from being that of the *ſecond Commandment.*

2. The only *Word* he inſiſts upon, which is *Peſel*, is very properly rendred an *Image*, and it doth not ſignify barely an *Idol*: The *Word* properly ſignifies any thing that is *carved*, or *cut out of Wood or Stone*; and it is no leſs than forty ſeveral times rendred by the *LXX.* by γλυπτὸν, *ſculptile*, and but thrice by εἴδωλον, and which is very obſervable, although *Exod.* 20. 4. they render it by εἴδωλον, yet in the Repetition of the *Law*, Deut. 5. 8. the *Alexandrian MS.* hath it γλυπτὸν, and *Deut.* 4. 16. in other Copies of the *LXX.* the ſame Word is tranſlated γλυπτὸν, from whence it is plain, that when they tranſlate it by an *Idol*, they mean no more thereby than a *graven Image*; and *Iſa.* 40. 18. they tranſlate it by εἰκὸν, which is properly an *Image*; ſo that no Aſſiſtance can be given him by that *Tranſlation*; and the *vulgar Latin* it ſelf uſeth *Idolum*, *Sculptile*, and *Imago*, all to expreſs the ſame thing. By which it appears, that any Image being made ſo far the Object of Divine Worſhip, that Men do bow down before it; doth thereby become an *Idol*, and on that account is forbidden in this Commandment.

Iſa. 44. 9, 10, 13.

Of the reaſon of the ſecond Commandment.

§. 5. 3. We conſider the *Reaſon* given of this Law, which will more fully explain the meaning of it; which the *Scripture* tells us, was derived from *God*'s infinite and incomprehenſible Nature, which could not be repreſented to Men, but in a Way that muſt be an infinite Diſparagement to it. *To whom will ye liken God? or what Likeneſs will you compare unto him? The Workman melteth a graven Image, and the Goldſmith ſpreadeth it over with Gold*, &c. *Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the Beginning? Have ye not underſtood from the Foundation of the Earth? It is he that ſitteth upon the Circle of the Earth*, &c. I deſire to know whether this Reaſon be given againſt *Heathen Idols*, or thoſe Images which were worſhipped for *Gods* or no? or whether, by this Reaſon *God* doth not declare, that all Worſhip given to him by any viſible Repreſentation of him, is extreamly diſhonourable to him? And to this purpoſe, when this Precept is enforced on the People of *Iſrael* by a very particular Caution, *Take ye therefore good heed to your ſelves, leaſt ye corrupt your ſelves, and make you a graven Image, the Similitude of any Figure*, &c. The ground of that Caution is expreſſed in theſe Words; *For ye ſaw no manner of Similitude on the Day that the Lord ſpake unto you.* If the whole Intention of the Law, were only to keep them from worſhipping the *Heathen Idols* or *Images for Gods*, to what purpoſe is it here mentioned *that they ſaw no Similitude of God when he ſpake to them?* For although *God* appeared with a *Similitude* then, yet there might have been great Reaſon againſt worſhipping the *Heathen Idols*, or fixing the Intention of their Worſhip upon the *bare Image.* But this was a very great Reaſon, why they ought not to think of honouring *God* by an Image; for if he had judged that a ſuitable Way of Worſhip to his Nature and Excellency; he would not have left the Choice of the *Similitude* to them-

Iſa. 40. 19, 20.

21.

22.

Deut. 4. 15, 16, &c.

themſelves, but would have appeared himſelf in ſuch a *Similitude* as had beſt pleaſed him.

§. 6. From hence the wiſer Perſons of the *Heathens* themſelves condemned the Worſhip of God by Images, as incongruous to a Divine *Nature*, and a Diſparagement to the *Deity*. So *Theodoret* tells us, that *Zeno* in his Books of *Government*, did abſolutely forbid *the making any Images for Worſhip, becauſe they were not Things worthy of God :* And that *Xenophanes Colophonius* derided the Folly of thoſe who made their *Images* which they worſhipped, to be *like themſelves*, and by the ſame Reaſon, ſaith he, if Horſes and Elephants could paint as Men can, no doubt the Gods *would* be made in their Shape ; as the *Ethiopians*, and *Thracians*, and others, made their *Gods* in their own Colour and Faſhion : But he adds, *That the true God ought not to be repreſented by the Reſemblance of Men, to whom he was unlike in Body and Mind.* And that the Reaſon which hindered *Plato* from prohibiting all manner of Images, was only the Fear of *Socrates* his Fate : For, ſaith he, *he did forbid all private Images, all Images of Gold and Silver, of Ivory, of Iron and Braſs, and left only Wood and Stone, which being ſo contemptible Matter, might more eaſily keep the People from worſhipping Images made of them :* As God himſelf, ſaith he, derideth the Idolatry in the Prophet, *he burneth Part thereof in the Fire, and the Reſidue thereof maketh he a God, even his graven Image. Antiſthenes* in *Clemens Alexandrinus* condemns the Uſe of *Images* for Inſtruction, *becauſe there is ſo great a Diſſimilitude between God and any viſible Repreſentation of him, that no Man can learn any thing of God, from an Image :* and *Xenophon* to the ſame purpoſe, *that God is Great and Powerful, but we know not how to repreſent him.* And *Clemens* gives that Reaſon why *Numa* prohibited among the *Romans* all *Images* to repreſent the *Deity, becauſe we could not attain to any due Conception of the Deity, but only by our Minds ;* which is the ſame Reaſon that *Plutarch* gives. And therefore *Varro* in the known Teſtimony to this purpoſe, ſpeaking of the old *Romans* who had no Images for 170. Years in their Divine Worſhip, ſaith, *that if the ſame Cuſtom had continued, their Worſhip would have been more pure and chaſt, and that thoſe who firſt placed Images in Places of Divine Worſhip, encreaſed their Error, and took away their Reverence ;* Wiſely judging, ſaith S. *Auguſtine*, that *the Folly of Images would eaſily bring the Deity into Contempt.* And *Auguſtus*, as *Agrippa* in *Philo* reports, after he underſtood, that the *Jews* in their Temple had no Images or viſible Repreſentations of the *Deity*, expreſſed his *Wonder* with great *Reverence*, having no mean Skill in *Philoſophy*. So that we ſee the wiſeſt Perſons, who had no ſuch *Law* from *God* to direct them, yet by the bare Uſe of Reaſon did agree in the Thing it ſelf, that it was unſuitable to the Divine Nature to worſhip *God* by any Images or viſible Repreſentations of him. From hence we have Reaſon to ſuppoſe, among the more ancient Nations who kept nearer to the Dictates of Natural Reaſon, the Worſhip of *Images* was almoſt generally rejected. So *Bardeſanes* in *Euſebius* ſaith of the moſt Eaſtern Countries then known : Of the *Seres* and the *Brachmanns* ; So *Herodotus, Strabo, Diogenes Laertius* ſay of the *Perſians :* So *Tacitus* of the *Germans*, that they rejected Images, *becauſe they thought them unſuitable to the Greatneſs of their Deities.* So *Lucian* likewiſe ſaith of the moſt ancient *Egyptians*, and Hiſtorians

Of the wiſer Heathens Notion of Images.
Theodoret c. Græc. Serm. 3. p. 519.

Clem. Alexand. Strom. 5. p. 584.

Iſa 44. 16, 17.

Clem. Alexand. Protrept. p. 46.

Strom. 1. p. 304.

Plutarch in Numâ.
Varro apud Auguſtin. de Civit. Dei, l. 4. c. 31.

Philo de legat. ad. Caium. 1055.

Euſebius de præpar. Evang. l. 6. c. 10.
Herodot. l. 1.
Strabo l. 15.
Diog. La-

cit. proœm. Tacit.de morib. German. c. 9. Lucian.de Dea Syria. init.

rians agree of the *Romans*, as we have already ſeen. If all this had been a meer poſitive *Law* intended only for the *Jews*, becauſe of their Dulneſs and Stupidity, as ſome imagine, whence comes it to paſs, that thoſe who never heard of this Law, yet judged ſuch a Way of Worſhip to be wholly unbecoming a Divine Nature? It was not meerly the Fear leaſt they ſhould worſhip the Images themſelves for *Gods*, which was the Reaſon of the Commandment, but the Incongruity of ſuch a Way of Worſhip, to a Being ſuppoſed to be of an infinite and ſpiritual Nature.

The Reaſon of this Law more clear by the Goſpel.

§. 7. And it ſeems of all things the moſt ſtrange to me, that any Perſon ſhould think this Precept only reſpected the *Jewiſh Oeconomy*, and that now under the *Goſpel* where we have clearer Diſcoveries of *God's* ſpiritual Nature and Worſhip, that we ſhould be left at Liberty to do that which was before unlawful to be done. Was it inconſiſtent with God's Nature then, and is it leſs ſo now, when we underſtand his Nature much better? And that is given as a particular Reaſon why we ought to worſhip him *after a ſpiritual manner*; and not by any *corporeal Repreſentation*, as the *Jews* ſay the *Samaritans* worſhipped *God* in the Form of a *Dove* in their Temple on Mount *Gerizim*: In which, notwithſtanding what *Morinus* ſaith, there ſeems to be no Improbability, not only from our *Saviour's* Words and the Occaſion of ſpeaking them to a *Samaritan* Woman (which we do not find he inſiſted on ſo much to the *Jews*, as being then free from this kind of *Idolatry*) and the conſtant Tradition of the *Jews*; but from the Nature of the *Samaritan* Religion which they received from the Ten Tribes, which worſhipped *God* under *Images* (as will appear afterwards,) and the Agreeableneſs of the Symbol of a *Dove* to the Name of *Semeramis*, and their *Aſſyrian* Off-ſpring among whom the *Dove* was accounted ſacred. But however this be, ſince the Reaſon of this Command, drawn from the inviſible and ſpiritual Nature of *God*, is now enforced upon us by the *Goſpel*, as the ground of giving *Spiritual Worſhip* to God; how can any Men in their Senſes imagine that Worſhip to be lawful among *Chriſtians* which was unlawful to the *Jews*? Is it, that there is now no Danger of falling into *Heathen Idolatry*, as there was among the *Jews*, on which account *God* tyed them up ſo ſtrictly in this point of *Images*? But this is to beg the Queſtion, and to take it for granted, that there was no other Reaſon of this Command; whereas *God* himſelf hath told us another, and that is, the Incongruity of it to his infinite Nature; which the very *Heathens* themſelves apprehended in this caſe. I grant *God* might by this means deſign to keep them at the greateſt diſtance from the *Heathen Idolatry*; but that doth not hinder, but there was an Evil in the thing it ſelf, as it doth imply ſo great a Diſparagement of the Divine Nature to be worſhipped by a corporeal Repreſentation. As we may ſay that the Prohibition of common *Swearing* was intended by *God* to keep Men from *Perjury*; but beſides that, it implies ſo great an Irreverence of *God*, that it is Evil without that further Reſpect. And can any one imagine there ſhould be greater Irreverence of *God* ſhewn in calling him to witneſs upon every ſlight Occaſion, than there is in bowing down before a Block or a hewn Stone repreſenting *God* to my Mind by it? What can ſuch an Image do to the heightning of Devotion, or raiſing Affections? If it be by calling to my mind that *Being* I am to worſhip, then there muſt be ſuppoſed

John 4. 23, 24.

Morinus in Pentateuch.Samarit. Exerc. 1. S. 9. c. 5.

ſome *Likeneſs* or *Analogy*, or *Union* between the Object repreſented and the Image, every one of which tends highly to the Diſhonour of the *Deity*, and ſuggeſts mean Thoughts to us of the *God* we are to worſhip. And is there no Danger among Chriſtians, that they ſhould entertain too low and unworthy Thoughts of God? And can any thing tend to it more effectually, than the bringing down the Repreſentations of him to the Figure and Lineaments of a Man, drawn upon a Table, or carved in an *Image?* On which account it ſeems much more reaſonable for me to worſhip *God* by proſtrating my ſelf to the Sun, or any of the Heavenly Bodies, nay to an Ant or a Fly, than to a Picture or an Image: For in the other I ſee great Evidences of the Power, and Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God, which may ſuggeſt venerable Apprehenſions of *God* to my mind; whereas theſe can have nothing worthy Admiration, unleſs it be the Skill of the Painter or Artificer? And I cannot for my heart, underſtand, why I may not as well, nay better, burn Incenſe and ſay my Prayers to the Sun, having an Intention only to honour the true *God* by it, as to do both thoſe to an *Image:* I am ſure the *Sun* hath far more Advantages, than any artificial Image can have; the Beauty and Influence of it may enflame on warm ones Devotions much more. If the Danger be, that I am more like to take the *Sun* for *God* than an Image; on that account, that which deſerves moſt Honour ſhould have leaſt given it, and that which deſerves leaſt ſhould have moſt. For the Danger is their ſtill greater, where the Excellency is greater, and by that means we ought rather to worſhip a Beaſt than a *Saint*, for there is leſs Danger of believing one to be God than the other, and ſo the *Ægyptians* were more excuſable than the *Papiſts*. I muſt ingenuouſly confeſs if I had been an *Heathen Idolater*, only upon ſuch Principles as theſe, that there is one ſupream infinite *Being*, who makes uſe of ſome more Illuſtrious Beings of the World, to communicate Benefits to the reſt, on which account I thought my ſelf bound to teſtify the Honour I owe to the ſupreme *Deity*, by paying my Devotion in Subordination to him, to thoſe ſubſervient and miniſterial *Gods*; I ſhould not have been afraid of what any *Papiſts* in the World could have ſaid for my Confutation. Nay, I ſhould have been tempted to have laughed at their Folly and deſpiſed their Weakneſs, who ſhould plead for the Worſhip of *God* in or by a dull and rude Image, and condemn me for honouring *God* in the moſt noble Parts of the Creation? If they had told me, *that the ſupreme God muſt have a Worſhip proper to himſelf*; Yes, I ſhould anſwer them in their own Terms, I by no means queſtion it, and that is it which is called λατρεία which is reſerved to the ſupreme Deity, all that I give to inferior *Deities*, is but δουλεία, only the *Sun* deſerved an ὑπερδουλεία, becauſe of his eminent Uſefulneſs. If they had ſaid, *I made them Gods, by giving them religious Worſhip:* No more than they do Images. If yet they had urged, *that God had forbidden worſhipping the Hoſt of Heaven*; yes, that is, giving the Worſhip to the ſupreme *God* to them, but not a ſubordinate, relative, inferior Worſhip, which was all I intended; and I hope they are not ſo ignorant of the Nature of human Actions, as not to know that they go whither they are intended; and my Intent was only to honour the true God by it; or elſe, that the worſhipping the Hoſt of Heaven was forbidden to the dull and ſtupid *Jews*, who had no kind of *Philoſophy*

phy in them, and did not ſee thoſe admirable Images of the Divine Perfections in them which I did; but for Men of Philoſophical and Contemplative Minds, what Injury to *God* could there be, as long as the more I ſaw Cauſe to honour theſe, far greater I ſtill ſaw to honour him who produced all theſe Things? Or laſtly, I would appeal to themſelves whether the Precept againſt *Worſhipping of the Hoſt of Heaven*, or *Images* were more plain in the *Scripture?* The ſecond Commandment is not in Words againſt the Worſhip of the *Things*, but the *Images* of them, and the firſt againſt worſhipping them as the *Supreme God*; I did neither; but they could not poſſibly excuſe themſelves, who did the ſame things to an Image, which they do to *God* himſelf. Thus we ſee the Reaſon of the Commandment is by no means appropriated to the *Jews*, but doth extend as far as the Knowledge of it doth; and the ſame Arguments which notwithſtanding that Command would juſtify the Worſhip of Images, will likewiſe juſtify the moſt early, the moſt general, the moſt laſting *Idolatry* of the World, which is the Worſhip of the Sun, Moon, and Stars. And a mighty Argument that the Reaſon of this Command, drawn from the Unſuitableneſs of the Worſhip of Images to the Nature of God, is of an unalterable and univerſal Nature, is, that the ſame Reaſon is urged under the New Teſtament againſt the *Idolatry* of the *Heathens*. So St. *Paul* dealt with the *Athenians*, proving the Unreaſonableneſs of their worſhipping *God* by Images, becauſe *he*
Act. 17. *was the* God *that made the World and is Lord of Heaven and Earth,*
24. 23. *and that we are his Off-ſpring*; *therefore we ought not to think that*
29. *the God-head is like unto Gold or Silver, or Stone graven by Art or Man's Device:* He doth not ſpeak meerly againſt their other Objects of Worſhip beſides the true *God*, nor their ſuppoſing their *Gods* to be preſent in their Images, nor taking their Images for *Gods*, but againſt their Suppoſition that there was any Reſemblance between *God* and their *Images*, or that he was capable of receiving any Honour by them. The ſame Argument he uſeth to the *Romans*, ſpea-
Rom. 1. 19 king of thoſe, *in whom that which may be known of* God *is manifeſt,*
21. *even his eternal Power and* God*-head,* yet theſe Perſons *who knew*
23. God*, did not glorify him as* God*, but changed the Glory of the incorruptible* God *into an Image made like to corruptible Man,* &c. *where changing his* Glory *into Images,* is immediately oppoſed *to the glorifying him as* God, in reſpect of his *eternal Power and God-head*; ſo that thoſe Two are inconſiſtent with each other, to *glorify* God by an *Image*, and to *glorify him as* God. For here the Apoſtle doth not diſcourſe againſt the moſt groſs and ſottiſh *Idolaters* of the *Heathens*, but as St. *Chryſoſtom* well obſerves againſt the *Philoſophers* and the *wiſeſt* among them: Who, though they differed in their Opinions of *Religion* extremely from the *Vulgar*, yet they concurred with them in all the external Practices of their *Idolatry*. And therefore the *Apo-*
V. 18. *ſtle* doth not charge them with falſe Notions of a *Deity*, for he ſaith;
21. *they held the Truth in Unrighteouſneſs, that they knew* God, but they ſhewed their Vanity and Folly in thinking they had found out ſubtiller ways of defending the common *Idolatries* among them, inſtead of oppoſing them, made uſe of their Wits to excuſe them. And the moſt intelligent *Heathens* did never look on their *Images* as any other, *than Symbols* or *Repreſentations* of that Being to which they give divine Worſhip. *No one but a Fool thinks otherwiſe of them,* ſaith *Celſus*; *they*

they are only Books for the ignorant, ſaith *Porphyrie*, and the *Heathens* in *Athanaſius*. They deny, in *Arnobius*, *that they ever thought their Images to be Gods*, *or to have any* Divinity *in them*, *but what only comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an Uſe*; and in St. *Auguſtin*, *that they worſhipped the Images themſelves*, *but through them they worſhipped the Deity*; *Maximus Tyrius* diſcourſes largely on this Subject, and ſhews, *that Images were but the Signs of divine Honour*, *and helps to Remembrance*. *They are but Symbols of the Preſence of the* Gods, ſaith *Julian*; *we do not think them* Gods, ſaith he, *but that through them we may worſhip the Deity*; *for we being in the Body*, *ought to perform our Service in a Way agreeable to it*. And *Euſebius* teſtifies in general of the *Heathens*, *that they did not look on their Images as* Gods; however ſome among them had an Opinion of the Gods being incorporated in them. I deſire to know whether theſe Men who worſhipped Images upon thoſe grounds did amiſs or no in it? I do not aſk whether they were miſtaken as to the *Objects* of their Worſhip; but on ſuppoſition they were not, whether they were to blame in a manner of ſerving *God* by Images, in ſuch a way as they deſcribe? If not, wherefore doth St. *Paul* pitch upon that to condemn them for, which they were not at all to blame in? He ought to have done as the *Jeſuits* in *China* did, who never condemned the People for worſhipping Images, but for worſhipping falſe *Gods* by them; and perſwaded them not to lay them aſide, but to convert them to the Honour of the true *God*; and ſo melted down their former Images and made new ones of them. Can we imagine St. *Paul* meant the ſame thing, when he blames Men not for believing them to be *Gods*, but that *God* could be worſhipped *by the Work of Mens Hands*; and for *changing thereby the Glory due to God* in regard of his infinite and incorruptible Being *into mean and unworthy Images*, thinking thereby to give Honour to him.

Celſus apud Origen. l. 7. p. 373.
Euſeb. de præparat. Evang. l 3. c. 7.
Athanaſ. c. Gent. p. 24--31.
Arnob. c. Gent. l. 6. p. 103.
Auguſt. Tom. 8. *in* Pſal. 113.
Maxim, Tyrius diſſert. 38.
Julian op. frag. epc. d. Petavii p. 537.
Euſeb. præpar. Evang. l. 4. c. 1.
Trigant. de Chriſtian. Expedit. apud Sinas l. 5. c. 16. p. 588.

§. 8. And upon theſe grounds the Primitive *Fathers* diſputed againſt the *Heathen Idolatry*; for, *the making uſe of corporeal Repreſentations makes the Deity contemptible*, ſaith *Clemens* of *Alexandria*. *Origen* ſaith, *That Chriſtians have nothing to do with Images*, *becauſe of the ſecond Commandment*; *and on that account will rather die*, *than defile themſelves with them*; *and that it is impoſſible any one that knows God*, *ſhould pray to them*. *That it is no ſufficient excuſe to ſay*, *they do not take them for Gods*, *but only for Symbols or Repreſentations of them*, *for they muſt be ignorant*, *mean*, *and unlearned Perſons*, *who can imagine the Work of an Artificer can be any Repreſentation of a Deity*. It would be too tedious at this time to tranſcribe all the Invectives in the Writings of the *Fathers* upon this Subject; where they diſpute againſt the *Heathens* from this Argument, and do ſtill ſuppoſe the Force of the Reaſon of this Law, to oblige *Chriſtians* as much as ever it did the *Jews*; but I purpoſely forbear, only taking notice that after the Worſhip of *Images* came in, with the Decay of the Primitive Piety and Learning in the *Eaſtern Churches*, yet the great Defenders of them ſtill declared their Abhorrence of any Repreſentation of the *Divine Nature*. So *Germanus Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* in his Epiſtles, yet extant in the Actions of that wiſe Synod at *Nice*; *we make*, ſaith he, *no kind of Image*, *or Similitude*, *or Figure*, *or Repreſentation of the inviſible Deity*; and *that the meaning of the Commandment of the Law againſt*

The Chriſtian Church believed this Law immutable.
Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. p. 559.
Origen. c. p. 4. l. 7. 375.
Synod. Nic. 2. Act. 4. Ep. ad Johan. Synod.

F 2 *Images*

Ad Thom. Claudior. Ep. ibid. Damaſcen. Orthod. fid. l. 4. c. 17.

Bellarm. de Imag. l. 2 cap. 8.

Images was, that the Divine Nature was inviſible and incomprehenſible, and like to nothing we ſee, and that we ought not to entertain any corporeal Conceptions of God. And *Damaſcen* ſaith expreſly, *that it is the higheſt Madneſs and Impiety to go about to make an Image of God,* i. e. ſaith *Clichtovæus, ſo as to think any Image to be like unto God, or able perfectly to repreſent him to us*; which is likewiſe *Bellarmin*'s Anſwer; as though ever any Men were ſuch Fools to believe an Image could perfectly repreſent an infinite Being; or that *God* need to make a Law to forbid that, which is utterly impoſſible in the very Nature of the Thing; he might more reaſonably forbid Men to paint a Sound, to graſp all the Air in the Hollow of their Hands, to drink up the Ocean, to wear the *Sun* for a *Pendant* at their Ears, or to make new Worlds, than to command them not to make any Image which ſhould perfectly repreſent his Nature: And yet of this kind of Image alone of the true *God*, *Bellarmine* underſtands the Prohibition of the *Law*, and the ſayings before mentioned; but *all other*, he ſaith, *were allowed by both, whether by way of Hiſtory, or analogical Reſemblance, or the Faſhion of a Man wherein he hath appeared*; i. e. all poſſible Repreſentations of *God* are allowed, and only that which is impoſſible forbidden. But this Anſwer is not more weak and trifling, than contrary to the meaning of *Germanus, Tharaſius,* or the reſt of the *Nicene Fathers*, who do acknowledge, there was no ground to make any Images with reſpect to the *Divine Nature*, till the Incarnation of Chriſt, but ſince God appeared in human Nature, there is no Incongruity in repreſenting that by an Image, and by that to give Honour to the inviſible *Godhead*, as long as they preſerve the true Belief concerning the Deity; and conſequently may honour *God* by giving Worſhip to the *Images* of thoſe *Saints*, whom they believe to be in Heaven with God.

Of the Doctrine of the ſecond Council of Nice. Synod. Nicen. 2. Act 6.

§. 9. This is the ſubſtance of the Doctrine of the ſecond *Council* of *Nice*; which they juſtify by fabulous Stories, and impertinent Citations, and inſufficient Anſwers. For, when the *Fathers* of the *Synod* at *Conſtantinople* had ſaid, "that *Chriſt* came to deliver us from "all *Idolatry*, and to teach the Worſhip of God in Spirit and in "Truth; they bravely Anſwer, *That then it is impoſſible for Chriſtians to fall into Idolatry, becauſe Chriſt's Kingdom was always to continue, and the Gifts and Graces of God are without Repentance.* Which would as well hold againſt the prevalency of the *Turk*, as Idolatry among them. Thoſe *Fathers* urge, "That the *Devil* now, "not being able to reduce the World to the former *Idolatry*, endeavours under-hand to introduce it, under a pretence of *Chriſtianity*, "bringing them again to the Worſhip of the Creature, and making a "God of a thing that is made, when they have called it by the "Name of *Chriſt*. Theſe Anſwer, *That it is true, the Fathers uſed that Argument againſt the* Arrians, *who ſuppoſed Chriſt to be a Creature, and they grant that they were guilty of Idolatry in giving Divine Worſhip to Chriſt, when they believed him to be a Creature; but the difference lies herein, that the* Arrians *truſted in Chriſt, and gave properly Divine Honour to him, which they ſay, they did not to the Images, but only worſhipped them for the ſake of the object repreſented by them.* But *Aquinas* and his followers have at large proved, that where any thing is worſhipped, meerly for the ſake of another, it muſt have the ſame kind of Worſhip given it, which they give to the

Aquinas Summ. p 3 q. 25. art. 3.

the thing repreſented by it: For as *Aquinas* obſerves, the motion of the Soul towards an Image is twofold; either as it is a thing, or as it is an Image: The firſt, he ſaith, is diſtinct from that motion which reſpects the object; but the ſecond is the ſame; ſo that to the Image of *Chriſt*, as made of *Wood* or *Stone*, no Worſhip at all is given: And therefore it being given meerly on the account of its being an Image, it neceſſarily follows, that the ſame Worſhip muſt be given to the Image, which is given to *Chriſt* himſelf. And ſo they are in the ſame caſe with the *Arrians*, whom they acknowledge to be *Idolaters*; notwithſtanding their *Chriſtianity*, or *that the gifts and graces of* God *are without Repentance.* Beſides the *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers* urge, "The great abſurdity of making an Image of "*Chriſt*, for Worſhip, becauſe *Chriſt* is *God and Man*; therefore the "Image muſt be of *God and Man*; which cannot be, unleſs the "*Deity* be circumſcribed within the created Fleſh, or there be a con"fuſion of both Natures after their Union, both which are Blaſphe"mies condemned by the *Church.* The *Nicene Fathers* in anſwer to this yield, *That the Name Chriſt is ſignificative of both Natures, and that an Image can only repreſent the viſible humane Nature, and that it agrees only in Name, and not in ſubſtance with the thing repreſented:* And after many reviling Expreſſions againſt their Adverſaries, (no Argument of the goodneſs of their cauſe) they ſay, *that if the Divine Nature were circumſcribed within the humane Nature in the Cradle, and on the Croſs, then it is in an Image; if not in one, neither is it in the other.* But what doth this Anſwer ſignifie, unleſs there be an equal Preſence and Union of the Divine Nature of Chriſt with the Image, as there was with the humane Nature? Which Union, was the reaſon of the *Adoration* given to the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, and what ground can there be then of giving Divine Worſhip to the Image of *Chriſt*, unleſs the ſame *Union* be ſuppoſed? If the humane Nature without the Union of the *Divine*, could yield us no ſufficient reaſon of Divine Worſhip being given to it, how much leſs can an Image deſerve it, which can only at the beſt repreſent but the external lineaments of that humane Nature? And if the Divine Nature be ſuppoſed united with the *Image*, then the ſame Divine Honour is due to the Image of *Chriſt*, which is to God himſelf, which yet theſe *Nicene Fathers* deny: And the Image then joyned with the Divine Nature, is as proper an object of Divine Worſhip without reſpect to any *Prototype*, as the Perſon of *Chriſt* is, conſiſting of the Divine and Humane Nature. Again, they urge, "If the Humane "Nature of *Chriſt* be repreſented in the Image of *Chriſt* to be wor"ſhipped, as ſeparate from the Divine, this would be plain *Neſtorianiſm.* To this the good *Nicene Fathers*, not knowing what to Anſwer, plainly deny the concluſion, and cry, *They Neſtorians? No, they lie in their teeth; they were no more* Neſtorians *than themſelves, nor ſo much neither:* And now, good Men, they ſay, *It is true, they do repreſent Chriſt only by his humane Nature in an Image; and when they look on Images, they underſtand nothing but what is ſignified by them; as when the Birth of the Virgin is repreſented, they conceive in their Minds, that he who was Born, was truly God as well as Man.* Alas for them! that they ſhould ever be charged with the Worſhip of Images! They plead for nothing now, but a help to their profound Meditations by them. But the Controverſie was about Worſhip, what ever they think; and their Adverſaries Argument did not lie in the Images being conſidered as an object of *Perception*, but of *Worſhip*, *i.e.* if the Image can only repreſent the humane Nature of *Chriſt*, as ſeparate from the Divine, and in that reſpect be an *object of Worſhip* to us, then the charge of *Neſtorianiſm* follows; but this they very wiſely paſs by; and their Diſtinction of *the Image from the Principal*, cannot ſerve their turn, ſince the *Image* receiving the Worſhip due to the *Principal*, muſt have not only the *Name*, (as they ſay) but the *reaſon* of *Worſhip* common with the *Principal* which it repreſents. After this, the *Fathers of Conſtantinople* proceed to another Argument, which is, "That all the Repreſentation of *Chriſt* "allowed us by the *Goſpel*, is that which *Chriſt* himſelf inſtituted, "in the *Elements* of the *Lord's Supper*, whoſe uſe was to put us in "remembrance of *Chriſt*. No other Figure or Type being choſen "by *Chriſt* as able to repreſent his being in the Fleſh, but this. "This was an *honourable Image* of his quickning *Body*, made by "himſelf, *ſay they*; which he would not have of the ſhape of a "Man to prevent *Idolatry*; but of a common Nature, as he took "upon him the common Nature of Man, and not any individuated "Perſon; and as the *Body* of *Chriſt* was really ſanctified by the Divine Nature; ſo by Inſtitution this holy Image is made Divine "through Sanctification by Grace. Here the *Nicene Council* quarrels with them, *for calling the Euchariſt an Image*, *contrary*, as they ſay, *to the Scriptures and Fathers*; but they are as much to be believed therein, as in their admirable Proofs, that the Worſhip of Images was the conſtant Doctrine of the *Church*; and having ſtrenuouſly denyed this, they ſuppoſe that to be enough to anſwer the Argument.

Beſides theſe particular Arguments againſt the *Images* of *Chriſt*, the *Council* of *Conſtantinople* uſeth many more againſt the *Images* of any other, "Becauſe theſe being the chief, there can be leſs reaſon for "any other beſides; that there is no Tradition of *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, or the Primitive *Fathers* for them; no way of Conſecration "of them preſcribed, or practiſed, no ſuitableneſs in the uſe of them "to the deſign of *Chriſtian Religion*, which being in the middle between *Judaiſm* and *Paganiſm*, it caſts off the Sacrifices of the one, "and not only the *Sacrifices*, but all the *Idolatries* of the other: "And it is Blaſphemy to the *Saints* in Heaven, to call in the *Heathen* ſuperſtitious into *Chriſtianity*, to honour them by: That it is "unbecoming their Glory in Heaven, to be ſet upon Earth in dull "and ſenſleſs Images; that Chriſt himſelf would not receive Teſtimony from *Devils*, though they ſpake truth; neither can ſuch a "*Heatheniſh* cuſtom be acceptable to the *Saints* in *Heaven*, though "pretended to be for their honour. That nothing can be plainer "in the *Goſpel*, than that *God is a Spirit*, and will be worſhipped in "*Spirit and in Truth*; to which nothing can be more contrary, "than the going about to honour *God* by worſhipping any Image of "himſelf, or his *Saints*. Theſe, and many other Arguments from the *Scriptures*, and *Fathers*, that *Council* inſiſts upon, to ſhew the Incongruity of the Worſhip of *Images*, to the Nature of God, and the Deſign of the *Chriſtian Religion*; to which the *Council* of *Nice* returns very weak and trivial Anſwers, as ſhall more largely appear, if any one thinks good to defend them. And we have this apparent advantage on our ſide, that although the *Popes* of *Rome* ſided with theſe Worſhippers of *Images*, yet the *Council* at *Francfort*, called together by *Charles* the *Great* condemn'd them: Not out of miſunderſtanding their Doctrine, as ſome vainly imagine; *becauſe* as *Vaſquez* well proves, the Copy of the *Nicene Council* was ſent to them by *Pope Adrian*; *becauſe* the *Acts* of that *Council* were very well known to the Author of the Book, written upon this Subject, under the Name of *Charles* the Great, and publiſhed by *du Tillet* at *Paris*, about the middle of the laſt Century, which is acknowledged by their learnedſt Men to have been written at the ſame time; *becauſe* the *Popes Legats Theophylactus* and *Stephanus* were preſent, and might eaſily rectify any miſtake, if they were guilty of it; and none of the *Hiſtorians* of that time, do take notice of any ſuch *Error* among them. But *Vaſquez* runs into another ſtrange miſtake himſelf, that the *Council* of *Frankford* did not condemn that of *Nice*; which is evident they did expreſly, by the ſecond *Canon* of that *Council* publiſhed by *Sirmondus*. And all the Objections of *Vaſquez* are taken off by what *Sirmondus* ſpeaks of the great Authority and Antiquity of that *MS.* from which he publiſhed them, and from the conſent of the Hiſtorians of that time, that the *Council* of *Frankford* did reject that of *Nice*: and *Sirmondus* ſaith, they had good reaſon to deny it to be an *Oecumenical Council*, where only the *Greeks* meet together, and none other *Provinces* were called, or asked their Opinion, and *Pope Adrian* himſelf, he ſaith, in his Defence of it againſt the *Caroline Books*, never gives it the Name or Authority of an *Oecumenical Council*. The ſame *Council* was rejected here in *England*, as our *Hiſtorians* tell us, *becauſe it aſſerted the Adoration of Images, which the Church of God abhors*; which are the words of *Hoveden* and others. And we find afterwards in *France* by the *Synod* of *Paris*, called by *Ludovicus Pius* upon the Letters of *Michael Balbus* Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, in order to the *Union* of *Chriſtendom* in this point, that theſe *Weſtern Churches* perſiſted ſtill in the Condemnation of the *Nicene Council*; which they would not have done, after ſo long a time to inform themſelves, if a meer Miſtake of their Doctrine at firſt, had been the Cauſe of their Oppoſition. But whoſoever will read the *Caroline Books*, or the *Synod* of *Paris*, or *Agobardus* and others about that time, will find that they condemn all religious Worſhip of Images, as *Adoration*, and contrary to that Honour which is due to *God* alone, and to the Commands which he hath given in *Scripture*. And I extremely wonder how any Men of common Senſe, and much more any of Learning and Judgment, that had read the Book of *Charles* the *Great* againſt the *Nicene Synod*, could imagine it altogether proceeded from a Miſtake of the meaning of it; when it ſo diſtinctly relates, and punctually anſwers the ſeveral Places of *Scriptures* and *Fathers* produced by it for the Worſhip of Images. In the firſt Book an Anſwer is given to many impertinent Places of the Old Teſtament, alledged in that *Council*; which the ſecond proceeds with, and examines ſeveral teſtimonies of the *Fathers*; and in the Two remaining Books purſues all their Pretences with that Diligence, that no one can imagine all this while that the Author did not know their meaning. And that by *Adoration* he means no more than giving *Religious Worſhip* to *Images*, appears from hence, becauſe he calls the civil Worſhip which Men give to one another, by the Name of *Adoration*; when he ſhews, that it

Vaſquez in l. 2. q. 25. diſp. 107. c. 5.

Sirmond. Concil. Gall. To. 2. p. 194.

Spelman. Conc. Tom. 1. p. 306. Hovedeni Annal. p. prior. ad A. D. 792. Simeon Dunel. Hiſtor. p. 111. Matth. Weſtmon. A. D. 793. Caroli Capitul. de non adorandis imaginibus. Pariſ. A. D. 1549. & in Goldaſti Conſtit Imperial To. 1. Synod. Pariſ. in Supplement. Concil. Gall. A. D. 824. Agobardi Opera Ed. Maſſoni & Balazii.

is

Caroli liber de Imag. l. 2. c. 24. is another thing to give Adoration to a Man upon a *civil Reſpect*, and to give *Adoration* to *Images* upon a *religious Account*, when God challenges all *religious Worſhip* or *Adoration* to himſelf; and whatever Reaſon will hold for ſuch a Worſhip of *Images*, will much more hold for the Worſhip of *Men*, who have greater Excellency in them, and more Honour put upon them by *God*, than any Images can ever pretend to. That *God* allows no other kind of Adoration to be given *c. 25.* to any but himſelf, but that which we give to one another. Can any be ſo ſenſleſs to think, that by this *civil Adoration*, he meant, we honoured every Man we met as our *Sovereign Prince?* And as little Reaſon is there to ſay, that by *Adoration* given to Images, he meant only the incommunicable Worſhip due only to *God*, in the Senſe of thoſe *Fathers*. *Can we imagine*, ſaith he, *that St.* Peter *would allow the Worſhip of Images, who forbad* Cornelius *to worſhip him! Or St.* John, *whom the Angel checked for offering to worſhip him, and bid him give that Honour to* God*? Or* Paul *and* Barnabas, *who with ſuch Horror ran among the Men of* Lycaonia, *when they were about to worſhip them; and yet, ſurely Angels and ſuch Perſons as theſe, deſerved more to be worſhipped than any Images can do. But we ſee by theſe Examples, that even theſe are not to be adored with any other kind of Adoration, than what the Offices of Civility require* *c. 31.* *from us.* Beſides, in his Language, thoſe who followed the *Council* of *Conſtantinople* are ſaid, not to *adore Images*; by which nothing elſe can be meant, than their giving no *Religious Worſhip* to them, and when he ſhews the great Inconſequence of the Argument from the *Adoration* of the *Statues* of the *Emperors* to the *Adoration* of *Images*, *L. 3. c. 15.* becauſe in Matters of *Religious Worſhip* we are not to follow the Cuſtoms of Men againſt the Will of God; he thereby ſhews what kind of *Adoration* he intended, not the Worſhip of *Latria*, but ſuppoſed to *Concil. Tom. 5. p. 553.* be of an inferior Sort. In ſo much, that *Binius* confeſſeth, *that the Deſign of theſe Books was againſt all Worſhip of Images.* It is true, *Pope Hadrian* in the Anſwer he ſent to theſe Books, which is ſtill *Tom. 6. p. 143.* extant in the *Tomes* of the *Councils*, doth deny that the *Synod* intended to give *proper divine Worſhip* to *Images*; but that is no more than the *Synod* it ſelf had in Words ſaid before, but that it was not the *Queſtion* what *they ſaid*, but what the Nature of the *thing* did imply? Whether that *religious Worſhip* they gave to *Images* was not Part of that *Adoration* which was only due to God? And he that expects an Anſwer from this to him, will find himſelf deceived; for *c. 36.* he is ſo pitifully put to it for an Anſwer to the Demand of any *Example* or Word of the *Apoſtles* to juſtify *Image-worſhip*, that he is forced to make uſe of ſome Myſtical Paſſages of *Dionyſius* the ſuppoſed *Areopagite*, wherein the Word *Image* happening to be, is very ſuffi- *Delaland Supplement. Concil. Gall. p. 109.* cient to his purpoſe. And this Anſwer of *Hadrian*'s gave ſo little Satiſfaction to the *Weſtern Biſhops*, that *A. D.* 824. the *Synod* at *Paris*, being called by *Ludovicus Pius* to adviſe about this point, did condemn expreſly Pope *Hadrian* for aſſerting a *ſuperſtitious Adoration of Images*; which they look on as a *great Impiety*, and ſay that he produces very impertinent Places of the *Fathers*, and remote from his purpoſe; and that ſetting aſide this *Pontifical Authority*, in his Anſwer to the *Caroline Books*, there were ſome things apparently falſe; and they have nothing to excuſe him by, but his *Ignorance*. And therefore they at large ſhew, that the *Religious Worſhip* of

Images came firſt from *Hereticks*; and that it was always condemned by the *Fathers* of the *Chriſtian Church*: And anſwer the Arguments produced on the other ſide out of the Writings of the *Fathers*. And ſuppoſing that ſuperſtitious Cuſtom of worſhipping Images, had for ſome time obtained, yet they ſhew by ſeveral Teſtimonies, that it ought to be abrogated. No Wonder then that *Bellarmine* is ſo much diſpleaſed with this *Synod*, *for* offering ſo boldly to cenſure the *Pope's Writings*, and a *Synod* approved by him, wherein he ſaith, they exceed the Fault of the *Author of the Caroline Books*: *becauſe*, as he confeſſeth, *they offered to teach the Pope, and reſiſted him to the Face.* And yet, no doubt, they had read and conſidered *Hadrian's* Words, wherein he diſowns *the giving true divine Honour to Images.* Not long after this *Synod*, came forth the Book of *Agobardus Archbiſhop* of *Lyons*, againſt *Images*; occaſioned, ſaith *Papirius Maſſonus*, *by the ſtupendous Superſtition in that Age in the Worſhip of them.* And this, ſaith he, is the Subſtance of his Doctrine, out of St. *Auguſtine* and other *Fathers*; *that* there is no other Image of *God*, but what is himſelf, and therefore cannot be painted, and he ought not to be worſhipped in any Image, but what he hath preſcribed us to worſhip, which is *Chriſt*; *that Adoration* is external or internal; *that* both of them are called *Religion*, by which we are bound eternally to *God*, and *only* to him: From whence it follows, that neither *Angels* nor *Saints* are to be worſhipped by any *Religious Worſhip*: For this is the *Law* of *Adoration*, that no Creature, no Phantaſm of *God* in our Minds, no Work of Mens Hands ought to be worſhipped; for if *God's* Creatures are not to be worſhipped, much leſs ours, ſuch as *Images* of *God*, *Angels* and *Saints* are. Neither is it enough to ſay, that they do not worſhip the *Image*, but the *thing* repreſented; for the Object terminates the Worſhip, and it is a Deceit of the *Devil* under the pretence of honouring the *Saints* to bring Mens Minds to *Idols*, and from the true *God* to carnal things: *That Images* are to be uſed only for ſhew and Memory, and not at all for *Religion*; that *God* alone is to be worſhipped with all *Religious Worſhip*, whether called *Latria* or *Doulia*, or by what Name ſoever; and for the caſting away all Superſtition, that no *Images* be painted in *Churches*, no *Statues* erected, nor accounted holy, that the *true God* may be worſhipped alone for ever. This is the abſtract of his Doctrine delivered by *Maſſonus*, whoſe other Writings ſhew he was far from being partial towards the *Reformation*. And the Book it ſelf is lately publiſhed by *Baluzius* again, where any one may eaſily ſatisfy himſelf concerning his Fidelity. But *Baluzius* very honeſtly tells us, ſome have ſuſpected this Book not to be very *Catholick*; and therefore it was cenſured by *Baronius* and the *Spaniſh Index*; yet he ingenuouſly confeſſeth, he ſaith no more than the whole *Gallican Church* believed in that *Age*. *What* that was, I have already ſhewed. This I have the more largely inſiſted upon, to ſhew, that it is no new thing for us to plead for all *Religious Worſhip* being appropriated to *God*; and that the Command againſt *Image-worſhip* was no Ceremonial *Law*, reſpecting meerly the *Jews*, but that the Reaſon of it doth extend to all *Ages* and Nations, and eſpecially to us who live under the *Goſpel*. From all which it follows, that it was not meerly the *Heathen Idolatry* which was forbidden by God, nor was this *Law* given barely

Bellarm. Append. ad lib. de cultu Imag. c. 3.

C. 4.

Agobardi opera p. 221. Ed. 1666.

to prevent their falling to that by Degrees, but the giving to himſelf ſuch a Worſhip, which he judges ſo unworthy of him.

Of the Scripture Inſtances of Idolatry contrary to the ſecond Commandment.

§. 10. 3. From thoſe who were beſt able to underſtand the meaning of it. We can imagine none ſo competent a Judge of the meaning of a *Law*, as the *giver* of it, and he afterwards declares the Senſe of this Law. The firſt Occaſion given for knowing the meaning of the *Law* concerning *Images*, was not long after the making of it; when upon *Moſes*'s Abſence, they compelled *Aaron* to make

Exo. 32.4.

them a *Golden Calf*. Here was an *Image* made contrary to the *Law*, as is on all ſides acknowledged, but the Queſtion is, whether by this the *Iſraelites* did fall into the *Heathen Idolatry*, or only worſhip the true *God* under that *Symbol* of his Preſence? That they did not herein fall back to the *Heathen Idolatry*, I thus prove: 1. From the *Occaſion* of it, which was not upon the leaſt Pretence of *Infidelity* as to the true *God*; or that they had now better Reaſon given them, *for the Worſhip of other Gods beſides him:* But all they ſay, was, *that* Moſes *had been ſo long abſent*; *they knew not what was become of him, and therefore they ſay to* Aaron, *make us Gods*, (or *a God*, as in *Neh.* 9. 18.) *to go before us.* We cannot imagine the People ſo ſottiſh, to deſire *Aaron* to make them a *God* in the proper Senſe; as though they could believe the *Calf* newly made, to have been the *God*, which before it was made, *brought them out of the Land of Egypt*, as they ſay afterwards, *v.* 4. but it muſt be underſtood as the *Symbol* of that *God* which did bring them from thence. The Controverſy then lies here, Whether they thought the *Egyptian Gods* delivered them ought of *Egypt*, while they forſook all their own Worſhippers, to preſerve thoſe who were ſo great Enemies to them, that their very *Way* of *Worſhip* was an *Abomination to all the*

Exo. 8.26.

Egyptians, and whether they could think the *Gods* of *Egypt* had wrought all the Miracles for them, in their Deliverance, and after it? Whether they appeared not long before on *Mount Sinai*, and delivered the *Law* to them? Or, whether it were not the true *God* they meant, who had made that the Preface to his *Laws*, *I am the God that brought thee out of the Land of Egypt*, to whom they intended ſtill to give Honour: But the only Queſtion was concerning the *Symbol* of his Preſence, that was to go before them. For which, we are to conſider, that immediately before *Moſes*'s going up into the Mount, the laſt Promiſe *God* made to them was, *that he would*

Exod. 23. 20, 23. Exod. 33. 34.

ſend his Angel before them; which is elſewhere called *his Preſence*. Moreover they underſtood that there ſhould be ſome extraordinary *Symbol* of this Preſence; but what it was, they could not tell; for *Moſes* was then gone into the Mount to learn: But he not being heard of in Forty Days, they took it for granted they ſhould never hear of him any more; therefore they fall upon deviſing among themſelves, what was the fitteſt *Symbol* for the Preſence of *God* going before them; and herein the greateſt Number being poſſeſſed with the Prejudices of their Education in *Egypt*, where *golden Bulls* were the Symbols of their chief *God Oſiris*, they pitch upon that, and force *Aaron* to a Compliance with them in it. 2. There is no Intimation given in the whole Story, that they fell into the *Heathen Idolatry*; for when afterwards they fell into it, the particular Names of the

Num. 25.3 Act. 7.43. Exo. 32. 5. Verſ. 6.

Gods are mentioned, as *Baal-peor*, *Moloch*, *Remphan*. But here on the contrary, *Aaron* expreſly proclaims *a Feaſt to the Lord*, and the

People accordingly met, and offered their accuſtomed Offerings; whereas if it had been the *Egyptian Idolatry*, their common Sacrifices were Abominations; they muſt not have ſacrificed *Sheep* and *Oxen*, as they were wont to do. And that it was not the *Idolatry* of other Nations, who worſhipped *the Hoſt of Heaven*, is plain from St. *Stephen*'s Words, *And they made a Calf in thoſe Days, and offered Sa-* Act. 7. 41, 42. *crifice unto Idols, and rejoiced in the Works of their own Hands; then God turned and gave them up to worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven.* Whereby it is both obſervable that the *Idolatry* of the *Calf* was diſtinct from the other *Heathen Idolatry*, this being a Puniſhment of the other; and withal though the *Calf* was intended by them, to be only a Symbol of *God's* Preſence, yet being directly againſt *God's Command*, and having Divine Worſhip given it, it is by St. *Stephen* called an *Idol*; and to the ſame purpoſe, the *Pſalmiſt* ſpeaks, *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worſhipped the Molten Image; thus they* Pſal. 106. 19, 20. *changed their Glory* (or rather *his*) *into the Similitude of an Ox that eateth Graſs.* Rom. 1. 23 Which certainly was *Idolatry*, as well as that St. *Paul* charges the *Romans* with, *viz. that they changed the Glory of the incorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds, and four-footed Beaſts, and creeping Things.* And we ſee how highly *God* was diſpleaſed with the *Iſraelites* for this Sin of the *golden Calf*, Exod. 32. 7, 8, 9, 10.

The ſame may be ſaid of the *two Calves* of *Jeroboam*, at *Dan* and *Bethel*; for it was neither agreeable to his end, nor ſo likely to ſucceed, to take the *Ten Tribes* off from the *Worſhip* of the true *God*, but only from the Place of it at *Jeruſalem*; and the Occaſion of the *Kingdoms* coming to him was from *Solomon*'s falling to *Heathen Idolatry*: 1 King. 11. 33. Which would make him more cautious of falling into it, eſpecially at his firſt Entrance: Ibid. And when the Gods of other Nations are mentioned, they are particularly deſcribed, as *Aſhteroth* of the *Zidonians*, *Chemoſh* of the *Moabites*, and *Milcom* of the *Children of Ammon*. And 1 King. 16 31. in *Ahab*'s Idolatry, the Occaſion and Deſcription of it is given: But of *Jeroboam* it is only ſaid *that he ſet up the Calves at* Dan *and* 1 King. 12 28, 29. Bethel, *and ſaid unto the People, it is too much for you to go up to* Jeruſalem, *behold thy Gods, O Iſrael, which brought thee up out of the Land of* Egypt. How eaſy had it been to have ſaid that *Jeroboam* worſhipped the *Gods of Egypt*, if that had been his Intention? But, how much better that *he then* argued, that they had been hitherto in a great miſtake concerning the *true God*, and not meerly as to the Place of his Worſhip, which is all he ſpeaks againſt: For he continued the ſame Feaſts and Way of Worſhip, which were at *Jeruſalem.* 1 King. 12 32. Beſides, how comes the Sin of *Ahab* to be ſo much greater than that of *Jeroboam*, if they were both guilty of the ſame *Apoſtaſy* to *Heathen Idolatry*? 1 King 16 21. How came the Worſhip of the true *God* in the Ten Tribes to be ſet in oppoſition to *Heathen Idolatry*? 1 King. 18. 21. How comes *Jehu* at the ſame time to boaſt *his Zeal for the Lord*, when it is ſaid of him, *that he departed not from the Sins of* Jeroboam, *viz.* 2 King. 10 16, 29. *The golden Calves of* Dan *and* Bethel? Laſtly, how comes the Worſhip of the true *God* to be preſerved in the Ten Tribes after their Captivity, when they ſtill continued their Separation in *Religion* from the *Kingdom of Judah*? For certainly if the *Samaritans* had only 2 King. 17. 28. deſired Information concerning the Worſhip of the *God* of *Iſrael*, after the Way of *Jeruſalem*, they would have ſent only thither for it;

but becauſe they ſent into the *Land* of their *Captivity*, for a Prieſt to be ſent to them; it is plain the former Differences ſtill continued, and yet it is ſaid, *he taught them to fear the Lord.* And notwithſtanding it be thus evident, that *Jeroboam* did not fall then into *Heathen Idolatry*, yet we ſee that he is charged with *Idolatry* in Scripture, for it is ſaid, *that he had done evil above all that were before him, and had gone and made him other* Gods *and molten Images to provoke* God *to Anger, and had caſt him behind his back.* From whence it neceſſarily follows, that if God may be allowed to interpret his own *Law*, the Worſhipping of *Images*, though deſigned for his Honour, is *Idolatry*.

1 King. 14. 19.

And ſince the *Law-giver* hath thus interpreted his own *Law*, we need not be ſolicitous about the Senſe of any others; yet herein we have the Concurrence of the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian Church:* The *Jews* have thought the Prohibition to extend to all kinds of *Images* for Worſhip, and almoſt all for *Ornament:* And the Image-worſhip of the Church of *Rome* is one of the great Scandals to this Day, which hinder them from embracing *Chriſtianity*. The primitive Chriſtians were declared Enemies to all Worſhip of God by *Images*; but I need the leſs to go about to prove it now, ſince it is at laſt confeſſed by one of the moſt learned *Jeſuits* they ever had, that *for the four firſt Centuries and further, there was little or no Uſe of Images in the Temples or Oratories of Chriſtians*; but we need not their Favour in ſo plain a Cauſe as this; as ſhall be evidently proved if Occaſion be further given. And againſt my Adverſaries Opinion, *that the ſecond Command only forbids the Worſhip of Idols*, we have the Conſent of ſome of the moſt learned Writers of his own Church: For *Vaſquez* acknowledgeth, *that it is plain in Scripture, that* God *did not only forbid that in the ſecond Command, which was unlawful by the Law of Nature, as the Worſhipping an Image for* God; *but the Worſhipping of the true* God *by any Similitude of him*; and he reckons up many others, of the ſame Opinion with him; of great Eſtimation in the *Roman Church.*

Petav. dogmat. Theol. To. 5. l. 15. c. 13. ſ. 3. c. 14. ſ. 8.

Vaſquez. in 3. Thom. diſp. 94. q. 25. c. 3.

Of *the diſtinctions uſed to excuſe this from being Idolatry*

Aug. c. duas Epiſt. Pel. l 3. c. 4.

§. 11. But we muſt now conſider, what he further produces for his Opinion; he therefore ſaith, *If St.* Auſtin'*s Judgment be to be followed, the Second Commandment is but a Part or Explication of the firſt.* But why doth he not tell us, whether St. *Auſtin*'s Judgment be to be followed or no, if it be of ſo much Conſequence to the reſolving of this Controverſy? Nay, how is he ſure this was St. *Auſtin*'s conſtant Judgment; ſince in his latter Writings, he reckons up the Commandments as others of the *Fathers* had done before him? But if St. *Auſtin*'s Judgment were to be followed in this, doth it thence follow that this Commandment muſt be only againſt *Idols?* No, but that all Things concerning the Worſhip of God muſt be in one Command; and ſo they may be, and yet be as full againſt *Image-worſhip*, as in *Two:* So, that no Relief is to be had from thence.

And as little from this Diſtinction *of an inferior and relative Honour only, which is given by them* (he ſaith) *to the ſacred Images of Chriſt, and his bleſſed Mother and Saints*; *and that which they call* Latria *or Worſhip due to* God, *the former*, he ſaith, *is only honorary Adoration expreſſed by putting off our Hats, kiſſing them, or kneeling before them.* Which is juſt as if an unchaſt Wife ſhould plead in her excuſe to her Huſband, that the Perſon ſhe was too kind with, was extremely like him, and a near Friend of his, and that it was out of Reſpect to him that ſhe gave him the Honour of his Bed; can any one think that ſuch an Excuſe as this would be taken by a jealous Huſband? How much leſs will ſuch like Pretences avail with that God, who hath declared himſelf particularly *jealous* of his Honour, in this Command above others, and that *he will not give his Glory to another*, but hath reſerved all *Divine Worſhip* as peculiar to himſelf; and no ſuch fond Excuſes of *relative*, *inferior*, and *improper Worſhip* will ſerve, when they encroach upon his Prerogative. It was well obſerved, by a very learned *Biſhop* of our *Church*, that ſuch kind of Diſtinctions ſo applied are like the Diſpute among ſome of the *Church* of *Rome* in *Scotland*, whether the *Lord's Prayer* might be uſed to *Saints* or no, and it was well reſolved and very ſubtilly, that *ultimately*, *principally*, *primarily*, and *ſtrictly* they might not, but *ſecondarily*, *leſs principally*, and *largely* or *relatively* they might. The ſame would certainly hold for Images too. And I wonder very much, they ſtick at any kind of Worſhip to be done to *Images*. For my own part, were I of their mind, I ſhould as little ſcruple offering up the *Hoſt* to an *Image*, as ſaying my *Prayers* to it, and I ſhould think my ſelf hardly dealt with, if I did not come off with the ſame Diſtinctions. For if I do it to God *abſolutely*, and for *himſelf*, and to the Image only *improperly* and *relatively*, wherein am I to blame? I cannot underſtand, if the Image have the *honorary Adoration*, as he calls it, given to it only with a reſpect to what is repreſented by it, but I may give the ſame kind of Worſhip to the Image which I do to the *Prototype*: And that, upon the Rule he quotes from St. *Baſil* (although he uſes it quite upon another Occaſion, as if he looks upon the Place he may ſee) *that the Worſhip of the Image is carried to the Prototype or thing repreſented.* I deſire therefore ſeriouſly to know of him, whether any *Worſhip* doth at all belong to the *Image* or no? If none at all, to what end are they *kneeled before*, and *kiſſed*, which if the Images had any Senſe in them, they would think was done to them? And why doth the *Council* of *Trent* determine that *due Worſhip* is to be given them? If there be any *due*, whether is it the *ſame* that is given to the *Prototype*, or *diſtinct* from it; if it be the *ſame*, then *proper Divine Worſhip* is given to the *Image*; if *diſtinct*, then the *Image* is worſhipped with *Divine Worſhip* for *it ſelf*, and not *relatively* and *ſubordinately*, as he ſpeaks.

B. Andrews *Anſwer to* **Perron. p. 57.**

I know, *Madam*, when any thing pincheth them, they cry preſently theſe are *Diſputes of the Schools*, and *Niceties* too deep for you to be able to judge of; but I aſſure you ſome of the beſt learned among them, have determined which ſide ſoever you take, you fall into *Idolatry*; and I hope that is no *Scholaſtick nicety* with you. I ſhall endeavour to give you their ſenſe as plainly as I can. *Bellarmin* ſaith, "That no Image is to be Worſhipped properly with that Wor- " ſhip which the thing repreſented is Worſhipped by; for *Latria* (as " he calls it) is a Worſhip proper to *God*, but no Image upon account " of *relation*, or any other way *is God*; therefore that *Worſhip* doth " not belong to it." It may be, ſaith he, ſome will ſay, *that* Latria " *is a Worſhip proper to* God, *when it is given for it ſelf, and not* " *for another* (or relatively.) I Anſwer, that it is of the Nature of " *Latria* (or *Divine Worſhip*) to be given *for it ſelf*: For, that is " the Worſhip, which is due to the true God as the firſt Principle

" of

Bellarm. *de imag. l.* 2, *c.* 24.

“ of all things, and it implies a Contradiction for the higheſt Worſhip to be given to the firſt Principle, and *relatively* or for another, and therefore this Worſhip is given to the Image for it ſelf, which is plain *Idolatry*; or elſe it is not given for it ſelf, and then it is not *Latria* or properly Divine Worſhip. Again, either the Divine Worſhip, or *Latria*, which is given to the Image relatively for another, is the ſame with that which is given to God, or an Inferior Worſhip, if it be the ſame, the Creature is equally worſhipped with God, which certainly is *Idolatry*; For *Idolatry* (ſaith he) *is not only when God is forſaken, and an Idol worſhipped, but when an Idol is worſhipped together with God.* If it be an *inferior* Worſhip, then it is not *Latria*, for that is the higheſt Worſhip. Thus far *Bellarmin:* On the other ſide *Vaſquez* a *Jeſuit*, a Man of great Reputation too, and of as ſearching a Wit as *Bellarmin*, he ſaith, That if an *inferior Worſhip* be given to the *Image*, *diſtinct* from that which is given to the thing repreſented, he that ſo gives it incurs the *Crime of Idolatry*; for he expreſſeth his ſubmiſſion to a meer inanimate thing, that hath no kind of excellency to deſerve it from him. By which we ſee that it is in Mens choice what ſort of *Idolatry* they will commit, who Worſhip *Images*, but in neither way they can avoid it.

Vaſquez. 3. Th. *diſp.* 108. *q.* 25. *art.* 3 *c.* 9.

The inſtances ſuppoſed to be parallel anſwered.

§. 12. But yet he thinks to eſcape *by ſome parallel inſtances*, as he fancies them; ſuch as, *the honour given to the Chair of State, or the King's Picture or Garment*; Moſes *and* Joſhua*'s putting off their Shooes, becauſe it was holy ground*; *the Jews falling down before God's Footſtool, and worſhipping the Holies of Holies where were the Cherubims*, Propitiatory, *and Ark*; *Proteſtants bowing at the Name of Jeſus, or kneeling at the Euchariſt, and bowing before the Altar*; from theſe he thinks he hath ſufficiently cleared that *inferior* and *relative* Worſhip which they give to Images. To which I anſwer,

1. *To that of the Chair of State*, that our Diſpute is not concerning *Civil Worſhip*, but *Divine*; and as to *Civil Worſhip*, I ſuppoſe he would not ſay, that were any honour to the *King*, in caſe he had abſolutely *forbidden it*, as we have proved God hath done in the caſe of *Images*.

2. *To the putting off the Shooes upon holy ground:* (1.) That we think there is ſome little difference to be made between what God hath *commanded*, and what he hath *forbidden*; for in the caſe of *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, there was an *expreſs command*; but in the caſe of Image-worſhip there is as plain a *Prohibition*. (2.) That the ſpecial Preſence and Appearance of God doth *ſanctify* a Place to ſo high a degree, that we may lawfully teſtify our reverence towards it; but this will not hold for Images, unleſs God be proved preſent in them, in the ſame manner as he appeared to *Moſes* and *Joſhua*; and yet even then, the Reverence he required was not *kiſſing it*, or *bowing to it*, much leſs *praying* to it, but only *putting off their Shooes*. (3.) If theſe things had been done towards the *ground*, the danger had not been ſo great as to *Images*; becauſe the *ground* had nothing of *Repreſentation* in it, but was only *Sacred* by *Divine Conſecration*; and therefore it could not pretend, to be any *ſimilitude* of *God*. But in *Images* there is nothing *Sacred* but being an *Image*; and ſo the *Repreſentation* is that, which gives all the excellency and value to it, and

Exod. 3. 5. Joſh. 5. 15.

and therefore the *Reverence* of holy Places and Things, is of a quite different nature from the *Worſhip* of *Images.*

3. *To the Jews Adoration towards the Ark and the Holy of Holies, where the Cherubims and Propitiatory were:* (1.) That they only directed their Worſhip *towards the Place*, where God had promiſed to be *ſignally preſent* among them; which ſignifies no more to the Worſhip of *Images*, than our lifting *our eyes to Heaven*, doth when we pray, becauſe God is more eſpecially preſent there. (2.) That though the *Cherubims* were there, yet they were always hid from the ſight of the People, the *High Prieſt* himſelf going into the *Holy of Holies* but once a Year; that the *Cherubims* were no *Repreſentations* of God; and his Throne was *between them* upon the *Mercy Seat*; and they were *Hieroglyphical figures* of God's own appointing, which the *Jews* know no more than we do; which are plain Arguments they were never intended for *objects of worſhip*; for then they muſt not have been meerly *appendices* to another thing, they muſt have been publickly expoſed, as the *Images* are in the *Roman Churches*, and their form as well known as any of the *Bleſſed Virgin.*

4. *To bowing at the Name of Jeſus*; that he might as well have inſtanced in going to *Church* at the *toll* of a *Bell*, for as the one only tells us the *time* when we ought to go to Worſhip God; ſo the mentioning the Name of *Jeſus* doth only put us in mind of him we owe all manner of reverence to, without diſhonouring him as the *Object* of our Worſhip, by any *Images* of him, which can only Repreſent that which is neither the *Object* nor *Reaſon* of our *Worſhip.*

5. *To kneeling at the Euchariſt*, that of all things ſhould not be objected to us, who have declared in our *Rubrick* after *Communion*, "That thereby no Adoration is intended or ought to be done either "unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine, there bodily received, or "any corporeal Preſence of Chriſt's natural Fleſh and Blood; for "the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain ſtill in their very natural "ſubſtances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were *Idolatry* "to be abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians.

To bowing towards the Altar, or at entring in and going out of the *Church*, that it is of the ſame nature with the *putting off our Hats*, while we are there; and is only determining a natural act of *Reverence*, that way which the ancient *Chriſtians* did uſe to direct their *Worſhip.*

204:1:A.
47:1.B.

CHAP. II.

Of their Idolatry in Adoration of the Hoſt, and Invocation of Saints.

The Argument propoſed, concerning the Adoration of the Hoſt; the inſufficiency of the Anſwer to it manifeſted: ſuppoſing equal Revelation for Tranſubſtantiation as for Chriſt's Divinity, yet not the ſame reaſon for worſhipping the Hoſt as the Perſon of Chriſt; the great

great diſparity between theſe two at large diſcovered; the Controverſy truly ſtated, concerning Adoration of the Hoſt; and it is proved, that no Man on the Principles of the Roman Church, can be ſecure he doth not commit Idolatry in it. The Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, that the ſame Principles will juſtifie the Worſhip of any Creature. No ſuch Motives to believe Tranſubſtantiation as the Divinity of Chriſt. Biſhop Taylor'*s Teſtimony anſwered by himſelf. To Worſhip Chriſt in the Sun, as lawful as to Worſhip him in the Hoſt. The groſſeſt Idolatry excuſable on the ſame grounds. The Argument propoſed and vindicated, concerning the Invocation of* Saints *practiſed in the Church of* Rome. *The Fathers Arguments againſt the Heathens, hold againſt Invocation of Saints; the ſtate of the Controverſy about Idolatry, as managed by them. They make it wholly unlawful, to give Divine Worſhip to any Creature, how excellent ſoever. The Worſhip, not only of Heathen Gods, but of Angels condemned. The common evaſions anſwered. Prayer more proper to God, than Sacrifice. No ſuch diſparity as is pretended, between the manner of Invocating Saints, and the Heathens Invocating their Deities. In the Church of* Rome, *they do more than pray to Saints to pray for them, proved from the preſent moſt Authentick Breviaries. Suppoſing that were all, it would not excuſe them. St.* Auſtin *no Friend to Invocation of Saints. Practices condemned by the Church pleaded for it. Of Negative points being Articles of Faith.*

Of the Adoration of the Hoſt.

§. 1. I Proceed *to the Adoration of the Hoſt*; and here the Argument I propoſed, was to take off the common anſwer; *That this could not be Idolatry, becauſe they believed the Bread to be God,* upon *the ſame ground,* I ſaid, *they who believe the Sun to be God, and Worſhip him on that account, would be excuſed from Idolatry too; nay the groſſer their Idolatry was, the more excuſable it would be; as that of thoſe who ſuppoſe their Images to be Gods, and upon this ground their Worſhip was more Lawful than of thoſe who ſuppoſed them not to be ſo.* To this he anſwers two ways; 1. *That they do not barely ſuppoſe, that the ſubſtance of Bread is changed into Chriſt's Body, and that he is really preſent under the form of Bread; but that they know and believe this, upon the ſame Grounds and Motives upon which they believe that Chriſt is God; and conſequently to be adored; and further adds, that the ſame Argument will hold againſt the Adoration of Chriſt as God, as againſt the Adoration of him in the Euchariſt, ſince they have a like Divine Revelation for his real Preſence under the Sacramental Signs, as for his being true God and Man.* 2. *Suppoſing they were miſtaken, yet it would not follow they were Idolaters, which he proves from Dr.* Taylor'*s words.* But notwithſtanding theſe appearances of anſwering, that my Argument ſtill ſtands good, will be evident by proving theſe things. 1. That ſuppoſing there were the ſame Revelation of *Chriſt's Divinity*, and of his *Preſence* in the *Euchariſt* by *Tranſubſtantiation*, yet there could not be the ſame reaſon for the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*, as for *worſhipping Chriſt* himſelf. 2. That there are not the ſame Motives and Grounds to believe that Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that there are to believe that *Chriſt is God*. 3. That ſuppoſing they are miſtaken in the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that doth not excuſe them from *Idolatry*,

latry. 4. That the ſame Reaſon which would excuſe them, would excuſe the moſt groſs *Idolaters* in the World.

§. 2. That ſuppoſing there were the ſame divine Revelation of *Tranſubſtantiation* and of *Chriſt's Divinity*, yet there could not be the ſame *Reaſon* for *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*, as of *Chriſt* himſelf. 1. Becauſe there is a plain *Command* in *Scripture* for one, and there is *nothing* like it for the other. *All the Angels are commanded to worſhip the Son of God*, and much more *all Men*, who have greater Obligation to do it. *All Men are to honour the Son as they honour the Father*; and *to his Name every Knee is to bow:* But where is there the leaſt Intimation given that we are to worſhip *Chriſt* in the *Elements* ſuppoſing him *preſent* there? If it be ſaid, *the general Command doth extend to him, wherever he is preſent*; It is eaſily anſwered, that this Argument doth prove no more his *Worſhip* in the *Elements*, than in a *Turf*, or any other *Piece of Bread*; for *Chriſt* being *God*, is every where preſent; and if his *Preſence* only may be ground of giving *Adoration* to that wherein he is *preſent*, we may as lawfully worſhip the *Sun*, or the *Earth* or any other thing, as they do the *Sacrament*. For he is *preſent* in all of them. But our *Worſhip* is not to be guided by our own Fancies, but the Will of *God*; and we have a *Command* for worſhipping of the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, and till we ſee one as to his Preſence in the *Sacrament*, we ought not to think the one *parallel* with the other. And by this the Weakneſs of his retorting the Argument *in the Arrians behalf* (ſo he calls *thoſe who believe Chriſt to be a pure Man*) *againſt thoſe who worſhip the Son of God will appear:* For our Worſhip doth not meerly depend upon our *Belief*, but upon the *divine Command*, and therefore thoſe who have denyed the one, have yet contended for the other. 2. The one gives us a ſufficient *Reaſon* for our *Worſhip*, but the other doth not: There can be no greater Reaſon for giving his Perſon *Adoration* than that he is the *eternal Son of God*; but what equivalent Reaſon to this is there, ſuppoſing the *Bread* to be really converted into the *Body of Chriſt*; All that I can believe then preſent is *the* Body *of* Chriſt; and what then? Is that the *Object* of our *Adoration?* Do we terminate our Worſhip upon his humane Nature? And was it ever more properly ſo than in *dying?* Is it not the Death of Chriſt that is ſet forth in the *Euchariſt?* And is his Body preſent any other way, than as it is agreeable to the end of the *Inſtitution?* But it may be they will ſay *the Body of Chriſt being hypoſtatically united with the divine Nature, one cannot be preſent without the other*, that indeed is a good Argument to prove the Body of *Chriſt* cannot be there by *Tranſubſtantiation:* For if the Bread be converted into that *Body* of *Chriſt* which is *hypoſtatically* united with the *divine Nature*, then the Converſion is not meerly into the *Body*, but into the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*; and then *Chriſt* hath as many Bodies *hypoſtatically* united to him, as there are *Elements* conſecrated; and ſo all the Accidents of the *Bread* belong to that *Body* of *Chriſt*, which is *hypoſtatically* united with the divine Nature. Nay, to make the Elements the Object of *Divine Worſhip*, as they do, they muſt ſuppoſe an *hypoſtatical Union* between *them* and the *Divine Nature* of Chriſt; for if the only Reaſon of joyning the *human Nature* with the *divine* in the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, as the *Object* of our *Worſhip*, be the *hypoſtatical Union* of thoſe Natures; then we can upon no other account make thoſe Elements the *Object* of *Worſhip*, but by ſuppoſing ſuch an *Union* between *Chriſt* and *them*. But I ſuppoſe

Heb. 1. 6.

Joh. 5. 23.
Phil. 2. 10.

poſe they will not venture to ſay, that *Chriſt* is *hypoſtatically* united with the *Shape*, *Figure* and *Colour* of the *Bread :* For they will have nothing elſe to remain after Conſecration (in ſpight of all the Reaſon and Senſe of the World) but meerly thoſe *Accidents* ; and the *Council* of *Trent* determines, *That the ſame Divine Worſhip which we give to God himſelf, is in expreſs Terms to be given to the moſt holy Sacrament, and pronounces an Anathema againſt all who deny it.* And what is the holy *Sacrament* but the *Body* of *Chriſt*, according to them under the *Accidents* of the *Bread* ; and although the *Body* of *Chriſt* being believed to be there, is the Reaſon of their *Worſhip* ; yet the Worſhip is given to the *Elements* upon that account.

Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 13 c. 5.

The State of the Controverſy.

§. 3. But this being a Matter of ſo great Importance, to make it as clear as the Nature of the Thing will allow, I ſhall yet further prove, that upon the *Principles* of the *Roman Church*, no Man can be aſſured that he doth not commit *Idolatry* every time he gives *Adoration* to the *Hoſt :* And I hope this will abundantly add to the diſcovering the *Diſparity* between the Worſhip given to the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, and that which is given to the *Euchariſt* upon *Suppoſition* of *Tranſubſtantiation.* But before I come to this, I ſhall endeavour to give a true Account of the *State* of the *Controverſy* between us : Which I ſhall do in theſe particulars.

1. The Queſtion between us is not, whether the *Perſon* of *Chriſt* is to be worſhipped with *divine Worſhip* ; for that we freely acknowledge. And although the human Nature of *Chriſt*, *of it ſelf*, can yield us no ſufficient Reaſon for *Adoration*, yet being conſidered as united to the divine Nature, that cannot hinder the ſame divine worſhip being given to his Perſon, which belongs to his divine nature, any more than the *Robes* of a *Prince*, can take off from the Honour due unto him.

2. It is not whether the *Perſon* of *Chriſt viſibly appearing* to us in any Place ought to have *divine Honour* given to him ? For ſuppoſing ſufficient Evidence of ſuch an *Appearance*, we make no more queſtion of this, than we do of the former. Neither do we ſay, that we need a particular *Command* in ſuch a Caſe to make it lawful ; any more than the *Patriarchs* did at every Appearance of *God* among them ; or thoſe who converſed with our *Lord* on Earth, every time they fell down and worſhipped him. Where our Senſe and Reaſon is ſatisfied as well as St. *Thomas*'s was in a *viſible Appearance* of *Chriſt*, we can give *divine Worſhip* as he did, when he ſaid *my Lord and my God* ; for in this Worſhip given to the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, I am ſure I give it to nothing, but what is either *God* or *hypoſtatically united* to the divine Nature : *But is there not the ſame Reaſon of believing Chriſt to be preſent, as of ſeeing him ?* I anſwer, in Matters of pure Revelation there is, where the Matter propoſed to our Faith can be no Object of Senſe ; as *Chriſt's* infinite Preſence in all Places as *God*, I firmly believe upon the Credit of divine Revelation, and I give divine Worſhip to him as *God*, ſuitable to that *infinite Preſence* ; but our Queſtion is, concerning the *viſible Preſence* of *Chriſt*, where Honour is given on the account of the divine Nature, but he can be *known to be preſent* only by his *Humanity* ; in this Caſe I ſay, the Evidence of *Senſe* is neceſſary in Order to the true worſhipping the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*. If any ſhould be ſo impertinent as to urge that ſaying to this purpoſe, *bleſſed are they that have not ſeen and yet have believed*, I ſhall only ſay, that doth not at all relate to this Matter, but to the Truth of Chriſt's Reſurrection.

Joh 20.29.

3. It is not concerning the *ſpiritual Worſhip* of *Chriſt*, in the Celebration of the *Euchariſt :* For we declare that in all ſolemn Acts of *Religious Worſhip*, and particularly in the *Euchariſt*, we give divine Honour to the *Son* of *God*, as well as to the *Father*. We affirm, that we ought not only perform the Offices of *Religion* out of Obedience to his divine Commands, but with a due Veneration of his *Majeſty* and Power, with Thankfulneſs for his infinite Goodneſs, and with Truſt in his Promiſes, and Subjection of our Souls to his ſupreme *Authority*. About theſe things, which are the main Parts of divine and ſpiritual Worſhip, we have no quarrel ; nor do we find fault with any for giving too much to *Chriſt* in this manner ; but rather for placing too much in the bare external Acts of *Adoration*, which may be performed with all external Pomp and Shew, where there is no inward Reverence nor ſincere Devotion. And yet,

4. It is not, concerning *external Reverence* to be ſhewn in the *time* of receiving the *Euchariſt :* For that our *Church* not only allows, but enjoyns ; and that *not barely for the avoiding ſuch Profanation and Diſorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwiſe enſue, but for a Signification of our humble and grateful Acknowledgment of the Benefit of Chriſt therein given to all worthy Receivers.* But it is withal declared, *that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal Preſence of Chriſt's natural Fleſh and Blood* ; as I have already recited it. But the Controverſy concerning the Adoration of the *Hoſt*, lies in theſe Two Things. 1. Whether *proper divine Worſhip*, in the *time* of receiving the *Euchariſt*, may be given to the *Elements*, on the account of a *corporal Preſence* of *Chriſt* under them ? 2. Whether out of the time of receiving, the ſame *Adoration* ought to be given to it, when it is *elevated* or *carried* in *Proceſſion*, which we would give to the very *Perſon* of *Chriſt* ? And that this is the true State of the Controverſy, I appeal to the Doctrine and Practice of the *Roman Church* in this Point. For it is expreſly determined by the *Council* of *Trent*, *That there is no manner of doubt left, but that all Chriſtians ought to give the ſame Worſhip to this holy Sacrament which they give to God himſelf. For it is not therefore leſs to be worſhipped, becauſe it was inſtituted by Chriſt our Lord that it might be taken.* By which Words the true State of the Controverſy is made evident, which is not about the *Reverence* due only to *Chriſt*, ſuppoſed to be *corporally preſent* there, but the *Adoration* due to the *Sacrament* upon that account. And by the *Sacrament* the *Council* muſt underſtand the *Elements* or *Accidents* (or whatever Name they call them by) as the immediate *Term* of that *Divine Worſhip*, or elſe the latter Words ſignify nothing at all. For what was that, *which was inſtituted by our Lord as a Sacrament ?* Was it not the external and viſible Signs or Elements ? Why do they urge, *that the Sacrament ought not the leſs to be adored becauſe it was to be taken*, but to take off the common Objection that we ought not to give divine Worſhip to that which we eat ? And what can this have Reſpect to but the *Elements ?* But this is not denyed, that I know of, by any who underſtand either the Doctrine or Practice of that *Church* ; although to anſwer our Arguments they would ſeem to direct their *Worſhip* only to *Chriſt*, as preſent under the *Elements* ; yet yielding that on the account of this *corporal Preſence*,

Rubrick after Communion.

Council. Trident. ſeſſ 13. c. 5.

ſence, that which *appears* ought to have the ſame *Worſhip* given to it, with that which is ſuppoſed or believed. And ſo they make the *Accidents* of the *Sacrament* to have the very ſame Honour, which the *humane Nature* of *Chriſt* hath; which they ſay hath no *divine Honour* for *it ſelf*, but on the account of the *Conjunction* of the *Divinity* with it.

No Security in the Roman Church againſt Idolatry in Adoration of the Hoſt.

§. 4. The Controverſy being thus ſtated, I come to ſhew, that upon the Principles of the *Roman Church* no Man can be aſſured that he doth not commit *Idolatry*, every time he gives *Adoration* to the *Hoſt*. For it is a Principle indiſputable among them, that to give proper divine Honour, called by them *Adoration*, to a Creature, is *Idolatry*; but no Man, upon the Principles of their *Church*, can be aſſured every time he worſhips the *Hoſt*, that he doth not give proper divine Honour to a Creature. For there are Two Things abſolutely neceſſary, to ſecure a Man's Mind in the Performance of an Act of divine Worſhip. 1. That either the *Object* be ſuch in it ſelf, which deſerves and requires ſuch Worſhip from us, as is the *divine Nature of Chriſt*: Or, 2. That if of *it ſelf*, it doth not deſerve it, there be a Reaſon ſufficient to give it, as in the *humane Nature of Chriſt* upon its *Union* with the *Divine*: But in this Matter, of the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*, no Man can be ſecure of either of theſe, upon their own Principles.

1. He cannot be ſecure that the *Object* is ſuch, as doth deſerve *divine Worſhip*. If a Man ſhould chance to believe his Senſes, or hearken to his Reaſon, or at leaſt think the Matter diſputable, whether that which he ſees to be *Bread*, be not really *Bread*, what Caſe is this Man in? He becomes an *Idolater* by not being a *Fool* or a *mad Man*. But becauſe we are not now to proceed upon the Principles of it *Senſe* or *Reaſon*, but thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*; I will ſuppoſe the Caſe of one that goes firmly upon the received Principles of it, and try whether ſuch a one can be ſatisfied in his Mind, that when he gives *divine Worſhip* to the *Hoſt*, he doth not give it to a *Creature*. And becauſe we are now ſuppoſing unreaſonable Things, I will ſuppoſe my ſelf to be that Perſon. The *Maſs-bell* now rings, and I muſt give the ſame *divine Honour* to the *Hoſt*, which I do to *Chriſt* himſelf: But hold, if it ſhould be but a *meer Creature*, all the World cannot excuſe me from *Idolatry*, and my own *Church* condemns me, all agreeing that this is groſs *Idolatry*: How come I then to be aſſured, that what but a little before was a meer Creature, is upon the pronouncing a few Words turned into my Creator. A ſtrange and ſudden Change! And I can hardly ſay, that *God* becoming *Man* was ſo great a Wonder, as a little piece of *Bread* becoming *God*. When *God* became *Man*, he ſhewed himſelf to be *God*, by Wonders and Miracles which he wrought for the Conviction of the World: I will ſee if I can find any ſuch Evidence of ſo wonderful a *Transformation from* a Wafer to a *Deity*. I ſee it to be the very *ſame* it was, I handle it as I did, if I taſte it, it hath the very ſame agreeableneſs to the *Palate* it had: Where then lies this mighty *change*? But O *carnal reaſon*, what have I to do with thee in theſe *myſteries* of *Faith*! I remember what *Church* I am of, and how much I am bid to beware of *thee*: But how then ſhall I be ſatisfied? Muſt I relie on the bare Words of *Chriſt*, *This is my Body*? But I have been told, the

Scripture is very obſcure and dangerous for me to be too confident of the *ſenſe* of it. I have heard ſome wiſe Men of our *Church* have ſaid, that theſe words may bear a *figurative ſenſe*, like *that Rock was Chriſt*, and that if there were no other evidence for *Tranſubſtantiation*, but what the *Scripture* gives, there were no reaſon to make it an Article of Faith. I have heard the great Names of *Scotus*, *Aliaco*, *Biel*, *Fiſher*, *Cajetan*, *Canus* and others quoted to this purpoſe, and their Teſtimonies produced. What a caſe am I in then, if thoſe *words* do not prove it? Now I think better of it, I muſt truſt the *Church* for the ſenſe of *Scripture*, and if I be not ſtrangely miſtaken, I am Sworn to interpret *Scripture* according to the *unanimous conſent of the Fathers:* But alas, what relief is this to my anxious mind? This is a thing I am to do, or not to do, almoſt every day; and to be reſolved of it, I am put to a task which will hold me all my life-time; and may be as unſatisfied at laſt as I am now. For I ſee the World is full of Diſputes, concerning the ſenſe of their words, as well as the *Scriptures:* One ſaith, that a Father by a *Figure* means a *Subſtance*; and that another by a *Subſtance* means a *Figure*; one Man ſays his Adverſaries Authorities are *counterfeit*, and another ſays the ſame of his: One quotes the ſaying of an *Heretick* for the *Orthodox*; and another makes it appear, that if he ſpake his own mind, he muſt contradict himſelf and others of the *Fathers*. One produces a *Pope* confirming the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and another as plain a Teſtimony of another *Pope*, of greater Antiquity and more Learning overthrowing it. One appeals to the firſt Ages of the *Church*, another to the *lateſt:* one ſaith, the *Fathers* ſpake *Rhetorically*, and another *Dogmatically*. One, that they loved to talk *myſtically*, and another, that they ſpake *differently* about this matter. In this great confuſion what ground of certainty have I to ſtand upon, whereby to ſecure my mind from commiſſion of a great Sin? I am ſure if I live in wilful Sin all my days, I ſhall be damned; but God hath never told me, if I do not ſtudy the *Fathers* all my life, I ſhall be damned. It is *ſatisfaction* I deſire, and that I am not like to have this way, when I ſee Men of greater Wit, Subtilty, and Judgment, than ever I am like to come to, are ſtill diſputing about the ſenſe of the Fathers in this point: Witneſs the late heats in *France* about it. While I am in this *Labyrinth* a kind *Prieſt* offers to give me eaſe, and tells me, theſe are doubts and ſcruples I ought not to trouble my ſelf about, the Authority of the preſent *Church* is ſufficient for me: I thank him for his kindneſs, only deſiring to know, what he means by the Authority of the *preſent Church:* For I find we *Catholicks* are not agreed about that neither. May I be ſure, if the *Pope* who is *Head* of the *Church* ſay it? No, not unleſs he *defines* it: But may I be ſure then? No, not unleſs a *General Council* concur: But may I be ſure, if a *General Council* determines it? Yea, if it be confirmed *wholly* by the *Pope*, and doth proceed *in the way of a Council:* But how is it poſſible for me to judge of that, when the intrigues of actions are ſo ſecret? I ſee then, if this be the only way of ſatisfaction, I muſt forbear giving Adoration, or be guilty of *Idolatry* in doing it. But ſuppoſe I am ſatisfied in the point of *Tranſubſtantiation*, it is not enough for me to know in general, that there is ſuch a *change*; but I muſt believe particularly that very *Bread* to be *changed* ſo, which I am now to worſhip,

ſhip, and by what means can I be ſure of that? For my *Church* tells me, that it is neceſſary that he be a *Prieſt* that conſecrates, and that he had an *intention* of conſecrating that very *Bread* which I am to adore. But what if it ſhould come to paſs after many Conſecrations, that ſuch a Perſon prove no *Prieſt*, becauſe not rightly *baptized*; (which is no unheard of thing) what became of all their actions who worſhipped every *Hoſt* he pretended to conſecrate? They muſt be guilty of *Idolatry*, every *Maſs* he celebrated. But how is it poſſible for me to be ſure of his *Prieſthood*, unleſs I could be ſure of the *intention* of the *Biſhop* that *ordained* him, and the *Prieſt* that *baptized* him? which it is impoſſible for me to be. Yet ſuppoſe I were ſure he was a *Prieſt*, what aſſurance have I, that he had an intention to conſecrate that very *Wafer* which I am to adore? If there were Thirteen, and he had an intention to conſecrate only Twelve, if I worſhip the Thirteenth, I give *Divine Honour* to a *meer Creature*; for without the *intention* of the *Prieſt* in Conſecration, it can be nothing elſe; and then I am guilty of downright *Idolatry*. So that upon the Principles of the *Roman Church*, no Man can be ſatisfied, that he doth not worſhip a meer Creature with Divine Honour, when he gives *Adoration* to the *Hoſt*.

2. No Man can be ſatisfied that he hath *ſufficient reaſon* for giving this *Worſhip* to the *Hoſt*. For which we muſt conſider, what *ſuppoſitions* the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt* depends upon, if any of which prove uncertain, I am in as bad a caſe as I was before. I firſt ſuppoſe, that the Bread being really and ſubſtantially changed into that very *Body of Chriſt* which was crucified at *Jeruſalem*, I ought to give the ſame *Honour* to that *Body of Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*, which I am to give to the *Perſon of Chriſt* as *God and Man*; and that the *Body of Chriſt* being *preſent* in the *Sacrament*, I may on the account of that *Preſence* give the ſame *honour* to the *Sacrament*, in which he is preſent. But if it prove uncertain, whether the *Humane Nature* of *Chriſt* as conjoyned to the *Divine Nature* be capable of receiving proper Divine Worſhip, then it muſt be much more ſo, whether the Body of *Chriſt* as preſent in the *Sacrament* be ſo? But granting that, it may be yet uncertain, whether I ought to give the ſame *honour* to the *viſible* part of the *Sacrament* which I do to the *humanity* of *Chriſt*; for though *Chriſt* may be *preſent* there, his *Preſence* doth not make the things wherein he is preſent, capable of the ſame Divine Honour with himſelf. Now that theſe things are uncertain upon their own Principles, I now make appear. I find it generally agreed by the *Doctors* of the *Roman Church*, that the *Humane Nature* of *Chriſt*, conſidered alone, ought not to have *Divine Honour* given to it; and I find it hotly diſputed among them, whether *Chriſt's Humane Nature*, though *united* to the *Divine*, ought, abſtractly conſidered, to have any true *Divine Honour* given it; and thoſe who deny it, make uſe of this ſubſtantial Argument, *proper Divine Honour is due only to God, but the Humane Nature of Chriſt is not God, and therefore that Honour ought not to be given it:* And I am further told by them, that the *Church* hath never determined this Controverſy. Let me now apply this to our preſent caſe: It is *certain* if the *Body* of *Chriſt* be *preſent* in the *Euchariſt*, as *diſtinct* from the *Divine Nature* I am not to adore it: It is very *uncertain*, if it be preſent, whether I am to give *Divine Worſhip* to the *Body* of *Chriſt*;

but it is moſt certain, that if I worſhip *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*, it is upon the account of his *corporal Preſence*. For although when I worſhip the *Perſon* of *Chriſt* as out of the *Sacrament*, my worſhip is terminated upon him as God and Man, and the *reaſon* of my *worſhip* is wholly drawn from his *Divine Nature*; yet when I worſhip *Chriſt*, as in the *Sacrament*, I muſt worſhip him there upon the account of his *bodily Preſence*, for I have no other reaſon to worſhip him in the *Sacrament*, but becauſe his *Body* is not preſent in it. And this is not barely determining the *Place* of *Worſhip*, but aſſigning the *cauſe* of it; for the primary reaſon of all *Adoration* in the *Sacrament* is, becauſe *Chriſt* hath ſaid, *This is my* Body, which words, if they ſhould be allowed to imply *Tranſubſtantiation*, cannot be underſtood of any other *change* than of the *Bread* into the *Body* of *Chriſt*. And if ſuch a ſenſe were to be put upon it, why may not I imagine much more agreeably to the Nature of the Inſtitution, that the meer *humane nature* of *Chriſt* is there, than that his *Divinity* ſhould be there in a particular manner preſent to no end; and where it makes not the leaſt Manifeſtation of it ſelf.

But if I ſhould yield all that can be begged in this kind, *viz.* that the *Body* of *Chriſt* being preſent, his *Divinity* is there *preſent* too; yet my mind muſt unavoidably reſt unſatisfied ſtill, as to the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*. For the ſuppoſing the *Divine Nature* preſent in any thing gives no ground upon that account, to give the ſame *Worſhip* to the thing wherein he is preſent, as I do to *Chriſt* himſelf. This the more conſiderative Men of the *Roman Church* are aware of, but the different ways they have taken to anſwer it, rather encreaſe Mens doubts than ſatisfy them. *Greg. de Valenciâ* denies not, "that *Divine Honour* is given by them to the *Eucha*-"*riſt*: And that the *accidents* remaining after Conſecration are the "*term* of *Adoration* not for themſelves, but by reaſon of the *admira*-"*ble conjunction* which they have with *Chriſt*, which is the very ſame which they ſay of the *humane nature* of *Chriſt*, and yet this ſame Perſon denies, that they are *hypoſtatically united* to him: Which if any one can underſtand, I ſhall not envy him. Bellarmin in anſwer to this Argument, is forced to grant as great an *hypoſtatical union* between *Chriſt* and the *Sacrament*, as between the *Divine* and *Humane Nature*; for when he ſpeaks of that, he ſaith it lies in this, that *the humane nature loſeth its own proper ſubſiſtence, and is aſſumed into the ſubſiſtence of the divine nature*, and in the caſe of the *Sacrament*, he yields ſuch a loſing the proper *ſubſiſtence* of the *Bread*, and that what ever *remains* makes no *diſtinct ſuppoſitum* from the Body of *Chriſt*, but all belong to him and make *one* with him, and therefore may be worſhipped as he is. Is not this an admirable way of eaſing the minds of diſſatisfied Perſons about giving *Adoration* to the *Hoſt*, to fill them with ſuch unintelligible terms and notions; which it is impoſſible for them to underſtand themſelves, or explain to others? *Vaſquez* therefore finding well that the force of the Argument lay in the *Preſence* of *Chriſt*, and that from thence they muſt at laſt derive only, the *ground* of *Adoration*; very ingenuouſly yields the Conſequence, and grants that God may very lawfully be *adored* by us in any *created Being*, wherein he is intimately preſent: And this he not only grants; but contends for in a ſet *Diſputation*, wherein he proves very well from the *Principles* of *Worſhip*

Greg. de Val de Idolol. l. 2. *c.* 5

Bell. de Sacr. Euchar. l. 4. *c.* 30.

De Incarnat. l. 3. *c.* 8.

Vaſquez. Tom. 1. *diſp.* 108. *c.* 12. *n.* 111.

allowed

Diſp. 110. *c.* 2. 3

allowed in the *Roman Church*, that God may be adored in *inanimate and irrational Beings* as well as in *Images*, and anſwers all the Arguments the very ſame way that they defend the other, and that we may Worſhip the *Sun* as lawfully, and with the ſame kind of Worſhip that they do an *Image*, and that Men may be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip with which we Worſhip God himſelf, if our mind do not reſt in the Creature, but be terminated upon God, as in the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*. See here the admirable effects of the Doctrine of *divine worſhip* allowed and required in the *Roman Church!* For, upon the very ſame Principles that a *Papiſt* Worſhips *Images*, *Saints*, and the *Hoſt*, he may as lawfully Worſhip the *Earth*, the *Stars*, or *Men*; and be no more guilty of *Idolatry* in one, than in the other of them. So that if we have no more reaſon to Worſhip the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, than they have to *adore* the *Hoſt*; upon their Principles we have no more ground to Worſhip *Chriſt*, than we have to Worſhip any *creature* in the World.

No ſuch motives to believe Tranſubſtantiation as the Divinity of Chriſt.

§. 5. 2. There are not the ſame motives and grounds to believe the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that there are to believe that *Chriſt* is *God*, which he affirms, but without any appearance of reaſon. And I would gladly know, what excellent motives and reaſons thoſe are, which ſo advantageouſly recommend ſo abſurd a Doctrine as Tranſubſtantiation is, as to make any Man think he hath reaſon to believe it? I am ſure it gives the greateſt advantage to the Enemies of *Chriſt's Divinity*, to ſee theſe two put together upon equal terms: As though no Man could have reaſon to believe *Chriſt* to be the *Eternal Son of God*, that did not at the ſame time ſwallow the greateſt Contradictions to ſenſe and reaſon imaginable. But what doth he mean *by theſe motives and grounds to believe?* The Authority of the *Roman Church?* I utterly deny that to be any ground of believing at all, and deſire with all my heart to ſee it proved: But this is a proper means to believe Tranſubſtantiation by, for the ground of believing is as abſurd as the Doctrine to be believed by it. If he means *Catholick Tradition*, let him prove, if he can, that Tranſubſtantiation was a Doctrine received in the *Univerſal Church*, from our *Saviours* time; and when he pleaſes I ſhall joyn iſſue with him upon that ſubject. And if he thinks fit to put the negative upon me, I will undertake to inſtance in an *Age* ſince the three firſt Centuries, wherein if the moſt Learned Fathers and *Biſhops* (yea of *Rome* it ſelf) be to be credited, Tranſubſtantiation was not believed. But if at laſt he means *Scripture* (which we acknowledge for our only rule of Faith; and ſhall do inſpight of all pretences to *Infallibility* either in *Church* or *Tradition*) I ſhall appeal even to *Bellarmin* himſelf in this caſe, whether there are the ſame motives and grounds from thence to believe *Tranſubſtantiation* as, there are, the *Divinity of Chriſt*. In the proof of *Tranſubſtantiation*, his only Argument is from thoſe words, *this is my body, which words*, ſaith he, *doth neceſſarily infer either a real mutation of the* Bread *as the* Catholicks *hold, or a metaphorical as the* Calviniſt, *but by no means do admit the Lutherans ſenſe*; and ſo ſpends the reſt of the Chapter againſt them: And concludes it thus, *Although there be ſome obſcurity or ambiguity in the words of our Lord, yet that is taken away by* Councils *and* Fathers, and ſo paſſes to them. Which are a plain Indication, he thought the ſame which others of his *Religion*

Bellar. de Sacram. Euch. l. 3. c. 19.

have ſaid, That the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation [illegible] from Scripture [illegible]. But when he [illegible] the [illegible] he goes through those ſeveral Claſſes of Arguments [illegible] wholly out of Scripture; the firſt out of both [illegible] only out of the Old, the third out of the New, the fourth from the Names of the true God given to Chriſt, the fifth from the [illegible] Attributes, Eternity, Immenſity, Power, Wiſdom, Goodneſs [illegible] ſty; the ſixth from the proper *Works* of God, Creation, Con[illegible] tion, Salvation, foreknowing of ſecret things, and working Mir[illegible] All which he largely inſiſts upon, with great Strength and [illegible] neſs; ſo that if he may be judge, the Motives to believe the Divi*nity* of *Chriſt*, are far from being the ſame in *Scripture* that there [illegible] to believe *Tranſubſtantiation*.

[illegible] Chri- [illegible] l. 1. c. 4.

§. 6. 3. But ſuppoſing they are miſtaken in the Belief of this Doctrine, this doth not excuſe them from *Idolatry*. To this Quotation out of Dr. *Taylor's Liberty of prophesying* to the contrary, I ſhall return him the Opinion of their own *Divines*. The Teſtimony of *Coſter* is ſufficiently known to this purpoſe, who ſaith the ſame thing in effect that I had done, *If the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation be not true, the Idolatry of the Heathens in worſhipping ſome golden or ſilver Statue, or any Images of their Gods, or the Laplan*ders *worſhipping a red Cloth, or the Egyptians an Animal, is more excuſable, than of Chriſtians that worſhip a bit of Bread.* And our Countryman Biſhop *Fiſher* confeſſeth, *That if there be nothing but Bread in the Euchariſt, they are all Idolaters.* But none is ſo fit to anſwer Dr. *Taylor* as himſelf, after almoſt Twenty Years time to conſider more throughly of thoſe Things, and then he confeſſeth, *That the Weapons he uſed for their Defence were but wooden Daggers, though the beſt he could meet with; and if that be the beſt they have to ſay for themſelves which he hath produced for them, their Probabilities will be ſoon out-ballanced by one Scripture-teſtimony urged by Proteſtants; and thou ſhalt not worſhip any graven Images, will outweigh all the beſt and faireſt Imaginations of their Churches.* And elſewhere, *That the ſecond Commandment is ſo plain, ſo eaſy, ſo peremptory againſt all the making and worſhipping any Image or Likeneſs of any thing, that beſides that every Man naturally would underſtand all ſuch to be forbidden, it is ſo expreſſed, that upon Suppoſition that God intend to forbid it wholly, it could not more plainly have been expreſſed.* By which it is clear he did not think that *Idolatry did lie only in forſaking the true God, and giving divine Worſhip to a Creature or an Idol, that is to an imaginary God, who hath no Foundation in Eſſence or Exiſtence*; which is the Reaſon he brings why they are excuſed from *Idolatry* in Adoration of the Hoſt, becauſe the Object of their Adoration is the *true God*; for he not only makes the ſecond Command to be peremptory and poſitive againſt the Worſhip of the true God by an Image, but elſewhere plainly determines this to be *Idolatry*, and ſaith, *that an Image then becomes an Idol, when divine Worſhip is given to it; and that, to worſhip falſe Gods, or to give divine Honour to an Image which is not God, is all one kind of formal Idolatry.* If therefore they cannot be excuſed from *Idolatry*, who worſhip the *true God* by an *Image*, though the Object of their Adoration be right, and they think the manner of it to be lawful; neither can they who worſhip *Chriſt*, upon the account

A miſtake doth not excuſe from Idolatry.

Coſter Enchir. Contr. c. 8. de Euch. Sacram. p. 308.

Fiſher c. Oecolamp. præf. l. 1. c. 2. p. (ep.) 760.

D. Taylor's *ſecond Part of diſſuaſive Introduct. to Anſwer to I. S. [illegible] Ways.*

2 Part of diſſuaſ. b. 2. ſ. 6. p. 138.

Ductor dubitant. b. 2. c. 2. p. 346. p. 339.

Diſp. 110. c. 2. 3

allowed in the *Roman Church*, that God may be adored in *inanimate and irrational* Beings as well as in *Images*, and anſwers all the Arguments the very ſame way that they defend the other, and that we may Worſhip the *Sun* as lawfully, and with the ſame kind of Worſhip that they do an *Image*, and that Men may be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip with which we Worſhip God himſelf, if our mind do not reſt in the Creature, but be terminated upon God, as in the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*. See here the admirable effects of the Doctrine of *divine worſhip* allowed and required in the *Roman Church!* For, upon the very ſame Principles that a *Papiſt* Worſhips *Images*, *Saints*, and the *Hoſt*, he may as lawfully Worſhip the *Earth*, the *Stars*, or *Men*; and be no more guilty of *Idolatry* in one, than in the other of them. So that if we have no more reaſon to Worſhip the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, than they have to *adore* the *Hoſt*; upon their Principles we have no more ground to Worſhip *Chriſt*, than we have to Worſhip any *creature* in the World.

No ſuch motives to believe Tranſubſtantiation as the Divinity of Chriſt.

§. 5. 2. There are not the ſame motives and grounds to believe the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that there are to believe that *Chriſt* is *God*, which he affirms, but without any appearance of reaſon. And I would gladly know, what excellent motives and reaſons thoſe are, which ſo advantageouſly recommend ſo abſurd a Doctrine as Tranſubſtantiation is, as to make any Man think he hath reaſon to believe it? I am ſure it gives the greateſt advantage to the Enemies of *Chriſt's Divinity*, to ſee theſe two put together upon equal terms: As though no Man could have reaſon to believe *Chriſt* to be the *Eternal Son of God*, that did not at the ſame time ſwallow the greateſt Contradictions to ſenſe and reaſon imaginable. But what doth he mean *by theſe motives and grounds to believe?* The Authority of the *Roman Church?* I utterly deny that to be any ground of believing at all, and deſire with all my heart to ſee it proved: But this is a proper means to believe Tranſubſtantiation by, for the ground of believing is as abſurd as the Doctrine to be believed by it. If he means *Catholick Tradition*, let him prove, if he can, that Tranſubſtantiation was a Doctrine received in the *Univerſal Church*, from our *Saviours* time; and when he pleaſes I ſhall joyn iſſue with him upon that ſubject. And if he thinks fit to put the negative upon me, I will undertake to inſtance in an *Age* ſince the three firſt Centuries, wherein if the moſt Learned Fathers and *Biſhops* (yea of *Rome* it ſelf) be to be credited, Tranſubſtantiation was not believed. But if at laſt he means *Scripture* (which we acknowledge for our only rule of Faith; and ſhall do inſpight of all pretences to *Infallibility* either in *Church* or *Tradition*) I ſhall appeal even to *Bellarmin* himſelf in this caſe, whether there are the ſame motives and grounds from thence to believe *Tranſubſtantiation* as, there are, the *Divinity of Chriſt*. In the proof of *Tranſubſtantiation*, his only Argument is from thoſe words, *this is my body, which words*, ſaith he, *doth neceſſarily infer either a real mutation of the* Bread *as the* Catholicks *hold, or a metaphorical as the* Calviniſt, *but by no means do admit the* Lutherans *ſenſe*; and ſo ſpends the reſt of the Chapter againſt them: And concludes it thus, *Although there be ſome obſcurity or ambiguity in the words of our Lord, yet that is taken away by* Councils *and* Fathers, and ſo paſſes to them. Which are a plain Indication, he thought the ſame which others of his *Religion* have

Bellar. de Sacram. Euch. l. 3. c. 19.

have ſaid, *That the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation could not be proved from Scripture alone.* But when he proves the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, he goes through nine ſeveral *Claſſes* of Arguments, ſix of which are wholly out of *Scripture*; the firſt out of both *Teſtaments*, the ſecond only out of the *Old*, the third out of the *New*, the fourth from the Names of the true God given to Chriſt, the fifth from the Divine Attributes, Eternity, Immenſity, Power, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Majeſty; the ſixth from the proper *Works* of God, Creation, Conſervation, Salvation, foreknowing of ſecret things, and working Miracles. All which he largely inſiſts upon, with great Strength and Clearneſs; ſo that if he may be judge, the Motives to believe the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, are far from being the ſame in *Scripture* that there are to believe *Tranſubſtantiation*.

D: Chriſto l. 1 c. 4.

§. 6. 3. But ſuppoſing they are miſtaken in the Belief of this Doctrine, this doth not excuſe them from *Idolatry*. To this Quotation out of Dr. *Taylor*'s *Liberty of propheſying* to the contrary, I ſhall return him the Opinion of their own *Divines*. The Teſtimony of *Coſter* is ſufficiently known to this purpoſe, who ſaith the ſame thing in effect that I had done, *If the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation be not true, the Idolatry of the Heathens in worſhipping ſome golden or ſilver Statue, or any Images of their Gods, or the* Laplanders *worſhipping a red Cloth, or the Egyptians an Animal, is more excuſable, than of Chriſtians that worſhip a bit of Bread.* And our Countryman Biſhop *Fiſher* confeſſeth, *That if there be nothing but Bread in the Euchariſt, they are all Idolaters.* But none is ſo fit to anſwer Dr. *Taylor* as himſelf, after almoſt Twenty Years time to conſider more throughly of thoſe Things, and then he confeſſeth, *That the Weapons he uſed for their Defence were but wooden Daggers, though the beſt he could meet with; and if that be the beſt they have to ſay for themſelves which he hath produced for them, their Probabilities will be ſoon out-ballanced by one Scripture-teſtimony urged by* Proteſtants; *and thou ſhalt not worſhip any graven Images, will outweigh all the beſt and faireſt Imaginations of their Church:* And elſewhere, *That the ſecond Commandment is ſo plain, ſo eaſy, ſo peremptory againſt all the making and worſhipping any Image or Likeneſs of any thing, that beſides that every Man naturally would underſtand all ſuch to be forbidden, it is ſo expreſſed, that upon Suppoſition that God intend to forbid it wholly, it could not more plainly have been expreſſed.* By which it is clear he did not think that *Idolatry did lie only in forſaking the true God, and giving divine Worſhip to a Creature or an Idol, that is to an imaginary God, who hath no Foundation in Eſſence or Exiſtence*; which is the Reaſon he brings why they are excuſed from *Idolatry* in Adoration of the Hoſt, becauſe the Object of their Adoration is the *true God*; for he not only makes the ſecond Command to be peremptory and poſitive againſt the Worſhip of the true God by an Image, but elſewhere plainly determines this to be *Idolatry*, and ſaith, *that an Image then becomes an Idol, when divine Worſhip is given to it; and that, to worſhip falſe Gods, or to give divine Honour to an Image which is not God, is all one kind of formal Idolatry.* If therefore they cannot be excuſed from *Idolatry*, who worſhip the *true God* by an *Image*, though the Object of their Adoration be right, and they think the manner of it to be lawful; neither can they who worſhip *Chriſt*, upon the account

A Miſtake doth not excuſe from Idolatry.

Coſter Enchir. Contr. c. 8. de Euch. Sacram. p. 308.

Fiſher c. Oecoloum. pad. l. 1. c. 2. p. (2p.) 760.

B. Taylor's *ſecond* Part of *diſſuaſive Introduct. in Anſwer to* I. S. 5. Ways.

2 Part of *diſſuaſ.* b. 2. ſ. 6. p. 138.

Ductor dubitant. b. 2. c. 2. p. 344. p. 339.

account of *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Sacrament*, for not only the Superſtition of an undue Object, but of a prohibited manner or way of Worſhip is *Idolatry*; even according to the Opinion of him whom he produces as a Teſtimony of their Innocency.

The groſſeſt Idolatry excuſable on the ſame grounds.

Aug. præfat. in Pſal. 93. Tom. 8. p. 2. p. 184.

Rom. 10. 18.

Aug. c. Manich. l. 20. c. 1. 68.

1 Joh. 8 9.

§. 7. 4. That if a Miſtake in this Caſe will excuſe them, it would excuſe the groſſeſt *Idolatry* in the World. St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of ſome, *who ſaid that Chriſt was the Sun, and therefore worſhipped the Sun*; I deſire to know whether this were *Idolatry in them or no?* They had Scripture to plead for it as plain as *This is my Body*, for he is not only called the *Sun of Righteouſneſs*; but the vulgar Latin (which they contend to be the only Authentick Verſion) reads that Place, *Pſal.* 19. 6. *In Sole poſuit Tabernaculum ſuum, He hath placed his Tabernacle in the Sun*; and that this is to be underſtood of *Chriſt*, may be proved from the *Apoſtles* applying the other Words, *their Line is gone out through all the Earth*, to the *Apoſtles* preaching the *Goſpel*. And the *Manichees* did believe that *Chriſt* had his Reſidence partly in the Sun, and partly in the Moon; and therefore they directed their Prayers always to the Sun. Let us now conſider Two Perſons equally perſwaded, that the *Sun* is now the Tabernacle of *Chriſt*, and that he is really preſent there, and diſpenſes all the comfortable Influences of Heat and Light to the World, he being ſo often in Scripture called the *true Light*; and another, that he is really preſent by *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Sacrament*. I would fain underſtand why the one ſhould not be as free from *Idolatry*, as the other? If it be ſaid, *that all thoſe Places which ſpeak of Chriſt as the Sun, are to be underſtood Metaphorically*, that is the ſame thing we ſay to them concerning thoſe Words of *Chriſt*, *This is my Body*; and if notwithſtanding that, they are excuſed by believing otherwiſe; ſo muſt the other Perſon unavoidably be ſo too. It is to no purpoſe to alledge *Fathers* and *Councils*, for one Opinion more than for the other; for the Queſtion is not concerning the Probability of one Miſtake more than of the other (although if they be ſtrictly examined, the Abſurdities of *Tranſubſtantiation* are much greater) but we ſuppoſe a *Miſtake* in both, and the Queſtion is, whether ſuch a Miſtake doth excuſe from *Idolatry* or no? And we are not to enquire into the Reaſons of the *Miſtake*, but the Influence it hath upon our Actions. And then we are yet to ſeek why a Miſtake equally involuntary as to the real Object of divine Adoration, may not excuſe from *Idolatry*, as well as to the wrong Application of Worſhip due to a real Object of Adoration? *i. e.* Whether a Man giving Adoration to what he believes to be *God*, which is not ſo in it ſelf, be not as excuſable, as believing a true Object of Adoration in general, but giving divine Worſhip to that which is not it? As whether the worſhipping falſe Gods, ſuppoſing them to be true, be not as venial a Fault, as worſhipping that for the true *God*, which is not ſo? As for inſtance, ſuppoſe the *Egyptians* worſhipping the *Sun* for *God*, and the *Iſraelites* the golden *Calf*, believing it was the true *God* which brought them out of the *Land* of *Egypt*? Or let us take one of the *Inca*'s of *Peru*, who believed by a Tradition ſuppoſed infallible among them, that the *Sun* was their *Father* and the *viſible God*, by which the *Inviſible* did govern the World; and therefore they ought to give all external Adoration to the Sun, and internal only to the *Inviſible Deity*; upon what account ſhall theſe be charged with Idolatry, if an

Garcilaſſo de la vega le Commentaire Royal. liv. 2. c. 1.

an involuntary Miſtake, and firm Belief that they worſhip the true God, doth excuſe from it? Nay, the moſt ſtupid and ſenſleſs of all *Idolaters* who worſhipped the very *Images* for *Gods* (which the wiſeſt among them always diſclaimed, and pretended only ſuch a relative Worſhip as he pleads for) were in truth the moſt excuſable upon this ground; for ſuppoſing that it be true which they believed, they did a very good thing, and what every Perſon elſe ought to do upon the ſame Belief. Which is the utmoſt can be ſaid for the *Papiſt's* Adoration of the *Hoſt*, ſuppoſing the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* were as true as it is falſe and abſurd.

Of Invocation of Saints.

§. 8. 3. As *to Invocations of Saints*, I found the chief Anſwer given was this, *That they did not attribute the ſame kind of Excellency to Saints, which they give to* God; *but ſuppoſe only a middle ſort of Excellency between God and us, which they make the Foundation of the Worſhip which is given to them.* And as to this my Argument was thus framed, if the Suppoſition of a middle Excellency between God and us, be ſufficient ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathens worſhip of their inferior *Deities* could be no *Idolatry*, for they ſtill pretended, they did not give to them the Worſhip proper to the Supreme God; which is as much as is pretended by the devouteſt *Papiſts* in Juſtification of the *Invocation of Saints*; To this he anſwers two ways: 1. *By ſhewing the Diſparity of the Heathens Worſhip from theirs* in two things: 1. *In the Object.* 2. *In the Manner of their Worſhip.* 1. *The Perſons whom they Worſhip,* he ſaith, *are ſuch as are endowed with ſupernatural Gifts of Grace in this Life, and Glory in Heaven; whoſe Prayers by Conſequence are acceptable and available with God, but the Supreme Deity of the Heathens, is known to be* Jupiter, *and their inferior Deities,* Venus, Mars, Bacchus, Vulcan, *and the like Rabble of Devils as the Scripture calls them; and therefore there can be no Conſequence, that becauſe the Heathens were Idolaters in the Worſhip of theſe, though they pretended not to give them the Worſhip proper to* Jupiter *the Supreme God, therefore the Catholicks muſt be guilty of Idolatry in deſiring the Servants of the true* God *to pray for them to him.* 2. *As to the manner of Worſhip,* he ſaith, *If any of them did attain, as the* Platoniſts, *to the Knowledge of the true God, yet as St.* Paul *ſays, they did not glorify him as* God, *but changed his Glory into an Image made like to corruptible Man, adoring, and offering Sacrifice due to God alone, to the Statues themſelves, or the inferior Deities they ſuppoſed to dwell or aſſiſt in them; which St.* Auſtin *upon the* 90. Pſal. *proves to be Devils, or evil Angels, becauſe they required Sacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worſhipped as Gods. But all he means by formal Invocation,* he ſaith is, *deſiring or praying the Saints to pray for them. And if this were Idolatry, we muſt not deſire the Prayers of a juſt Man, even in this Life; becauſe this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferior Deity.* 2. He anſwers, *that the ſame Calumny was caſt upon the Catholicks in St.* Auſtin's *time, and is anſwered by him, and his Anſwer will ſerve as well now as then, in his Twentieth Book againſt* Fauſtus, Chap. 21. *who himſelf held formal Invocation a Part of the Worſhip due to Saints, as it is evident from the Prayer he made to St.* Cyprian *after his Martyrdom.* l. 7. de Bapt. c. Donat. c. 1. *and* Calvin *confeſſeth* (he ſaith) *it was the Cuſtom at that time to ſay, Holy* Mary, *or Holy* Peter *pray for us.*

account of *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Sacrament*, for not only the Superſtition of an undue Object, but of a prohibited Manner or way of Worſhip is *Idolatry*, even according to the Opinion of him whom he produces as a Teſtimony of their Innocency.

The groſſeſt Idolatry excuſable on the ſame grounds. Aug. præfat. in Pſal. 93. Tom. 8. p. 2. p. 184.

§. 4. That if a Miſtake in this Caſe will excuſe them, it would excuſe the groſſeſt *Idolatry* in the World. St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of ſome, *who ſaid that Chriſt was the Sun, and therefore worſhipped the Sun*; I deſire to know whether this were *Idolatry in them or no?* They had Scripture to plead for it as plain as *This is my Body*, for he is not only called the *Sun of Righteouſneſs*; but the vulgar Latin (which they contend to be the only Authentick Verſion) reads that Place, *Pſal.* 19. 6. *In Sole poſuit Tabernaculum ſuum, He hath placed his Tabernacle in the Sun*; and that this is to be underſtood of *Chriſt*, may be proved from the *Apoſtles* applying the other Words, *their Line is gone out through all the Earth*, to the *Apoſtles* preaching the *Goſpel*. And the *Manichees* did believe that *Chriſt* had his Reſidence partly in the Sun, and partly in the Moon; and therefore they directed their Prayers always to the Sun. Let us now conſider Two Perſons equally perſwaded, that the *Sun* is now the Tabernacle of *Chriſt*, and that he is really preſent there, and diſpenſes all the comfortable Influences of Heat and Light to the World, he being ſo often in Scripture called the *true Light*; and another, that he is really preſent by *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Sacrament*. I would fain underſtand why the one ſhould not be as free from *Idolatry*, as the other? If it be ſaid, *that all thoſe Places which ſpeak of Chriſt as the Sun, are to be underſtood Metaphorically*, that is the ſame thing we ſay to them concerning thoſe Words of *Chriſt*, *This is my Body*; and if notwithſtanding that, they are excuſed by believing otherwiſe; ſo muſt the other Perſon unavoidably be ſo too. It is to no purpoſe to alledge *Fathers* and *Councils*, for one Opinion more than for the other; for the Queſtion is not concerning the Probability of one Miſtake more than of the other (although if they be ſtrictly examined, the Abſurdities of *Tranſubſtantiation* are much greater) but we ſuppoſe a *Miſtake* in both, and the Queſtion is, whether ſuch a Miſtake doth excuſe from *Idolatry* or no? And we are not to enquire into the Reaſons of the *Miſtake*, but the Influence it hath upon our Actions. And then we are yet to ſeek why a Miſtake equally involuntary as to the real Object of divine Adoration, may not excuſe from *Idolatry*, as well as to the wrong Application of Worſhip due to a real Object of Adoration? *i. e.* Whether a Man giving Adoration to what he believes to be *God*, which is not ſo in it ſelf, be not as excuſable, as believing a true Object of Adoration in general, but giving divine Worſhip to that which is not it? As whether the worſhipping falſe Gods, ſuppoſing them to be true, be not as venial a Fault, as worſhipping that for the true *God*, which is not ſo? As for inſtance, ſuppoſe the *Egyptians* worſhipping the *Sun* for *God*, and the *Iſraelites* the golden *Calf*, believing it was the true *God* which brought them out of the *Land* of *Egypt*? Or let us take one of the *Inca*'s of *Peru*, who believed by a Tradition ſuppoſed infallible among them, that the *Sun* was their *Father* and the *viſible God*, by which the *Inviſible* did govern the World; and therefore they ought to give all external Adoration to the Sun, and internal only to the *Inviſible Deity*; upon what account ſhall theſe be charged with Idolatry, if an

Rom. 10. 18.

Aug. c. Manich. l. 20. c. 1. 68.

1 Joh. 8 9.

Garcilaſſo de la vega le Commentaire Royal. liv. 2. c. 1.

an involuntary Miſtake, and firm Belief that they worſhip the true God, doth excuſe from it? Nay, the moſt ſtupid and ſenſleſs of all *Idolaters* who worſhipped the very *Images* for *Gods* (which the wiſeſt among them always diſclaimed, and pretended only ſuch a relative Worſhip as he pleads for) were in truth the moſt excuſable upon this ground; for ſuppoſing that it be true which they believed, they did a very good thing, and what every Perſon elſe ought to do upon the ſame Belief. Which is the utmoſt can be ſaid for the *Papiſt's* Adoration of the *Hoſt*, ſuppoſing the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* were as true as it is falſe and abſurd.

Of *Invocation of Saints.*

§. 8. 3. As *to Invocations of Saints*, I found the chief Anſwer given was this, *That they did not attribute the ſame kind of Excellency to Saints, which they give to* God; *but ſuppoſe only a middle ſort of Excellency between* God *and us, which they make the Foundation of the Worſhip which is given to them.* And as to this my Argument was thus framed, if the Suppoſition of a middle Excellency between God and us, be ſufficient ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathens worſhip of their inferior *Deities* could be no *Idolatry*, for they ſtill pretended, they did not give to them the Worſhip proper to the Supreme God; which is as much as is pretended by the devouteſt *Papiſts* in Juſtification of the *Invocation of Saints*, To this he anſwers two ways: 1. *By ſhewing the Diſparity of the Heathens Worſhip from theirs* in two things: 1. *In the Object.* 2. *In the Manner of their Worſhip.* 1. *The Perſons whom they Worſhip*, he ſaith, *are ſuch as are endowed with ſupernatural Gifts of* Grace *in this Life, and* Glory *in Heaven; whoſe Prayers by Conſequence are acceptable and available with God, but the Supreme Deity of the Heathens, is known to be* Jupiter, *and their inferior Deities*, Venus, Mars, Bacchus, Vulcan, *and the like Rabble of Devils as the Scripture calls them; and therefore there can be no Conſequence, that becauſe the Heathens were Idolaters in the Worſhip of theſe, though they pretended not to give them the Worſhip proper to* Jupiter *the Supreme God, therefore the Catholicks muſt be guilty of Idolatry in deſiring the Servants of the true* God *to pray for them to him.* 2. *As to the manner of Worſhip*, he ſaith, *If any of them did attain, as the* Platoniſts, *to the Knowledge of the true God, yet as St.* Paul *ſays, they did not glorify him as* God, *but changed his Glory into an Image made like to corruptible Man, adoring, and offering Sacrifice due to God alone, to the Statues themſelves, or the inferior Deities they ſuppoſed to dwell or aſſiſt in them; which St.* Auſtin *upon the* 90. Pſal. *proves to be Devils, or evil Angels, becauſe they required Sacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worſhipped as* Gods. *But all he means by formal Invocation*, he ſaith is, *deſiring or praying the Saints to pray for them. And if this were Idolatry, we muſt not deſire the Prayers of a juſt Man, even in this Life; becauſe this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferior Deity.* 2. He anſwers, *that the ſame Calumny was caſt upon the Catholicks in St.* Auſtin's *time, and is anſwered by him, and his Anſwer will ſerve as well now as then, in his Twentieth Book againſt* Fauſtus, Chap. 21. *who himſelf held formal Invocation a Part of the Worſhip due to Saints, as it is evident from the Prayer he made to St.* Cyprian *after his Martyrdom.* l. 7. de Bapt. c. Donat. c. 1. *and* Calvin *confeſſeth* (he ſaith) *it was the Cuſtom at that time to ſay, Holy* Mary, *or Holy* Peter *pray for us.*

This

This is his full Anſwer: In which are two things to be examined. 1. Whether the Diſparity between the *Heathen Worſhip* and theirs be ſo great, as to excuſe them from *Idolatry*? 2. Whether the Anſwer given by St. *Auſtin* doth vindicate them: And whether *Invocation* of *Saints*, as it is now practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, were allowed, or in uſe then?

The Fathers Arguments againſt Heathen Idolatry condemn Invocation of Saints.

§. 9. 1. Concerning the Diſparity. 1. As to the *Object* of *Worſhip*. Far be it from me to parallel the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*, with the impure *Deities* of the *Heathens*, to their Excellencies: But the true State of the *Queſtion* is, Whether the *Heathens* were only to blame in making an ill Choice of thoſe they worſhipped, as in worſhipping *Jupiter*, and *Venus*, and *Vulcan*, who are ſuppoſed to have been wicked Wretches, or elſe in giving divine Worſhip to any beſides the true God? And if their *Idolatry* lay not only in the former, but the latter, then this Diſparity cannot excuſe them. There were two *Queſtions* in debate between the Primitive *Fathers* of the *Chriſtian Church*, and the *Heathen Idolaters*. The firſt was more general, and in *Theſi*; whether it were lawful to give divine Worſhip to any beſides the true and ſupreme God? The ſecond was more particular, and in *Hypotheſy*; whether on ſuppoſition that were lawful, thoſe whom the *Heathens* worſhipped were fit Objects for ſuch Adoration? In this latter the triumph over them with a great deal of Eloquence, laying open the Impiety of thoſe whom they commonly worſhipped; but withal, knowing that the wiſer among them had another Notion of theſe *Deities* under the common Names than the *Vulgar* had, they therefore charge them with *Idolatry*, in giving the Worſhip proper to God, to any Creature, let it be never ſo excellent and ſerviceable to Mankind; and tell us, that it was the Property of the *Chriſtian Religion to give divine Worſhip to none but God himſelf, and his Son Jeſus Chriſt*; without ever making any Diſtinctions of abſolute and relative Worſhip, which they muſt have been driven to, in caſe they had given *Religious Worſhip* to any beſides. Thus *Juſtin Martin* tells the *Heathen Emperors*, to whom he makes his *Apology* for the *Chriſtians*, *that Chriſt did perſwade Men to worſhip* God *alone, by ſaying, This is the great Commandment, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy* God, *and him only ſhalt thou ſerve; and that we are to render to* Cæſar, *the Things that are* Cæſars, *and to* God *the things that are Gods: On which account*, ſaith he, *we worſhip* God *alone, and give cheerful Service in all other things to you.* *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Antioch* (who lived in the ſecond Century after Chriſt, as well as *Juſtin*) giving an account why the *Chriſtians* refuſed to give *Adoration* to the *Emperors*, as was then uſed (not that Adoration, which was proper to the Supreme God; for none can be ſo ſenſleſs to imagine, they required that: But ſuch kind of Religious Worſhip, as they gave to the *Images* of their Gods) ſaith, *That as the King or Emperor ſuffers none under him to be called by his Name; and that it is not lawful to give it to any but himſelf; ſo neither is it to worſhip any but God alone:* And elſewhere ſaith, *that the Divine Law doth not only forbid the Worſhip of Idols, but of the Elements, the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, or any thing elſe in Heaven, in Earth, in Sea, or Fountains, or Rivers; but we ought only to worſhip the true God, and Maker of all Things in the Holineſs of our Hearts, and Integrity of our Minds.*

Juſtin Martyr Apol. 2. p. 65. 66.

Theophil. ad Antolych. l. 1. p. 77.

L. 2. p. 110.

To the ſame purpoſe ſpake *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Origen*, *Athenagoras*, *Lactantius*, *Arnobius*; who all agree, that Religious Worſhip is proper to the true God, and that no created thing is capable of it, on that very account becauſe it is created; it were eaſy to produce their Teſtimonies, if it were requiſite in ſo evident a Matter as this is. If it be ſaid, *That all theſe Teſtimonies are only againſt that Idolatry which was then practiſed by the Heathens.* I anſwer, 1. Their Reaſons equally extend to the giving Divine Worſhip to any *Created Being* whatſoever, ſo that either they argued weakly and unſkilfully, or elſe it is as unlawful to give *Divine Worſhip* now to *Saints*, as it was then to any *Creature*. 2. I would willingly underſtand, why it ſhould be more lawful to worſhip God for his admirable Wiſdom, Power, and Goodneſs in the Works of Creation, than in ſuppoſed *Saints*? *i. e.* why I may not as well honour God by giving Worſhip to the *Sun*, as to *Ignatius Loyola*, or St. *Francis*, or any other late *Cannonized Saint*? I am ſure the *Sun* is a certain Monument of God's Goodneſs, Wiſdom, and Power, and I cannot be miſtaken therein, but I can never be certain of the *Holineſs* of thoſe Perſons I am to give divine Worſhip to. For all that I can know, *Ignatius Loyola* was a great Hypocrite; but I am ſure that the *Sun* is none; but that he ſhines, and communicates perpetual Influences to the huge Advantage of the World. However I know the beſt of Men have their Corruptions, and to what degree it is impoſſible for others to underſtand; but I am certain the Spots in the Sun are no Moral Impurities, nor diſpleaſing to God. And *Philip Nerius* could not have been miſtaken in the ſhining of the *Sun*, although he might be in the ſhining of *Ignatius*'s Face; which yet is thought ſo conſiderable a thing, that it is read in the Leſſons appointed for *Ignatius* in the *Roman Breviary*.

Breviar. Rom. 31. Jul. Antw. 1663.

3. On what account ſhould the *Chriſtians* refuſe giving all external Signs of Religious Worſhip to the *Heathen Emperors*, if they thought it lawful to be given to any ſort of Men? Why might not they worſhip the *Statues* of *Kings* and *Princes*, as well as others do thoſe of *Rebels* and *Traytors*? I mean, why might not the *Image* of *King Henry the ſecond* have the ſame Reverence ſhewn to it, that the *Shrine* of *Thomas Becket* had? Unleſs it be more meritorious to diſobey a *Prince*, than to give him reverence. Might not the Primitive *Chriſtians* have much eaſier defended themſelves in giving thoſe outward Signs of Worſhip to the *Images* of *Emperors*, than others can do in the Worſhip they give to *Saints*? For they might have pleaded that external Signs are to be interpreted by the Intention of the Perſon who uſes them; that they intended no more by them, but the higheſt Degree of civil Honour on the account of the Authority they poſſeſſed? Or if this would not ſerve, might not they have ſaid, that *Kings* and *Princes* were *Gods Vicegerents*, and repreſented him to the World, and that in giving divine Worſhip to them, they gave it to God; and that their abſolute, ultimate, and terminative Worſhip was upon God; and only a relative, inferior, and tranſient Worſhip was given to them; and all this might be better juſtified by St. *Baſil*'s Rule, *That the Honour of the Image paſſes to the Prototype*; for he there pleads for the Worſhip of *Chriſt*, *becauſe he is one with the Father, being his Image*; *as the Image of a*

S. Baſil. ad Amphiloch. p 332

King is called the King, and hath the ſame Honour given to it; for the Honour of the Image paſſeth to the thing repreſented. And as *Chriſt* hath the Advantage above all, by being *God's natural Image*; ſo *Princes* above *Saints*, in that they repreſent God to the World, which the other do not. But notwithſtanding all theſe Pleas, the Primitive *Chriſtians* were ſo punctual in obſerving that Command of worſhipping God alone, that they rather choſe to looſe their Lives and ſuffer Martyrdom, than be in the leaſt guilty of giving any divine Worſhip to a Creature.

Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 9.

Baron. Martyrol. Apr. 23 & Julii 25.

4. They abſolutely deny, that any religious Worſhip is to be given to the moſt excellent created Beings; and therefore did not only condemn the Idolatry then in uſe, but that which hath obtained in the *Roman Church*: Suppoſing all the Perſons worſhipped therein to have been real *Saints*. For that, we are to conſider that all the *Heathens* were not ſuch great Fools, as ſome Men make them, to excuſe themſelves: If the wiſer Men were contented to let the People worſhip the *Poetical Gods*, having their minds poſſeſſed with thoſe *Idea*'s of them, which they had taken up by their Education; yet they underſtood them only as *Allegories*, (as ſome make the Image of St. *Chriſtopher*, and St. *George* in the *Church* of *Rome* to be no other) and they had Temples erected to the greateſt Virtues, to *Piety*, *Faith*, *Concord*, *Juſtice*, *Chaſtity*, *Clemency*, *&c.* and others to the greateſt Benefactors to Mankind; which was the only ground they pleaded, for giving worſhip to them: But ſtill they acknowledge one *Supreme God*, not *Jupiter* of *Creet*, but the *Father of Gods and Men*; only they ſaid, *this Supreme God* being of ſo high a Nature, and there being other intermediate Beings between Him and Men, whoſe Office they conceived it was to carry the Prayers of Men to God, and to bring down help from him to them; they thought it very fitting, to addreſs their ſolemn Supplications to them. Here now was the very ſame caſe in diſpute, (altering only the Names of things) which is between us, and the *Church* of *Rome*; and if ever they ſpeak home to our caſe, they muſt upon this point. And ſo they do, but very little to their comfort.

All divine Worſhip given to a Creature condemned by the Fathers.

§. 10. Theſe things I ſhall largely prove, if farther occaſion be given; at preſent I ſhall only inſiſt on two things. 1. That they did condemn all ſuch kind of Worſhip, ſuppoſing their Principle true. 2. That they did not only condemn it, in thoſe Spirits which the *Heathens* worſhipped, but in good *Angels* themſelves. 1. They did condemn the Worſhip, ſuppoſing their Principle true. For this I ſhall produce now but few Authorities, but ſuch as are full as to the *Heathens* pretences, and the *Chriſtians* Anſwers. The firſt is of *Origen* in his Anſwer to *Celſus*, who objects againſt the *Chriſtians*, the *unreaſonableneſs of forſaking the worſhip of inferior Deities, becauſe no Man can ſerve two Maſters*; *which*, ſaith he, *is a ſeditious Principle, and ariſes from attributing our Paſſions to God; but he that honours them as Subjects to the ſupreme God, cannot offend him who is the Lord of them.* To which *Origen* anſwers, *That the Scripture doth indeed ſtile God, the God of Gods; and Lord of Lords, but withal ſaith, that to us, there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him; which the Apoſtle ſpeaks*, ſaith he, *of himſelf and all others whoſe minds were raiſed up to him who is the*

Origen. c. Celſ. l. 8. p. 381.

the God of Gods, and Lord of Lords; and his mind aſcends to the Supreme God, who worſhips him inſeparably and indiviſibly by his Son, who alone conducts us to the Father. Therefore ſeeing there are many Gods and many Lords, we endeavour by all means, not only to carry our minds above thoſe things on Earth, which are worſhipped by the Heathen for Gods, but above thoſe whom the Scripture calls Gods, by which it is plain by the drift of his Diſcourſe, he means the *Angels.* And *Celſus* afterwards yielding, *That it is not* P. 384.
lawful to give honour to any, but to whom the Supreme doth communicate it: *Origen* deſires proof from them, *That God hath communicated this honour to their Gods, Heroes and Demons; and that it did not ariſe from the Ignorance and Folly of Mankind, who thereby fell off from him who ought properly to be worſhipped.* But he proves, *from Miracles, and Prophecies, and Precepts, that this honour was given to Chriſt, that they who honour the Father, ſhould honour the Son alſo:* And that was all which *Celſus* had to object againſt the *Chriſtians, That they did not keep to their own rule, of worſhipping God alone; for they thought God was not diſhonoured, by the honour they gave to Chriſt; and on the ſame account he thought, they might give it to inferior Deities.* If there had been then any ſuſpicion of Religious Worſhip given to *Saints* or *Angels* by the *Chriſtians*, when had there been a more proper ſeaſon to object it? No Man, of the meaneſt capacity, would have omitted a matter ſo neceſſary to his buſineſs; much leſs ſo inquiſitive and malicious an Enemy, as *Celſus* was. And the account *Origen* gives of the worſhip the Chriſtians Attribute to the Son of God is, *becauſe it is ſaid, I and my Father are one; and the Father in me, and I in him;* which cannot be ſaid of any created Beings. It is true, afterwards he ſaith, *That if* Celſus *had ſpoken of the true Miniſters of* God, *ſuch as* Gabriel, Michael, *and all the Angels and Arch-angels, he acknowledges, that by explaining the notion of worſhip or reſpect, and the actions of thoſe who give it, ſomewhat more might be ſaid on that ſubject.* But he utterly denies, *that our Prayers are to be offered to any, but Chriſt alone; and that any word which is proper only to religious worſhip,* L.5.p.233.
is to be attributed to the Angels themſelves. For he ſaith elſewhere, *Although the Angels be called Gods in Scripture, yet we are not to worſhip them with divine worſhip:* And leſt any ſhould think, that offering up our Prayers or Invocations to them were not excluded by this; he immediatly explains himſelf; *For,* ſaith he, *all our Supplications, Prayers, Interceſſions and Thankſgivings are to be offered only to* God *over all; by that High Prieſt who is greater than all the Angels, the living Word, and* God. And afterwards ſaith, ἀλλὰ μὴν μὴ δεῖν ἔυχεσθαι τοῖς ἐυχομένοις, *we ought not to pray to them, who* p. 238.
pray for us; for they would rather themſelves ſend us to that God to whom they pray, than have us pray to them, or divide our Supplications between God and them. This he ſpeaks indeed of the *Sun,* and *Moon,* and *Stars,* but upon the ſuppoſition that they are *intellectual Beings,* and *do pray to* God *for us.* And again he ſaith, *we* L.8.p.395. p. 401.
ought to pray only to the God *over all, and his only Son the firſt born of every creature, who as our High Prieſt, offers our Prayers to his God and our* God. And becauſe *Celſus* argues much for worſhip to be given to *Demons,* becauſe *to them is committed the care of terreſtrial Affairs:* To this *Origen* anſwers, *by denying thoſe whom he calls Demons,* P. 416.

King is called the King, and hath the ſame Honour given to it; for the Honour of the Image paſſeth to the thing repreſented. And as *Chriſt* hath the Advantage above all, by being *God's natural Image*; ſo *Princes* above *Saints*, in that they repreſent God to the World, which the other do not. But notwithſtanding all theſe Pleas, the Primitive *Chriſtians* were ſo punctual in obſerving that Command of worſhipping God alone, that they rather choſe to looſe their Lives and ſuffer Martyrdom, than be in the leaſt guilty of giving any divine Worſhip to a Creature.

Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 9.

Baron. Martyrol. Apr. 23 & Julii 25.

4. They abſolutely deny, that any religious Worſhip is to be given to the moſt excellent created Beings; and therefore did not only condemn the Idolatry then in uſe, but that which hath obtained in the *Roman Church*: Suppoſing all the Perſons worſhipped therein to have been real *Saints*. For that, we are to conſider that all the *Heathens* were not ſuch great Fools, as ſome Men make them, to excuſe themſelves: If the wiſer Men were contented to let the People worſhip the *Poetical Gods*, having their minds poſſeſſed with thoſe *Idea*'s of them, which they had taken up by their Education; yet they underſtood them only as *Allegories*, (as ſome make the Image of St. *Chriſtopher*, and St. *George* in the *Church* of *Rome* to be no other) and they had Temples erected to the greateſt Virtues, to *Piety*, *Faith*, *Concord*, *Juſtice*, *Chaſtity*, *Clemency*, *&c.* and others to the greateſt Benefactors to Mankind; which was the only ground they pleaded, for giving worſhip to them: But ſtill they acknowledge one *Supreme God*, not *Jupiter* of *Creet*, but the *Father of Gods and Men*; only they ſaid, *this Supreme God* being of ſo high a Nature, and there being other intermediate Beings between Him and Men, whoſe Office they conceived it was to carry the Prayers of Men to God, and to bring down help from him to them; they thought it very fitting, to addreſs their ſolemn Supplications to them. Here now was the very ſame caſe in diſpute, (altering only the Names of things) which is between us, and the *Church* of *Rome*; and if ever they ſpeak home to our caſe, they muſt upon this point. And ſo they do, but very little to their comfort.

All divine Worſhip given to a Creature condemned by the Fathers.

Origen. c. Celſ. l. 8. p. 381.

§. 10. Theſe things I ſhall largely prove, if farther occaſion be given; at preſent I ſhall only inſiſt on two things. 1. That they did condemn all ſuch kind of Worſhip, ſuppoſing their Principle true. 2. That they did not only condemn it, in thoſe Spirits which the *Heathens* worſhipped, but in good *Angels* themſelves. 1. They did condemn the Worſhip, ſuppoſing their Principle true. For this I ſhall produce now but few Authorities, but ſuch as are full as to the *Heathens* pretences, and the *Chriſtians* Anſwers. The firſt is of *Origen* in his Anſwer to *Celſus*, who objects againſt the *Chriſtians*, the *unreaſonableneſs of forſaking the worſhip of inferior Deities, becauſe no Man can ſerve two Maſters*; *which*, ſaith he, *is a ſeditious Principle, and ariſes from attributing our Paſſions to God; but he that honours them as Subjects to the ſupreme God, cannot offend him who is the Lord of them.* To which *Origen* anſwers, *That the Scripture doth indeed ſtile God, the God of Gods; and Lord of Lords, but withal ſaith, that to us, there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him; which the Apoſtle ſpeaks*, ſaith he, *of himſelf and all others whoſe minds were raiſed up to him who is the*

the God of Gods, and Lord of Lords; and his mind aſcends up to the Supreme God, who worſhips him inſeparably and indiviſibly by his Son, who alone conducts us to the Father. Therefore ſeeing there are many Gods and many Lords, we endeavour by all means, not only to carry our minds above thoſe things on Earth, which are worſhipped by the Heathen for Gods, but above thoſe whom the Scripture calls Gods, by which it is plain by the drift of his Diſcourſe, he means the *Angels.* And *Celſus* afterwards yielding, *That it is not* P. 384. *lawful to give honour to any, but to whom the Supreme doth communicate it:* Origen deſires proof from them, *That God hath communicated this honour to their Gods, Heroes and Demons; and that it did not ariſe from the Ignorance and Folly of Mankind, who thereby fell off from him who ought properly to be worſhipped.* But he proves, *from Miracles, and Prophecies, and Precepts, that this honour was given to Chriſt, that they who honour the Father, ſhould honour the Son alſo:* And that was all which *Celſus* had to object againſt the *Chriſtians, That they did not keep to their own rule, of worſhipping* God *alone; for they thought God was not diſhonoured, by the honour they gave to Chriſt; and on the ſame account he thought, they might give it to inferior Deities.* If there had been then any ſuſpicion of Religious Worſhip given to *Saints* or *Angels* by the *Chriſtians,* when had there been a more proper ſeaſon to object it? No Man, of the meaneſt capacity, would have omitted a matter ſo neceſſary to his buſineſs; much leſs ſo inquiſitive and malicious an Enemy, as *Celſus* was. And the account *Origen* gives of the worſhip the Chriſtians Attribute to the Son of God is, *becauſe it is ſaid, I and my Father are one; and the Father in me, and I in him;* which cannot be ſaid of any created Beings. It is true, afterwards he ſaith, *That if* Celſus *had ſpoken of the true Miniſters of* God, *ſuch as* Gabriel, Michael, *and all the Angels and Arch-angels, he acknowledges, that by explaining the notion of worſhip or reſpect, and the actions of thoſe who give it, ſomewhat more might be ſaid on that ſubject.* But he utterly denies, *that our Prayers are to be offered to any, but Chriſt alone; and that any word which is proper only to religious worſhip,* L.5.p.233. *is to be attributed to the Angels themſelves.* For he ſaith elſewhere, *Although the Angels be called* Gods *in Scripture, yet we are not to worſhip them with divine worſhip:* And leſt any ſhould think, that offering up our Prayers or Invocations to them were not excluded by this; he immediatly explains himſelf; *For,* ſaith he, *all our Supplications, Prayers, Interceſſions and Thankſgivings are to be offered only to* God *over all; by that High Prieſt who is greater than all the Angels, the living Word, and* God. And afterwards ſaith, κελεύομεν μὴ δεῖν ἔυχεσθαι τοῖς ἐυχομένοις, *we ought not to pray to them, who* p. 238. *pray for us; for they would rather themſelves ſend us to that God to whom they pray, than have us pray to them, or divide our Supplications between* God *and them.* This he ſpeaks indeed of the *Sun,* and *Moon,* and *Stars,* but upon the ſuppoſition that they are *intellectual Beings,* and *do pray to God for us.* And again he ſaith, *we* L.8.p.395. p. 401. *ought to pray only to the* God *over all, and his only Son the firſt born of every creature, who as our High Prieſt, offers our Prayers to his God and our* God. And becauſe *Celſus* argues much for worſhip to be given to *Demons,* becauſe *to them is committed the care of terreſtrial Affairs:* To this *Origen* anſwers, *by denying thoſe whom he calls Demons,* P. 416.

mons, to have any adminiſtration of the Affairs of Chriſtians; *but ſuppoſing we knew they were not* Demons, *but Angels, which had the management of theſe things committed to them, yet then we dare not give them that honour which is due to* God, *for neither would* God *have it ſo, nor they themſelves*; but ἐυφημοῦμεν αὐτοῦς ϗ μακαρίζομεν, *we celebrate their praiſe and happineſs, to whom* God *hath entruſted ſuch great things.* But *Celſus* yet further urges, *that, according to the Doctrine of the Ægyptians, every part of a Man hath a particular Demon, or Etherial* God; *and every one of theſe being invocated, heals the Diſeaſes of the parts proper to themſelves. Why then may they not juſtly invocate them, if they love health better than ſickneſs, and happineſs than miſery?* If one of the Church of *Rome* had been to anſwer *Celſus*, he muſt have told him, that the thing was rational which he ſaid, only they were out in their Names; for inſtead of *Chnumen, Chnaachumen, Cnat, Sicat, Biu, Eru, &c.* they ſhould have choſen *Raphael* for travelling, and againſt Diſeaſes, *Apollonia* againſt the Tooth-ach, *Sebaſtian* and *Roch* againſt the Plague, St. *Nicholas* againſt Tempeſts, *Michael* and St. *George* againſt Enemies; and others
Serrar.Litan.2.q.32 in like caſes, for ſo *Serrarius* tells us, *That experience and tradition hath diſcover'd the particular help of theſe in ſuch caſes; if they be particularly invocated.* But *Origen* gives a ſhorter anſwer, *that theſe things do ariſe from a diſtruſt of the ſufficiency of that incommunicable worſhip we give to* God *alone, as though he were not able to protect every one that ſerves him from all ſnares: And that far more effectual cures have been wrought by the Name of Jeſus than all their Demons. And how much better do thoſe who are* Chriſtians, *who ſlight all theſe things and commit themſelves to* God *over all, through his Son Jeſus* Chriſt; *and of him do deſire the help and protection of his Holy*
P. 420. *Angels?* I ſhall conclude his Teſtimony with that excellent ſaying of his. *Our care ought to be to pleaſe one* God *over all, and to make him propitious to us, by piety and all virtue, but if he would have others under* God *to be pleaſed with us too, we ought to conſider, that as the ſhadow follows the body, ſo* God *being pleaſed, all his Friends whether Angels, Souls or Spirits will be ſo too, and not only ſo, but are ready to help them and pray to* God *for them.* But not the leaſt foundation in his Diſcourſe for our Invocation of them.

Ambroſ. in 1.Rom. To. 5. p. 174. The Author of the Commentaries under the *Name* of St. *Ambroſe*, of the ſame Age with him (as appears by ſeveral Paſſages in him) ſaith, *That the Idolaters made uſe of this miſerable excuſe for themſelves, that by thoſe inferior Deities they worſhipped, they went to* God *himſelf, as we go to the King by his* Courtiers. *But,* ſaith he, *is any Man ſo mad, or regardleſs of himſelf, to give the honour due to the King to any of his Courtiers; which if a Man does, he is condemned for Treaſon? And yet they think themſelves not guilty, who give the honour due to* God's *Name, to a creature; and forſaking* God *adore his Fellow Servants, as though any thing greater than that were preſerved for* God *himſelf. But therefore we go to a King by his Officers and Servants, becauſe the King is but a Man, who knows not of himſelf whom to imploy in his publick Affairs,* (without being recommended by others:) *But with* God *is otherwiſe, for nothing is hid from him, he knows the deſerts of every one, and therefore we need no one to recommend us to his Favour; a devout mind is enough.* Was this now all the quarrel the Chriſtians had with the *Heathens*, that they worſhipped *Jupiter* and *Venus* and *Vulcan*? Do they not expreſly deny the giving Gods Worſhip to any Creature? And do they not as plainly affirm that Men do it when they invocate their *Fellow Servants* to be Interceſſors with God for them? And that it is no leſs a Guilt of Idolatry in this Caſe, than it is in giving the *Honour* due to a Prince to any of his Servants?

Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 8. c. 14. 18.

St. *Auſtin* gives this account of the Principles of the *Heathen Worſhip*, *that there were three Sorts of Beings to be conſidered, purely divine, and mortal, and a middle ſort between them, which participated of both; and that the Entercourſe between Gods and Men, was by the Means of thoſe intermediate Beings, who carried the Prayers of Men up to God, and brought down the Bleſſings they prayed for to Men.* Againſt theſe indeed St. *Auſtin* diſputes firſt, by ſhewing that thoſe *Spirits* which they worſhipped, were *evil Spirits*; and that there was no Reaſon to imagine that God had a greater Entercourſe with them, than with penitent Sinners; but withal he adds, (c. 21.) *that this kind of Worſhip both proceeded upon the Suppoſition that the Gods cannot know the Neceſſities and Prayers of Men, but by the Intervention of thoſe Spirits; but if our Minds can be known without their Help, there is no need of their Mediation.* And afterwards ſaith, (l. 9. c. 15.) *that thoſe who are Chriſtians do believe, that we need not many, but one Mediator, and that ſuch a one, by whoſe Participation we are made happy,* i. e. *the Word of God, not made, but by whom all Things were made; and he hath ſhewed, that to the attaining Bleſſedneſs we ought not to ſeek many Mediators, by whom we are to make our Degrees of Approach to God; becauſe God himſelf, by partaking our Nature hath ſhewn us the ſhorteſt Way of our partaking his Divinity. Neither doth he, delivering us from Mortality and Miſery, carry us ſo to immortal and bleſſed Angels, that by participating with them, we ſhould become bleſſed and immortal; but to that Trinity, by whoſe Participation the Angels themſelves are bleſſed.* And concludes that *Book* with this ſaying, (l. 9. c. 23.) *that immortal and bleſſed Spirits, however they are called, which are made and created are no Mediators to bring miſerable Mortals to Bleſſedneſs and Immortality.* And it would be ridiculous here to diſtinguiſh, *Mediators* of *Redemption* and *Interceſſion*; for all that they attributed to their good *Spirits* was only *Interceſſion*; and *Chriſt* being made a *Mediator*, effectual for the end he deſigned, there could be no Neceſſity of any *Interceſſors* beſides him. And St. *Auſtin* there adds, that the Deſign of his following *Book* is to prove; *that thoſe good Spirits which are immortal and bleſſed, which they thought ought to be worſhipped with ſacred Rites and Sacrifices, whatſoever they are, and howſoever called, would not have any one worſhipped by ſuch religious Worſhip,* i. e. *by ſacred Rites* as well as *Sacrifices*) *but only one God, by whom they were created, and by whoſe Participation they are made happy.*

The Worſhip of Angels condemned. Col. 2. 18.

§. 11. By which the ſecond thing I propoſed will appear to be true, *viz.* that they did not only condemn giving this Worſhip to the *Spirits* which the Heathen worſhipped, but to good *Angels* too. For St. *Paul* in the general doth condemn the *Worſhip of Angels*; if he had meant only *evil Angels*, he would have expreſſed it ſo; eſpecially if St. *Auſtin*'s Obſervation be true, *that the evil Spirits are by their Names in Scripture diſtinguiſhed from the good*, if he had meant any particular *Superſtition*, uſed in the Worſhip of *Angels*, he would not have uſed ſuch Terms, which condemn all *Worſhip* of them as *ſuperſtitious*; if he had meant only the *Worſhip* of *Angels*; ſo as to exclude *Chriſt*, he would have intimated that the Fault lay in *excluding Chriſt*, and not in the bare *Worſhip* of *Angels*; but by the Series of his Diſcourſe it appears, that thoſe who ſet up other *Mediators* beſides *Chriſt* do not *hold the Head, i. e.* do not adhere to *Chriſt* alone, as him whom God hath appointed as our *Mediator* only. Whether this were practiſed by *Jews, Philoſophers*, or *Hereticks*, is all one to us; ſince the Practice is condemned, wherever it is found. *Theodoret* ſaith, *they were the Jews who perſwaded Men to worſhip Angels, becauſe the Law was delivered by Angels*; *which Practice* he ſaith, *continued a long time in* Phrygia *and* Piſidia, *and therefore the Synod of* Laodicea *doth forbid praying to Angels*; *and to this day, the Oratories of* St. Michael *are among them*; *they therefore thought it a piece of Humility, ſince God could not be ſeen, nor touched, nor comprehended by us, to obtain the Favour of God, by the Interceſſion of Angels*. No wonder *Baronius* is ſo much diſpleaſed with *Theodoret* for this Interpretation; for he very fairly tells us, *what he condemns* (and St. *Paul* too) *was the Practice of their Church*; *and thoſe Oratories were ſet up by Catholicks, and not by Hereticks*. But whether as to the Lawfulneſs of this Worſhip, *Baronius* or St. *Paul*, whether as the ancient Practice of the *Church, Baronius* or *Theodoret* deſerves more to be believed, I leave any one to Judge. And yet *Theodoret* is not alone in this; for *Irenæus* denies *any Invocations of Angels to be in uſe among Chriſtians*; if he had meant only *evil Angels*, it ſeems very ſtrange he ſhould uſe the name generally given to good, and always indifferent to both. *Origen* expreſly denies *any offering up of Prayers to them to be practiſed by Chriſtians, or reaſonable to be done, and produces this very Place of the Apoſtle againſt it*. The *Council* of *Laodicea*, we ſee by *Theodoret*, is very ſevere againſt *all who worſhip Angels*, and charges them *with Idolatry in ſo doing*; if they had only meant the *Heathen Idolaters*, as *Baronius* contends, yet by that it appears, that the *Heathens* were condemned for worſhipping thoſe whom they believed to be *good Spirits*; but theſe are only *Shifts* to eſcape by, and ſuch which would not have come into the mind of any Man, if he did not firſt fear the Force of that *Canon* againſt the Practice of the *Roman Church*. For why the *Heathen Idolatry* ſhould at that time be called *ſecret* or *hidden*, as it is in that *Canon*, is not eaſy to be thought upon; but very eaſily intelligible according to *Theodoret*'s Interpretation, becauſe of the *clandeſtine Meetings* of thoſe who worſhipped *Angels*, and therein ſeparated themſelves from the *Chriſtian Churches*. St. *Auſtin* diſcourſes purpoſely on this Subject (as is intimated before) whether *God* or the *bleſſed Spirits* are willing *we ſhould perform any ſacred Offices or Sacrifices to them*; *or conſecrate our ſelves, or any thing of ours to them by any religious Rites*; which he denies: *For this*, ſaith he, *is the Worſhip proper to the Deity*, called by him in one Word *Latria*, which he thinks more proper to expreſs divine Worſhip, as diſtinct from the Honour and Service we give to Men (which is plainly his meaning there) than any one Word in *Greek* or *Latin* beſides. And this *Word* he ſaith *is proper to the Deity*, as ſuch; becauſe he elſewhere

Theod. in Coloſſ. 2. 18.

Baron. An. 60. ſ. 20. 21

Iræn. l. 2. c. 57.

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5. p. 233. p. 236.

Concil. Laodic. can. 35.

Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 10. c. 1.

elſewhere tells us, *the Difference between* λατρεία *and* δουλεία, *is this, that* λατρεία *is the Service of God, properly, as God,* δουλεία *is the Service of God, as Lord.*

Aug. q. in Exod. q. 94

The common Evaſions anſwered.

§. 12. I know very well by what Arts all theſe Teſtimonies are endeavoured to be evaded, *viz.* by ſaying, *That theſe are intended againſt the Gentiles Idolatry, who worſhipped thoſe Spirits as Gods, and offered Sacrifices to them; but this cannot hold as to the Doctrine or Practice of the Roman Church, who deny them to be Gods, and aſſerts that the Worſhip by Sacrifice is proper only to God:* But ſuch Devices as theſe are can never ſatisfy an impartial Mind. For (1.) They do expreſly deny, that *Invocation* or *Prayer* is to be made to them; for ſo *Origen* and *Theodoret* ſpeaks expreſly, *that Men are not to pray to Angels,* and any one that reads St. *Auſtin* will find, that he makes ſolemn Invocation to be as proper to God, as Sacrifice is. (2) On what account ſhould it be lawful to *ſacrifice* to *Saints* or *Angels* if it be lawful to *invocate* them? May not one be *relative* and *tranſient* as well as the other? Nay the *Heathen* in St. *Auſtin* argued very well, *that Sacrifices being mere external Things, might more properly belong to the inferior Deities; but the more inviſible the Deity was, the more inviſible the Sacrifices were to be; and the greater and better the Deity, the Sacrifice was to be ſtill proportionable:* And can any Man in his Senſes, think that a meer outward *Sacrifice* is more acceptable to God, than the *Devotion* of *our Heart* is? And wherein can we better expreſs that to God, than in offering up our *Prayers* to him? So that in all Reaſon the Duty of *Prayer* ought to be reſerved as more proper to God than any external Sacrifice; and thoſe who did appropriate Sacrifice to God, did comprehend *Prayer* as the moſt ſpiritual and acceptable Part of it: So St. *Auſtin* ſpeaking of the *Sacrifice* due to God, *makes our Hearts the Altar, and Chriſt our Prieſt, and our Prayers and Praiſes to be offered up to God by a fervent Charity; and any Work, which is therefore done, that thereby we may be united to God in a holy Communion with him, in order to our Happineſs, to be a true Sacrifice;* and let any Man judge, whether this Deſcription, do not ſo naturally agree to *Prayer,* as if it had been only intended for it. Beſides, it is obſervable, that *Sacrifices* of old were ſolemn Rites of *Supplication;* and *calling upon the Name of the Lord* where Altars were erected, is the main thing ſpoken of; thence the *Temple* (though the Place of Sacrifice) is called *the Houſe of Prayer,* and where God ſlights *Sacrifices,* he requires *Prayer* as much more acceptable to him. It ſeems then very ſtrange, that *Sacrifice* alone, as diſtinguiſh'd from *Prayer,* ſhould be that *Latria* that is proper to God. (3) Upon the ſame account that the *Heathen* did give Divine Honour to their *inferior Deities,* thoſe in the *Roman Church* do ſo to *Angels* and *Saints.* For the *Heathens* made a Difference in their *Sacrifices* to the ſupreme God, and their inferior *Deities* and their *Heroes;* ſo that if the putting any Difference in the Way of Religious Worſhip doth excuſe the one, it muſt do the other alſo. Did the *Heathen* uſe ſolemn Ceremonies of making any capable of *divine Worſhip?* So does the *Roman Church.* Did they ſet up their *Images* in publick Places of *Worſhip,* and there kneel before them, and invocate thoſe repreſented by them? So does the *Roman Church.* Did they conſecrate Temples, and erect *Altars* to them, and keep Feſtivals, and burn Incenſe before them? So does the

Aug de Civit. Dei. l. 10. c. 19.

l. 10. c. 4.

c. 6.

Gen. 21. 32. 26. 25.

Iſa. 56. 7. Pſal. 50. 6, 15.

the

Bellar. de Sanct. beat l. 1. c. 7.

Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 9. c. 23.

the *Roman Church.* Laſtly, did they offer up *Sacrifices* in thoſe Temples, to the *Honour* of their leſſer *Deities* and *Heroes?* So does the *Roman Church.* For *Bellarmin*, reckoning up the Honours belonging to *Canonized Saints*, beſides thoſe before mentioned, reckons up this as one, *that the Sacrifices of the Euchariſt, and of Lauds and Prayers are publickly offered to God for their Honour.* I would fain underſtand, what the ſacrificing to *one* for the *Honour* of *another* means? To offer ſacrifice *to one for another*, is an intelligible thing; but to ſacrifice *to one for the Honour of another* is a thing beyond my Reach, if that *Sacrifice* does not belong to him for whoſe *Honour* it is offered; and if the Sacrifice do belong to him, I wonder at the Scrupuloſity of thoſe who dare not ſay the *Sacrifice* to him as well. For what is *ſacrificing* to God, but ſacrificing *to his Honour*, or doing ſuch an Act of Religion with a Deſign to honour God by it but when Men offer a Sacrifice, but not to honour God by it, but the *Bleſſed Virgin*, or any *Saints* or *Angels*, how can that *Sacrifice* belong to any other, but thoſe whoſe *Honour* is deſign'd by it? It being then the Opinion and the Practice of the *Roman Church*, that Sacrifices are to be offered for the *Honour* of *Saints* or *Angels*, it is evident they have reſerved no Part of *Divine Worſhip* peculiar to God himſelf, any more than the *Heathen* did. (4) It makes no material Difference, that the *Heathen* called thoſe they worſhipped Gods, but they do not ſo in the *Roman Church.* For St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *there was ſcarce any Difference between the Heathen and them about the Name, whether Angels might be called Gods or no: For he thinks that they are called ſo in Scripture, as well as* Origen: But the Queſtion was about the thing, whether they were to be worſhipped as Gods or no, *i. e.* by giving any Part of *Religious Worſhip* to them? Which they utterly deny. And were I in the Communion of the *Roman Church*, I ſhould much leſs ſcruple to call *Canonized Saints* or *Angels*, by the Names of *Gods*, than to give them the *Worſhip* of *Invocation* or the *Honour* of *Sacrifices*: And they who do ſo, are not only condemned by plain *Scripture*, and *Reaſon*, but by thoſe of the *Primitive Church* who writ againſt the *Heathen Idolatry*: Which was the thing to be ſhewed.

§. 13. 2. Another diſparity is inſiſted on by him, which is, as to the *manner of worſhip. And as to this*, he ſaith, *all that they underſtand by formal Invocation, is deſiring or praying thoſe Juſt Perſons, who are in glory in Heaven to pray for us; and if the Catholicks be guilty of Idolatry in this, we muſt not deſire the Prayers of a juſt Man even in this life, becauſe this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferior Deity.* To ſhew the palpable weakneſs of this anſwer, I ſhall prove theſe two things. 1. That thoſe in the *Church* of *Rome* do allow and practiſe another kind of *formal Invocation*, from what he aſſerts. 2. That ſuppoſing this were all, it would not excuſe them; and that it is of a very different nature, from *deſiring the Prayers of juſt Men for us in this life.*

Of the practice of Invocation in the Church of Rome.

1. That they do allow and practiſe another kind of *formal Invocation* from what he aſſerts. He might very well ſay, he did not underſtand well what I meant by *formal Invocation*, when he makes this to be the meaning of it; for never any Perſon before him imagined that ſenſe of it; And that term of *formal Invocation* was purpoſely choſen by me, to diſtinguiſh it from the *Rhetorical Apoſtrophe's*

of ſome of the *Greek Fathers*, the *Poetical Flouriſhes* of *Damaſcus*, *Prudentius*, and *Paulinus*, from *general wiſhes* that the *Saints* would pray for us. Of which are ſome inſtances, in good Authors; from *Aſſemblies at the Monuments of Martyrs*, which were uſual in ancient times; and that which I thought any Man would underſtand by it was that which is conſtantly practiſed in the *Roman Church*, *viz.* in places and times purpoſely appointed for *Divine* and *Religious Worſhip*, withal the ſame external ſigns of *Devotions* which we uſe to God himſelf, to offer up our *Prayers to Saints* or *Angels*, to help us in our neceſſities, as well as to pray to God for us. The former part none can be ignorant of, that have but ſo much as heard of the Devotion of the *Church* of *Rome*; all the difficulty lies in that, whether *they pray to them to help their neceſſities*, as well as *to pray for them?* And ſo many *forms* of Prayer, allowed and practiſed in their *Church*, have been ſo often objected to them, wherein theſe things are manifeſt, that I cannot but wonder this ſhould be denied. Do they believe, we never look into their *Breviaries*, *Roſaries*, *Hours*, and other Books of Devotion, wherein, to this day ſuch Prayers are to be found? Do they think we never heard of the *Offices* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, or our *Ladies Pſalter* (a Blaſphemous Book, never yet cenſured) wherein the *Pſalms*; in their higheſt ſtrains of *Prayer* to God, are applied to the *Virgin Mary?* I have known my ſelf intelligent Perſons of their *Church*, who commit their Souls to the *Virgin Maries* Protection every day, as we do to *Almighty Gods*: And ſuch, who thought they underſtood the Doctrine and Practice of their *Church*, as well as others. But *Madam*, theſe are myſteries not to be known till they have their *Proſelytes* ſafe and faſt enough; then, by degrees, they let them know, what is to be done, when they have given away all liberty of judging for themſelves. Then, it is no matter what they are commanded or expected to do, they muſt do as others do, or elſe their ſincerity is queſtioned, and they are thought H*ereticks* in their hearts, whatever they profeſs. I ſhall not inſiſt upon any ancient *Breviaries*, or obſolete *Forms*, or private *Devotions*, which yet they are accountable for, till they do condemn them. I need no more than the preſent *Roman Breviary* reſtored according to the *Council* of *Trent*, and authorized by Three ſeveral *Popes*. In the *Feaſt* of *Aſſumption* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, as though it were not enough in the *Antiphona* to ſay, *Hail Bleſſed Virgin, thou alone haſt deſtroyed all* H*ereſies in the World*; but leſt this ſhould be interpreted of doing it by her Son, a *formal Invocation* of her follows, *Vouchſafe to let me praiſe thee* O Holy *Virgin, and give me ſtrength againſt thy Enemies.* And in the *Hymn* frequently uſed in her *Office*, and particularly that Day, ſhe is not only called the *Gate of Heaven*, but *She is intreated to looſe the bonds of the guilty, to give light to the Blind, and to drive away our evils, and to ſhew her ſelf to be a Mother*; or as it is in the *Maſs-book* Printed at *Paris* 1634. *Jure Matris impera redemptori, by the Authority of a Mother, command the Redeemer.* This is not to pray to Her, to pray to God for us; but to pray Her to order and command Him what he ſhall do for us: And is not this a notable reſpect to *Jeſus Chriſt*, now he is in Glory, and hath all Power in Heaven and in Earth committed to him; to ſubject him to the commands of a Woman, though honoured to be his Mother. In a word, *They pray to her therein for purity of life,*

Brev. Rom. Antw. 1663. p. 984.

life, and a ſafe conduct to Heaven. But leſt the Hymns ſhould be thought only *Poetical*, in the *Feaſt of St. Maria ad Nives*, *Aug.* 5. a formal Prayer is made to Her, *to help the miſerable, to ſtrengthen the weak, to comfort thoſe that mourn, and that all who celebrate her holy Feſtivity may feel her aſſiſtance.* By which we may underſtand the meaning of that ſolemn *Hymn* uſed in her Office, wherein ſhe is called the *Mother of Mercy and Clemency, and is prayed to protect us from our Enemies, and to receive us in the hour of death.* Is all this only praying to her to pray for us? What could be more ſaid to *Almighty God*, or his Son *Jeſus Chriſt?* Either there can be no ſuch thing as direct and immediate Prayers to any one, or theſe are ſuch. Nor is this Devotion only to the *Bleſſed Virgin*, but we ſhall ſee it alike in that to *Angels* and *Saints*; in the *Antiphona* upon the Apparition of *Michael* the *Archangel* May 8. *he is prayed to come to the help of the People of God.* And in the *Feaſt* of the *Guardian Angels*, recommended to all *Catholicks* by *Paul* the Fifth, in the laſt *words* of the *Breviary*, *they are prayed to defend them in War, that they may not periſh in God's terrible judgment.* In the *Hymn* to the *Holy Apoſtles* they are prayed *to command the guilty to be looſed from their guilt, to heal unſound minds, and to encreaſe their virtues, that when Chriſt ſhall come, they may be partakers of eternal Glory.* Theſe may ſuffice for a preſent taſte of the ſincerity of ſuch Perſons who ſay, that in the *Church* of *Rome* they do nothing but *pray to the Saints to pray for them.* And it is a very pitiful ſhift that *Bellarmin* is put to, whereby to excuſe ſuch Prayers as theſe, *That indeed as to the words themſelves they do imply more than praying to them to pray for us; but the ſenſe of the words*, he ſaith, *is no more.* But whence I pray, muſt the People take the ſenſe of ſuch Prayers as theſe are, if not from the ſignification of the words? If this were all, why in all this time that theſe Prayers have been complained of, hath not their ſenſe been better expreſſed? Have not their *Breviaries* been often reviewed, if this had not been their meaning, why have they not been expunged all this while? Suppoſe then that any Perſons in the *Roman Church* (as every one ought to do) take their ſenſe from the words, and do not force it upon them, and they pray according to the form preſcribed; do they well or ill in it? If they do ill in it, their Church is guilty of intolerable negligence, in not preventing it, if they do well, then their *Church* allows of more than praying to *Angels* and *Saints* to pray for them. *Bellarmin*'s inſtances of the *Apoſtles* in *Scripture* being ſaid *to ſave Men*, do ſhew what ſhifts a bad Cauſe will put a Man to: For will any Man in his wits ſay, the caſe is the ſame in ordinary *Speech* and in *Prayer?* Is it all one, for a Man to ſay, that his ſtaff helped him in his going, and to fall down upon his knees to pray to his ſtaff to help him? God did uſe the *Apoſtles* as *Inſtruments* on Earth, to promote the Salvation of Mankind; but may we therefore *pray* to them now in Heaven, to ſave us? May we not truly ſay, that the *Sun* enlightens the World, but may we therefore pray to the *Sun* to enlighten us? No, the *Sun* is but *God's Inſtrument*, and our addreſſes muſt be in Prayer to the Supreme *Lord* over all. But to take his own Explication of praying to them for theſe things: i. e. *praying to them that they would pray to God for them, as we deſire one another to pray:* Would not that Man be condemned of groſs *Idolatry*, or prodigious Folly, who inſtead

P. 911.

Offic. parv. B. Mariæ, p. 127.

Brev. p. 224.

Commun. Apoſtol. p. 2. 9.

Bell. de Sanct. Beatit. l. 1. *c.* 17.

ſtead of deſiring his *Friends* to *pray* to *God* for the pardon of his Sins, and the aſſiſtance of *Divine Grace*, ſhould fall down on his Knees before them and ſay to them, *I pray you pardon my Sins, and aſſiſt me with the Grace of God?* What would St. *Paul* have ſaid to ſuch Men that ſhould have asked ſuch things of him, who yet ſaith, *that he was an Inſtrument of ſaving ſome?*

The difference between praying to Saints in Heaven, and deſiring Men on Earth to pray for us.

§. 14. 2. Suppoſing this were all that were done and allowed in the *Roman Church*, yet this would not excuſe them: For their Practice is very different in their *Invocation* of *Saints*, from *deſiring our Brethren on Earth to pray for us.* And I cannot but wonder, how any Men of common ſenſe can ſuffer themſelves to be impoſed upon ſo eaſily in this Matter. For is there really no difference between St. *Paul*'s deſiring his Brethren *to pray for him* as he often did; and a Man's falling down upon his Knees with all the ſolemnity of Devotion he uſes to God himſelf, to St. *Paul*, to deſire him to pray for him, when he was preſent upon Earth, and did certainly know what he deſired of him? Suppoſe in the midſt of the ſolemn Devotions of the *Church*, where St. *Peter* or St. *Paul* had been preſent, the *Litanies* of the *Church* had been then as they are now; and after they had prayed to the Perſons of the *Holy Trinity*, the People ſhould with the ſame poſtures and expreſſions of Devotion, have immediately turned themſelves to the *Apoſtles*, and cryed only, *Peter and Paul pray for us*; do you think, this would have been acceptable to them? No doubt St. *Peter* would have been leſs pleaſed with this, than with *Cornelius*, only *falling down before him*; and *yet then he bid him ſtand up, I my ſelf alſo am a Man.* They who impute this only to his *modeſty*, will not allow him to carry this *vertue* to Heaven with him; for they ſuppoſe him to be very well pleaſed with that honour in Heaven, which he refuſed on Earth. And St. *Paul* would have rent his Garments and cryed out, as he did to the Men of *Lyſtra*, *Why do ye theſe things; we alſo are Men of like paſſions with you?* They would not receive any honour, that might in the leaſt ſeem to incroach upon the *Divine Honour*; and yet they might, upon better grounds, have done it to them on Earth, than now in Heaven; becauſe they were then ſure they heard them, which now they can never be. And would it not be a ſenſleſs thing, to deſire ſome excellent Perſon in the *Indies*, when we are at our ſolemn Devotion to pray for us, becauſe it is poſſible, God may at the ſame time reveal our Minds to him? I would willingly be informed, if we had aſſurance of the *Sanctity* of a Perſon in this life, as great as they have in the *Church* of *Rome*, of thoſe they invocate; whether there would be any evil at all in publick places of Worſhip, and at the time uſed for the Service of God, to ſet ſuch a Perſon up in ſome higher place of the Church, to burn Incenſe before him, to proſtrate themſelves with Hands and Eyes lifted up to him; if at laſt they pretended, that all that time they only *prayed to him to pray for them?* And certainly a good Man is much more the *Image of God*, and deſerves more Reverence than all the artificial *Images* of *Saints*, or of *God* himſelf. If they will condemn this, they may conceive, that ſuppoſing *they only prayed to Saints in their Devotions to pray for them*, this would not excuſe them: For they do it in thoſe Places, at ſuch Times, and in ſuch a Manner as highly incroaches upon the Worſhip and Service due to God alone.

Acts 10. 25, 26.

Acts 14. 14, 15.

§. 15.

St. Auſtin no Friend to Invocation of Saints.

§. 15. 2. I now come to conſider, whether the Anſwer given by St. *Auſtin* will vindicate them; and whether Invocation of Saints, as it is now practiſed in the *Church* of Rome, were allowed, or in *uſe* then? Here he tells us, *That* Fauſtus *the Manichean calumniates the Catholicks (the word is* St. *Auſtins* he ſaith, and we do not quarrel with the word, but that they are not ſuch *Catholicks* as St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of) *becauſe they honoured the Memories or Shrines of Martyrs, charged them to have turned the Idols into Martyrs, whom they worſhipped ſaid he with like Vows.* To ſhew how very far what St. *Auſtin* ſaith, is from juſtifying the preſent Practiſes of the *Roman* Church, we need no more than barely to repreſent what St. *Auſtin* affirms, and what he denies. He affirms, that it was the cuſtom of the *Chriſtians* in his time to have their Religious Aſſemblies at the *Sepulchres* or *Memories* of the *Martyrs*; where the Place it ſelf would raiſe their Affections, and quicken their Love towards the *Martyrs* and towards *God:* but he utterly denies, that any *Religious Worſhip* was performed to the *Martyrs*; for neither was any Sacrifice offered up to any of them, nor any other part of *Religious Worſhip:* For thereupon he ſhews (which is very conveniently left out in the citation) *that not only Sacrifice was refuſed by Saints and Angels, but any other Religious Honour, which is due to God himſelf, as the Angel forbad* St. John *to fall down and worſhip him. All the Worſhip* therefore, he ſaith, that they give to Saints is, *That of Love and Society, and of the ſame kind which we give to holy Men in this Life, who are ready to ſuffer for the truth of the Goſpel.* But that the Worſhip of *Invocation* is expreſly excluded by St. *Auſtin*, appears by what himſelf ſaith on a like occaſion; where he ſhews the difference between the *Gentiles* Worſhip and theirs: *They* (ſaith he) *build Temples, erect Altars, appoint Prieſts, and offer Sacrifices: but we erect no Temples to Martyrs, as to Gods; but Memories as to dead Men, whoſe Spirits live with God; we raiſe no Altars on which to ſacrifice to Martyrs, but to one God, the God of Martyrs, as well as ours; at which, as* Men *of God who have overcome the World by confeſſing him, they are named in their place and order, but are not invocated by the Prieſt who ſacrifices.* And elſewhere ſaith, *Whatever the Chriſtians do at the memories of the* Martyrs, *is for Ornaments to thoſe memories, not as any ſacred* Rites *or Sacrifices belonging to the dead as Gods: we therefore do not worſhip our* Martyrs *with Divine Honours, nor with the faults of* Men, *as the Gentiles did their Gods.* Which gave occaſion to *Lud. Vives* in his Notes on that Chapter to ſay, *that many Chriſtians in his time* (what ſort of Catholicks thoſe were it is eaſy to gueſs, but to be ſure, none of St. *Auſtins*) *did no otherwiſe worſhip Saints, than they did God himſelf; neither could he ſee in many things any difference between the opinion they had of Saints, and what the Gentiles had of their Gods.* I cannot underſtand then, how St. *Auſtins* Anſwer ſhould juſtify that which he condemns: He denies that there was an *Invocation* of *Saints*, but only a *Commemoration* of them; the *Church* of *Rome* pleads for an *Invocation* of them, and condemns all thoſe who deny it. So that his Anſwer is very far from clearing the *Roman Church*, in the practice of *Invocation*, and the Objection we make againſt it, that it doth parallel the *Heathen Idolatry*; for it grants, it would do ſo, if they gave to the

Aug. de civit. Dei, *l.* 20. *c.* 10.

l. 8. *c.* 27.

Saints the Worſhip due to *God*, of which he makes *Invocation* to be a part.

But after all this, can we imagine, that he ſhould practice himſelf, contrary to his own Doctrine? *Yes*, (ſaith he) *he made a Prayer to St.* Cyprian, *let bleſſed* Cyprian *therefore help us in our Prayers.* But is there no Difference to be made, between ſuch an *Apoſtrophe* to a Perſon in ones Writing, and ſolemn Supplication to him with all the Solemnity of Devotion, in the Duties of Religious Worſhip? If I ſhould now ſay, let St. *Auſtin* now help me in his Prayers, while I am defending his conſtant Opinion that *Invocation* is proper to God alone; would they take this for renouncing the *Proteſtant* Doctrine, and embracing that of the *Church* of *Rome*? I doubt they would not think that I eſcaped the *Anathema* of the *Council* of *Trent* for all this. The Queſtion between us, is not how far ſuch Wiſhes, rather than Prayers, were thought allowable, being uttered occaſionally, as St. *Auſtin* doth this to St. *Cyprian*; but whether ſolemn *Invocation* of *Saints*, in the Duties of Religious Worſhip, as it is now practiſed in the *Roman Church*, were ever practiſed in St. *Auſtin*'s Time? And this we utterly deny. We do not ſay, that they did not then believe, that the Saints in Heaven did pray for them; and that ſome of them did expreſs their Wiſhes, that they would pray particularly for them: We do not ſay, that ſome Superſtitions did not creep in, after the Anniverſary Meetings at the *Sepulchres* of the *Martyrs* grew in Requeſt; for St. *Auſtin* himſelf ſaith, *that what they taught was one thing, and what they did bear with was another* ſpeaking of the Cuſtoms uſed at thoſe Solemnities: But here we ſtand, and fix our Foot againſt all Oppoſition whatſoever, that there was no ſuch Doctrine or Practice allowed in the *Church* at that time, as is owned and approved at this day in the *Church* of *Rome*. But from St. *Auſtin* we are ſent to *Calvin*, whoſe Authority (though never owned as infallible by us) we need not fear in this Point: And I cannot but wonder, if he ſaw the Words in *Calvin* or *Bellarmin*, that he would produce them. For *Calvin* doth there ſay, *That the Council of* Carthage *did forbid praying to Saints, leaſt the publick Prayers ſhould be corrupted by ſuch kind of Addreſſes, Holy* Peter *pray for us*; If St. *Auſtin* were preſent in this *Council*, as my Adverſary ſaith *he was*, I wonder what Advantage it will be to him from *Calvin*'s ſaying, that the *Council* did condemn and forbid thoſe Prayers; which were in uſe by ſome of the People. But it ſeems, he takes the Peoples Part againſt the *Council*, and St. *Auſtin* too; and thinks it enough for them, to follow the Practices condemned by *Councils* and *Fathers*; which we are ſure they do, and are glad to find ſo ingenuous a Confeſſion of it. He may as well the next time bring St. *Auſtin*'s Teſtimony for worſhipping *Martyrs* and *Images*, becauſe he ſaith, *he knew many who adored Sepulchres and Pictures*: And for the Worſhip of *Angels*, becauſe he ſaith, *he had heard of many, who had tryed to go to God by praying to Angels, and were thought worthy to fall into Deluſions.*

Aug. de bapt. c. Don. l. 7. c. 1.

c. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 21.

Calv. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 20. n. 22. Bell. de Beatit. ſanct. l. 1. c. 16.

De Morib. Eccl. Cath. c. 34. Confeſſ. l. 10. c. 42.

§. 16. But the ſtrangeſt Effort of all the reſt, is what he hath reſerved to the laſt Place, *viz. That the Charge of Idolatry againſt them muſt be vain and groundleſs, becauſe if I be preſſed cloſe, I ſhall deny any one of theſe Negative Points to be divine Truths*; viz. *That Honour is not to be given to the Images of Chriſt, and his Saints; that*

Of Negative Points of Faith.

St. Auſtin no Friend to Invocation of Saints.

§. 15. 2. I now come to conſider, whether the Anſwer given by St. *Auſtin* will vindicate them; and whether Invocation of Saints, as it is now practiſed in the *Church* of Rome, were allowed, or in *uſe* then? Here he tells us, *That* Fauſtus *the Manichean calumniates the Catholicks* (*the word is* St. *Auſtins* he ſaith, and we do not quarrel with the word, but that they are not ſuch *Catholicks* as St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of) *becauſe they honoured the Memories or Shrines of Martyrs, charged them to have turned the Idols into Martyrs, whom they worſhipped ſaid he with like Vows.* To ſhew how very far what St. *Auſtin* ſaith, is from juſtifying the preſent Practiſes of the *Roman Church*, we need no more than barely to repreſent what St. *Auſtin* affirms, and what he denies. He affirms, that it was the cnſtom of the *Chriſtians* in his time to have their Religious Aſſemblies at the *Sepulchres* or *Memories* of the *Martyrs*; where the Place it ſelf would raiſe their Affections, and quicken their Love towards the *Martyrs* and towards *God:* but he utterly denies, that any *Religious Worſhip* was performed to the *Martyrs*; for neither was any Sacrifice offered up to any of them, nor any other part of *Religious Worſhip:* For thereupon he ſhews (which is very conveniently left out in the citation) *that not only Sacrifice was refuſed by Saints and Angels, but any other Religious Honour, which is due to God himſelf, as the Angel forbad St.* John *to fall down and worſhip him. All the Worſhip* therefore, he ſaith, that they give to Saints is, *That of Love and Society, and of the ſame kind which we give to holy Men in this Life, who are ready to ſuffer for the truth of the Goſpel.* But that the Worſhip of *Invocation* is expreſly excluded by St. *Auſtin*, appears by what himſelf ſaith on a like occaſion; where he ſhews the difference between the *Gentiles* Worſhip and theirs: *They* (ſaith he) *build Temples, erect Altars, appoint Prieſts, and offer Sacrifices: but we erect no Temples to Martyrs, as to Gods; but Memories as to dead Men, whoſe Spirits live with God; we raiſe no Altars on which to ſacrifice to Martyrs, but to one God, the God of Martyrs, as well as ours; at which, as* Men *of God who have overcome the World by confeſſing him, they are named in their place and order, but are not invocated by the Prieſt who ſacrifices.* And elſewhere ſaith, *Whatever the Chriſtians do at the memories of the* Martyrs, *is for Ornaments to thoſe memories, not as any ſacred* Rites *or Sacrifices belonging to the dead as Gods: we therefore do not worſhip our* Martyrs *with* Divine *Honours, nor with the faults of* Men, *as the Gentiles did their Gods.* Which gave occaſion to *Lud. Vives* in his Notes on that *Chapter* to ſay, *that many Chriſtians in his time* (what ſort of *Catholicks* thoſe were it is eaſy to gueſs, but to be ſure, none of St. *Auſtins*) *did no otherwiſe worſhip Saints, than they did God himſelf; neither could he ſee in many things any difference between the opinion they had of Saints, and what the Gentiles had of their Gods.* I cannot underſtand then, how St. *Auſtins* Anſwer ſhould juſtify that which he condemns: He denies that there was an *Invocation* of *Saints*, but only a *Commemoration* of them; the *Church* of *Rome* pleads for an *Invocation* of them, and condemns all thoſe who deny it. So that his Anſwer is very far from clearing the *Roman Church*, in the practice of *Invocation*, and the Objection we make againſt it, that it doth parallel the *Heathen Idolatry*; for it grants, it would do ſo, if they gave to the

Aug. de civit. Dei, *l.* 20. *c.* 10.

l. 8. *c.* 27.

Saints the Worſhip due to *God*, of which he makes *Invocation* to be a part.

But after all this, can we imagine, that he ſhould practice himſelf, contrary to his own Doctrine? *Yes*, (ſaith he) *he made a Prayer to St.* Cyprian, *let bleſſed* Cyprian *therefore help us in our Prayers*. But is there no Difference to be made, between ſuch an *Apoſtrophe* to a Perſon in ones Writing, and ſolemn Supplication to him with all the Solemnity of Devotion, in the Duties of Religious Worſhip? If I ſhould now ſay, let St. *Auſtin* now help me in his Prayers, while I am defending his conſtant Opinion that *Invocation* is proper to God alone; would they take this for renouncing the *Proteſtant* Doctrine, and embracing that of the *Church* of *Rome*? I doubt they would not think that I eſcaped the *Anathema* of the *Council* of *Trent* for all this. The Queſtion between us, is not how far ſuch Wiſhes, rather than Prayers, were thought allowable, being uttered occaſionally, as St. *Auſtin* doth this to St. *Cyprian*; but whether ſolemn *Invocation* of *Saints*, in the Duties of Religious Worſhip, as it is now practiſed in the *Roman Church*, were ever practiſed in St. *Auſtin*'s Time? And this we utterly deny. We do not ſay, that they did not then believe, that the Saints in Heaven did pray for them; and that ſome of them did expreſs their Wiſhes, that they would pray particularly for them: We do not ſay, that ſome Superſtitions did not creep in, after the Anniverſary Meetings at the *Sepulchres* of the *Martyrs* grew in Requeſt; for St. *Auſtin* himſelf ſaith, *that what they taught was one thing, and what they did bear with was another* ſpeaking of the Cuſtoms uſed at thoſe Solemnities: But here we ſtand, and fix our Foot againſt all Oppoſition whatſoever, that there was no ſuch Doctrine or Practice allowed in the *Church* at that time, as is owned and approved at this day in the *Church* of *Rome*. But from St. *Auſtin* we are ſent to *Calvin*, whoſe Authority (though never owned as infallible by us) we need not fear in this Point: And I cannot but wonder, if he ſaw the Words in *Calvin* or *Bellarmin*, that he would produce them. For *Calvin* doth there ſay, *That the Council of* Carthage *did forbid praying to Saints, leaſt the publick Prayers ſhould be corrupted by ſuch kind of Addreſſes, Holy* Peter *pray for us*; If St. *Auſtin* were preſent in this *Council*, as my Adverſary ſaith *he was*, I wonder what Advantage it will be to him from *Calvin*'s ſaying, that the *Council* did condemn and forbid thoſe Prayers; which were in uſe by ſome of the People. But it ſeems, he takes the Peoples Part againſt the *Council*, and St. *Auſtin* too; and thinks it enough for them, to follow the Practices condemned by *Councils* and *Fathers*; which we are ſure they do, and are glad to find ſo ingenuous a Confeſſion of it. He may as well the next time bring St. *Auſtin*'s Teſtimony for worſhipping *Martyrs* and *Images*, becauſe he ſaith, *he knew many who adored Sepulchres and Pictures:* And for the Worſhip of *Angels*, becauſe he ſaith, *he had heard of many, who had tryed to go to God by praying to Angels, and were thought worthy to fall into Deluſions*.

Aug. de bapt. c. Don. l. 7. c. 1.

c. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 2.

Calv. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 20. n. 22. Bell. de Beatit. ſanct. l. 1. c. 16.

De Morib. Eccl. Cath. c. 34. Confeſſ. l. 10. c. 42.

Of Negative Points of Faith.

§. 16. But the ſtrangeſt Effort of all the reſt, is what he hath reſerved to the laſt Place, *viz. That the Charge of Idolatry againſt them muſt be vain and groundleſs, becauſe if I be preſſed cloſe, I ſhall deny any one of theſe Negative Points to be divine Truths*; viz. *That Honour is not to be given to the Images of Chriſt, and his Saints*;

that what appears to be Bread in the Euchariſt, is not the Body of Chriſt; that it is not lawful to invocate the Saints to pray for us. But the Anſwer to this is ſo eaſy, that it will not require much time to diſpatch it. For I do aſſert it to be an Article of my Faith, *That God alone is to be worſhipped with divine and religious Worſhip*; and he that cannot hence infer, that no created Being is to be worſhipped, hath the Name of *reaſonable Creature* given him to no purpoſe. What need we make *Negative Articles of Faith*, where the *Affirmative* do neceſſarily imply them? If I believe that the *Scripture* is my only Rule of Faith as I moſt firmly do; will any Man that conſiders what he ſaith, require me to make *Negative Articles of Faith*, that the *Pope* is not, *Tradition* is not, *Councils* are not, a private *Spirit* is not? For all theſe things are neceſſarily implied therein: And ſo for all particular Doctrines, rejected by us upon this Principle, we do not make them *Negative Points of Faith*; but we therefore refuſe the Belief of them, becauſe not contained in our only Rule of Faith: On this account we reject the *Popes Supremacy*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Infallibility of the preſent Church in delivering Points of Faith*, *Purgatory*, and other Fopperies impoſed upon the Belief of *Chriſtians*. So that the ſhort Reſolution of our *Faith* is this, that we ought to believe nothing as an Article of Faith, but what God hath revealed; and that the compleat Revelation of God's Will to us, is contained in the *Bible*; and the Reſolution of our Worſhip, is into this Principle, that God alone is to be worſhipped with divine and religious Worſhip; and therefore whether they be *Saints* or *Angels*, *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, whether the *Elements* of a Sacrament, or of the World, whether Croſſes and Reliques, or Woods and Fountains, or any ſort of Images; in a word, no Creature whatſoever is to be worſhipped with religious Worſhip, becauſe that is proper to God alone. And if this Principle will excuſe them from *Idolatry*, I deſire him to make the beſt of it. And if he gives no more ſatisfactory Anſwer hereafter, than he hath already done, the greateſt Charity I can uſe to thoſe of that *Church*, is to wiſh them Repentance, which I moſt heartily do.

A. B.

53: 1.D.
64. 2.G

CHAP. III.

Of the Hindrances of a good Life, and of Devotion in the Roman *Church.*

The Doctrines of the Roman *Church prejudicial to Piety. The Sacrament of Penance, as taught among them, deſtroys the Neceſſity of a good Life. The Doctrine of Purgatory takes away the Care of it; as appears by the true ſtating it, and comparing that Doctrine with Proteſtants. How eaſy it is, according to them, for a rich Man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Purgatory dreadful to none, but poor and friendleſs. Sincerity of Devotion hindred by Prayers in an unknown Tongue. The great Abſurdity of it manifeſted. The Effects of our Anceſtor's Devotion had been as great, if they had ſaid their Prayers in Engliſh. The Language of Pray-*

er proved to be no indifferent thing from St. Paul's *Arguments. No univerſal Conſent for Prayers in an unknown Tongue, by the Confeſſion of their own Writers. Of their Doctrine of the Efficacy of Sacraments; that it takes away all Neceſſity of Devotion, in the Minds of the Receivers. This complained of by* Caſſander *and* Arnaud; *but proved againſt them, to be the Doctrine of the* Roman *Church, by the Canons of the Council of* Trent. *The great Eaſineſs of getting Grace by their Sacraments. Of their diſcouraging the reading the Scriptures. A ſtanding Rule of Devotion neceſſary. None ſo fit to give it, as God himſelf: This done by him in the Scriptures. All Perſons therefore concern'd to read them. The Arguments againſt reading the Scriptures, would have held againſt the publiſhing them in a Language known to the People. The Dangers as great then, as ever have been ſince. The greateſt Prudence of the* Roman *Church is wholly to forbid the Scriptures, being acknowledged by their wiſeſt Men, to be ſo contrary to their Intereſt. The Confeſſion of the Cardinals at* Bononia, *to that purpoſe. The avowed Practice of the* Roman *Church herein, directly contrary to that of the Primitive: Although the Reaſons were as great then, from the Danger of Hereſies. This confeſſed by their own Writers.*

Of the Sacrament of Penance deſtroying the Neceſſity of a good Life.

§. 1. 2. THE ſecond Reaſon I gave why Perſons run ſo great a Hazard of their Salvation in the Communion of the *Roman Church* was, becauſe that *Church* is guilty of ſo great Corruption of the *Chriſtian Religion*, by Opinions and Practices which are very apt to hinder a good Life, which is neceſſary to Salvation. But,

1. This *Neceſſity* I ſaid, was taken off by their making the *Sacrament of Penance* joyned with Contrition, ſufficient for Salvation. Here he ſaith, *That Proteſtants do make Contrition alone, which is leſs, ſufficient for Salvation, and our Church allowing Confeſſion and Abſolution (which make the Sacrament of Penance) in caſe of Trouble of Conſcience, they being added to Contrition, cannot make it of a malignant Nature.* To this I anſwer: That Contrition alone is not by us made ſufficient for Salvation. For we believe, that as no Man can be ſaved without true Repentance, ſo that true Repentance doth not lie meerly in Contrition for Sins. For *godly Sorrow* in Scripture is ſaid, *to work Repentance to Salvation, not to be repented of*; and it cannot be the Cauſe and Effect both together. *Repentance* in Scripture implies a *forſaking of Sin*, as it were very eaſy to prove (if it be thought neceſſary) and without this we know not what ground any Man hath to hope for the Pardon of it, although he confeſs it, and be abſolved a Thouſand Times over; and have Remorſe in his Mind for it, when he doth confeſs it. And therefore I had Cauſe to ſay, that they of the Church of *Rome* deſtroy the Neceſſity of a good Life, when they declare a Man to be in a State of Salvation, if he hath a bare *Contrition* for his Sins, and confeſs them to the Prieſt, and be abſolved by him. For to what end ſhould a Man put himſelf to the Trouble of mortifying his Paſſions and forſaking his Sins? If he commits them again, he knows a preſent Remedy, *toties quoties*; it is but confeſſing with Sorrow, and upon Abſolution he is as whole, as if he had not ſinned. And is it poſſible to imagine a Do-

2 Cor. 7. 10.

ctrine that more effectually overthrows the *Neceſſity* of a *good Life*, than this doth? I cannot but think, if this Doctrine were true, all the Precepts of *Holineſs* in the *Chriſtian Religion* were inſignificant Things: But this is a Doctrine fitted to make all that are *bad*, and willing to continue ſo, to be their *Proſelytes*; when ſo cheap and eaſy a Way of Salvation is believed by them: Eſpecially if we enquire into the Explication of this Doctrine among the *Doctors* of that *Church*. I cannot better expreſs this, than in the Words of Biſhop *Taylor* (whom he deſervedly calls *an eminent leading Man among the Proteſtants*) who after having mentioned their Doctrines about Contrition, "The ſequel of all (he ſaith) is this, that if a Man live a wicked Life for Sixty or Eighty Years together, yet if in the Article of his Death, ſooner than which God (ſay they) hath commanded him to repent, by being a little ſorrowful for his Sins, then reſolving for the preſent that he will do ſo no more, and though this Sorrow hath in it no Love of God, but only a Fear of Hell, and a Hope that God will pardon him; this, if the Prieſt abſolves them, doth inſtantly paſs him into a State of Salvation. The Prieſt with Two Fingers and a Thumb can do his Work for him; only he muſt be greatly prepared and diſpoſed to receive it: Greatly we ſay according to the Senſe of the *Roman Church*; for he muſt be attrite, or it were better, he were contrite; one Act of Grief, a little one, and that not for one Sin more than for another, and this at the end of a wicked long Life, at the time of our Death will make all ſure. Upon theſe Terms, it is a Wonder that all wicked Men in the World are not Papiſts, where they may live ſo merrily, and die ſo ſecurely, and are out of all Danger, unleſs peradventure they die very ſuddenly, which becauſe ſo very few do, the Venture is eſteemed nothing, and it is a Thouſand to one on the Sinner's ſide.

Diſſuaſive p. 1. ch. 2. p. 81.

But we dare not flatter Men ſo into eternal Miſery; we cannot but declare to them the Neceſſity of a Sincere Repentance and holy Life, in Order to Salvation: And that we cannot abſolve thoſe, whom God hath declared he will not abſolve. Indeed for the Satisfaction of truly penitent Sinners, our *Church* approves of applying the *Promiſes* of Pardon in *Scripture* to the particular Caſe of thoſe Perſons; which is that we mean by *Abſolution*. But if the Church of Rome pretend they can abſolve, whether God will or no, we muſt leave *God* and *them* to diſpute that Point.

The Doctrine of Purgatory takes away the Care of a good Life.

§. 2. 2. I ſaid the Care of a good Life was taken off among them, by ſuppoſing an Expiation of Sin (by the Prayers of the living) after Death. *No*, ſaith he, *it is rather apt to encreaſe it; becauſe of the temporal Pains the Sinner is to ſuſtain after Death, if there be not a perfect Expiation of Sin in this Life by Works of Penance: And although he be aſcertained by Faith, that he may be holpen by the charitable Suffrages of the faithful living, yet this is no more Encouragement to him to ſin, than it would be to a Spendthrift to run into Debt, and to be caſt into Priſon, becauſe he knows he may be relieved by the Charity of his Friends. If he were ſure there were no Priſon for him, that would be an Encouragement indeed to play the Spend-thrift, and this*, he ſaith, *is the Caſe of the Proteſtants in Denyal of Purgatory*. One would think by this Anſwer, we *Proteſtants* had a very pleaſant *Religion*, and that we held nothing that could afright a Sinner from continuing in his Sins, becauſe we deſtroy *Purgatory :* I pray, *Madam*, aſk him whether he be in earneſt, that this *is the Caſe of the* Proteſtants *in the Denial of* Purgatory ; that the Sinner *is ſure there is no* Priſon *for him.* Do the *Proteſtants* believe that there is no Hell, or that Hell is no Priſon, or that it is leſs terrible than Purgatory ? We had thought there had been ſomething more dreadful in the *Torments of Hell*, than in the Flames of *Purgatory.* But if our plain Doctrine, that every impenitent Sinner muſt expect no leſs than eternal Vengeance in another World, will not prevail upon Men to leave their Sins, and lead a good Life ; can we imagine a groundleſs Fiction of *Purgatory* ſhould ever do it ? Eſpecially, conſidering the true ſtating of the Doctrine of *Purgatory* among them, by which we ſhall eaſily diſcern what Obligation it lays upon Men to *Holineſs* of Life. " There are (ſay they) two ſorts of Sins " which Men are guilty of, ſome of which are in their own Nature *ve-* " *nial*, and ſo do not deſerve eternal Puniſhment, and for theſe a general " and vertual Repentance is ſufficient : But there are other which they " call *mortal Sins*, which have a Debt and Obligation to eternal Pu- " niſhment belonging to them ; but this *eternal* Puniſhment is chan- " ged into *temporal*, by the *Sacrament* of *Penance* ; but ſtill this " *temporal* Puniſhment, muſt be undergone either in *this Life*, " or that to *come* ; if a Man do not ſatisfy in this Life, and " cannot get Help enough out of the *Stock* of the *Church* to do it " for him ; there is no Remedy, to *Purgatory* he muſt go ; and if he " be not helped by his Friends on Earth, God knows how long he " may ſtay there ; but then he is to blame that he took no more " Care of his Soul when he lived ; if not by a holy Life, yet by " leaving no more to thoſe whoſe Office it ſhould be, to procure him " a Deliverance thence. Judge now, *Madam*, if this be not a very frightful Doctrine, eſpecially to thoſe, who are *poor* and *friendleſs*. But in caſe a Man be rich enough, to provide *Maſſes* to be ſaid for his Soul ; and that he hath a good *Stock* of *Indulgences* before-hand, for ſome *Thouſands* of Years, he may make pretty tolerable ſhift in Purgatory, eſpecially in theſe laſt *Ages* of the World ; wherein it is probable, it may not be near ſo long to the Day of Judgment (when the final Sentence is to be pronounced) as he hath got Years of *Indulgences* already. I pray what need a Perſon be afraid of, that lives a very bad Life, according to theſe Principles ? Muſt he ſuffer for his *Original Sin ?* No, that Guilt and Puniſhment and all, is clear done away in *Baptiſm*. Muſt he ſuffer for his *Venial Sins ?* That were ſtrange, if he had never any *general Repentance* for them. Need he be afraid of the dreadful Sentence of the Day of Judgment, *Go ye curſed into everlaſting Flames ?* He is a *Fool* indeed, that by a little preſent *Contrition* and *Confeſſion*, will not obtain *Abſolution* from a *Prieſt* ; and then in a trice the *eternal* Flames are extinguiſhed, and only ſome *temporal* Puniſhment ſucceeds in the *Room* of them. But it would ſeem ſomewhat hard to a voluptous Man however to be put to ſevere *Penances* ; is there no Remedy in this Caſe ? Yea, there is a *Stock* in the *Church* ; and if he will not procure Help for himſelf thence by ſome plenary *Indulgences*, if he will not bear it here, he muſt in another World. What then ? Is he paſt all Hope of Remedy there ? That is according to his *Purſe* and *Friends*. *How eaſy is it for a rich Man to enter into the Kingdom of God ?* But we have no ſuch eaſy Way of eſcaping the Miſeries of another Life : We dare not tell Men they may be relieved there by *Maſſes* and *Sacrifices*, and I know not what: Our Doctrine is plain and agreeable to the moſt obvious and eaſie ſenſe of the *Goſpel*, if Men be good here, they ſhall be happy afterwards; if they be bad, and continue ſo, they ſhall be certainly miſerable, and unavoidably ſo. But for thoſe who are neither good nor bad, (if any ſuch can be) neither Sincere nor Hypocrites, neither Penitent nor Impenitent, we leave them to take care of them: Our Saviour hath only declared, that thoſe who are Good, Sincere, and Penitent, ſhall be happy; thoſe who are otherwiſe, muſt be miſerable: If they have found out ſome ways for them to eſcape notwithſtanding, at their peril be it, who relie upon them. But for others, we underſtand no more how Puniſhment in another life ſhould remain after the guilt of Sin is pardoned, than how a Shadow ſhould continue, when the Body is gone: For Puniſhment follows guilt, as the Shadow the Body. And if pardon of Sin ſignifies any thing, it is taking away the Puniſhment we were obnoxious to by reaſon of Sin. But how that Man ſhould be ſaid to have his *debt forgiven*, who is caſt into Priſon for it: Only whereas he might have lain and rotted there, his *Creditor* tells him, he ſhall endure the ſame Miſery, but he ſhall eſcape at laſt, is a thing no Man would believe, who ſuffered in ſuch a caſe. He might indeed ſay, that he did not exerciſe the utmoſt rigour of *Juſtice*, but would hardly be brought to magnify the infinite clemency and kindneſs of his *Creditor*. But we that deſire to underſtand the way of Salvation as it is delivered by our *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and to be ſaved in that way, cannot for our hearts underſtand any more by his Doctrine, but that Men ſhall be ſaved, if they believe and obey his Doctrine, and ſhall be condemned, if they do it not. We find nothing of *half ſaving* and *half damning* Men, ſuch as the *ſtate* of *Purgatory* is believed to be in the *Church* of *Rome*. For the pains of Perſons therein, are ſaid to be as great as of the damned in Hell; and yet all this while *God* is their *Friend*, and they are ſure to be ſaved. They had need in ſuch a caſe to call in the help of their *Friends* on Earth, if *God* be ſo ill a *Friend* in *Heaven*.

And can he not believe, that it is a far greater encouragement to a *Spendthrift* to be told indeed of a dreadful Priſon, but ſuch as if he leaves but Money behind him to employ his Friends in begging his Pardon, he ſhall be ſurely delivered; than to be aſſured if he continues his Folly, there will be no Redemption or hopes of deliverance, when he is once caſt into it. I dare appeal to any one who can but underſtand what we ſpeak of, whether of theſe two, is the more probable way of reclaiming a Man from riotous courſes? But that which is beyond this, is, that the one is moſt certainly true, the other but a meer figment of the brains of Men, who have contrived a way to bring wicked Men to Heaven at laſt, although ſomewhat the farther way about, and it muſt coſt them dear for their *Friends*, to help them through.

Sincerity of Devotion hindered by prayers in an unknown Tongue.

§. 3. 3. After I had ſhewed how much the neceſſity, and care of a good Life, were obſtructed by the Principles of the *Roman Church*; I proceeded to ſhew, how the *Sincerity of Devotion* was hindred among them, by ſeveral particulars.

1. *By Prayers in a Language which many underſtand not.* To this he anſwers, *If I ſpeak of private Prayers, all Catholicks are taught*

to ſay them in their Mother Tongue : If of the publick Prayers of the Church, he underſtands not why it may not be done with as much Sincerity of Devotion, the People *joyning their Intention and particular* Prayers *with the* Prieſt, *as their Embaſſador to God, as if they underſtood him; he is ſure the effects of a ſincere Devotion for Nine Hundred Years together, which this manner of Worſhip produced in this Nation, were much different from thoſe we have ſeen ſince the reducing the publick Liturgy into Engliſh; for which he inſtances in building and endowing Churches, Colledges, Religious Houſes, and the Converſion of ſeveral Nations by Engliſh* Miſſionaries. *But this,* he ſaith, *is a matter of Diſcipline, and not to be regulated by the fancies of private* Men, *but the judgment of the Church: And withal is confeſſed by ſome* Proteſtants, *that moſt Sects of Chriſtians have the Scriptures, Liturgies, and* Rituals *in a Tongue unknown, but to the Learned, and therefore according to* St. Auſtin, *it is inſolent madneſs to diſpute that which is frequented by the whole Church through the World.* For our more diſtinct proceeding in anſwer to this, three things are to be conſidered: 1. Whether praying in a known or unknown Tongue, do more conduce to Devotion? 2. Whether this whole matter be a thing left in the power of the *Church* to determine? 3. Whether Prayers in an unknown Tongue, be univerſally received in all other parts of the *Chriſtian* World?

Preface to the Polyglott Bible 1655.

1. Whether of theſe conduce more to Devotion, is our main enquiry. And if praying in an *unknown tongue* doth do, I wonder he tells us, *that all Catholicks are taught to ſay them in their Mother-tongue:* Why ſo, I pray? Is it that by underſtanding what they ſpeak, their minds might be more attentive, and their affections more raiſed in the deſires of the things they pray for? And will not the ſame Arguments more hold for publick Prayer, wherein all the Congregation are to joyn together? So that their private Prayers condemn their publick, unleſs *Latin* in the *Church* be of greater force, than uttered in a *Cloſet.* But can it enter into the minds of any Men, who conſider what the end of meeting together to *pray* is, that ſuch an end ſhould as much, or more, be attained, where People know not what they ſay, as where they do? If all the buſineſs of *Chriſtian worſhip* were only to patter over a few words (as if there were no difference between *Prayer* and *Charms*) what he ſaith, were to ſome purpoſe, but that is ſo diſhonourable a thing to *Chriſtian Religion,* that it is hard to ſay, whether they have more corrupted the *Doctrine* or the *Devotion* of the *Chriſtian Church.* If I ſaw a Company of *Indians* met together, with their *Prieſt* among them, uſing many antick geſtures and mimical poſtures, and ſpeaking many words which the People muttered after him, but underſtood not what they ſaid; I might probably ſuſpect they were *conjuring*, but ſhould hardly believe them, if they called that *praying.* I could not but enquire of them, what they meant by *praying?* If they told me, ſaying ſo many hard words, which they underſtood not, I had done with them, but ſhould ſhrewdly ſuſpect the *Knavery* of their *Prieſts.* If they told me, by *praying* they meant *expreſſing their deſires of the things they ſtood in need of, to the God they worſhipped*; I could not but ask of them whether it were not neceſſary for them to *know* what it was they asked, or how could they deſire they knew not what? Or whether the God they worſhipped, underſtood only that *one tongue,*

and ſo they were fain to ſpeak to him, in his own Language? This I confeſs, were a ſufficient reaſon; and in that caſe the People were to be pitied, if they could not learn that Tongue themſelves. But ſuppoſing all Languages equally known to him we make our Addreſſes to, why ſhould not the People uſe that, which they underſtand themſelves? Are their Prayers like counterfeited *Jewels*, that the leſs they underſtand them, the better they like them? It may juſtly give Men ſome ſuſpicion, that there are not fair dealings, where ſo little light is allowed to judge by: And *that Devotion* commended moſt, which *Ignorance* is the Mother of. We think it as unreaſonable, to deſire the People to ſay *Amen* to Prayers they know not the meaning of, as for Men to ſet their Hands to *Petitions* without reading what is contained in them. It is a great chance if they do not miſtake, to their own great prejudice, and do what they repent of afterwards. We declare, that our meeting together to worſhip God, is to joyn together our hearty Prayers; which the more the People underſtand, the better their minds are ſatisfied in what they deſire, and the more fervent will their Supplications be. If it be enough for *ſome to underſtand* them, it may as well be enough for *ſome to pray* them; if their *Prayers* who underſtand them, prevail for thoſe who do not, then it is no matter at all whether they be *preſent* or no; unleſs the efficacy of the others Prayers be confined within the Walls where they meet. And if *their* Prayers be moſt prevalent, who underſtand moſt, then it were ten times better, if all the People underſtood what they prayed for: And it muſt neceſſarily follow, that praying in an unknown Tongue; is a great obſtructer of the Devotion of the People, and that which hinders the efficacy of their Prayers. If it be enough for the People to be preſent, and to pray their own private Prayers there in publick, to what End is there any publick *Liturgy* at all? Why ſhould not all of them be at their private Prayers together? Why ſhould the *Prieſt* with his *Jargon* of hard words interrupt them? For it is no other, to them who know not what he ſaith; and why may they not as well ſay their private Prayers at the *chiming of Bells*, as at the *words* of a *Prieſt?* For they underſtand both alike, and both ſeem to ſound as ſuch wiſe People will have them.

But he tells us, *the effects of this Devotion were admirable in the charitable and pious Works of our Anceſtors, who uſed this way ſo many Ages together.* I pray *Madam*, ask him, whether he really thinks, they would have done none of thoſe things, if they had ſaid their *Prayers in Engliſh?* If they would not, I do much admire the force of the *Latin Tongue:* If they would, then that was not the cauſe, and theſe things do not prove what they were intended for: And ſo *Tenderden Steeple* was not the cauſe of *Goodwin Sands.* We do not go about to diſparage our *Anceſtors*, we bleſs God for the good they did; but do not think that doth oblige us to think them infallible in their Opinions, or without fault in all their Practices: But our true *Anceſtors* in *Religion*, are *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* and the *Primitive Church*; and all theſe are yielded to be of our ſide, by the moſt zealous *Adverſaries* we have: And give us leave to think their examples ought to have more force with us, than any other whatſoever. We pretend not, to be wiſer than they were; nor to know what is more expedient for *Devotion* than they: We are content to be condemned for *Error*, with thoſe who are by all Chriſtians acknowledged to be *Infallible*; and to want *Devotion*, where we follow the Examples of the moſt *holy Perſons* the World ever had. If the Practice of the Primitive *Church* in this point, were not given us for the firſt ſix hundred Years and more, it were an eaſy Matter to evince it by expreſs Teſtimonies: But that is not the thing inſiſted on, but that this is a matter of *Diſcipline*, and the *Church* hath the Power to determine it in one *Age* as well as another.

The language of Prayer, no matter of Diſcipline.

§. 4. Which is the next thing to be conſider'd. Here I ſhall deſire but two Principles to reſolve this by. 1. That the *Churches Power* is only to *Edification* and not to Deſtruction; for this was as much as the *Apoſtles* challenged to themſelves, and I hope none dare challenge more: But this is a Principle of natural Reaſon, that no Power in a Society ought to be extended beyond the benefit of it, or to contradict the end or deſign of it. 2. That the *Apoſtles* were the moſt competent Judges of what made for the *Edification* of the Church; and what they declared to tend to that End, no ſucceeding Perſons ought to condemn as contrary to it. This depends upon that infallible *Spirit* which the *Apoſtles* had, and the mighty Care in them of the *Churches* good; which we cannot think any ſince them can exceed them in. Theſe things being ſuppoſed, we are only to conſider, whether the *Apoſtle* hath not delivered his Senſe in our preſent Subject, *viz.* That Prayers in an unknown Tongue are contrary to the *Edification* of the *Church*? It ſeems ſomewhat hard to us to be put to prove a Matter ſo evident, from St. *Paul*: and we could not imagine, any would go about to reconcile Prayers in an unknown Tongue, to that Diſcourſe of his, but thoſe who think they can reconcile the worſhip of *Images*, to the ſecond Commandment. The Abuſe St. *Paul* corrects, with ſo much ſharpneſs, in the *Church* of *Corinth*, was an impertinent uſe of the gift of *Tongues*; ſuch I mean, as did not tend to the *Edification* of the *Church*: As for inſtance, one Man made a long Harangue in *Hebrew*, and pleaſed himſelf mightily in the ſound of the Words, when not a Perſon there, it may be, underſtood a word that he ſaid; another of a ſudden begins a Hymn, in *Syriack* or *Caldee*; another falls a praying, in *Ethiopick*; but all this while, no Man interprets, what theſe ſeveral Men ſaid: to what purpoſe is all this, ſaith the Apoſtle; only for By-ſtanders, to think they were *Children* or *mad Men*: could they imagine *God* gave them theſe Gifts of Tongues, to make uncouth and inſignificant Sounds with, where the People were met together for the Worſhip of God? If they were ſo much tickled with the Noiſe, they might make that at home, and not in the *Church* of *God*, where *all things ought to be done to Edification*. For they met together as a Company of reaſonable Men to receive ſome Benefit, that might be common to them all; and therefore the Gift of Tongues, in a ſociety of Chriſtians, could be of no uſe without an *Interpreter*. But leaſt all this ſhould ſeem to be ſpoken only of Inſtruction to the People, and not of Prayer to God, and that the Caſe were not alike in both theſe he adds, *If I pray in an unknown Tongue, my ſpirit prayeth, but my underſtanding is unfruitful. i. e.* I may exerciſe my Gift, but it is to no uſe at all in the *Church*. How ſo? " One of the *Roman* " *Church* might have told St. *Paul*, when I ſee him pray, and know " what he is doing, may I not joyn my Intention of praying with " his,

2 Cor. 10. 8.

1 Cor. 14.

1 Cor. 14. 20. 23.

V. 28.

V. 26.

V. 2, 3, 4, 5, &c.

V. 14.

" his, as our Embaſſadour, and pray my own private Prayers at " the ſame time that he doth? I know the Subſtance of what he " deſigns to pray for; and although I do not know his meaning, " God knows mine: and therefore I can ſee no hindrance of Devo- " tion at all in this, that when one begins a Prayer, in an unknown " Tongue, all the People fall upon their Knees and pray too: This is the plain Anſwer they muſt give St. *Paul*, who juſtify Prayers in an unknown Tongue. But we are content with St. *Paul*'s judgment in this caſe, and the Reaſon of it; that the Acts belonging to the Worſhip of God in the *Church* ought to be of ſo common Concernment, that all may have a ſhare in them, and receive the Benefit by them: Or elſe they were far better hold their peace. It is very impertinent to ſay, that the *Apoſtle* ſpeaks only of extraordinary Gifts, and not of the ſetled and ordinary Devotions of the *Church*. For the Caſe is the ſame, where the Language is not underſtood, whether it be ſpoken by a *Miracle* or not: And the *Apoſtle* lays down a general Rule from this particular Caſe, *that all things muſt be done to edifying*, which it appears he judges the uſe of an unknown Language not to be. And if after all this, it be in the *Churches* power to reverſe the *Apoſtles* Decree as to praying in an unknown Language, they may uſe the very ſame Power, as to all other Offices of *Religion*, and may command preaching to be in a Tongue as unknown as praying: that ſo the People may meet together, and pray, and hear Sermons, and underſtand never a word, for their great Edification. Unleſs among us *God* ſhould put it into their Hearts to ſpeak *Engliſh*, whether they would or no, as was once ſaid by an ignorant Perſon on the like occaſion. If all that is intended in the Prayers of the People, be only *an Intention to pray*, whatever the words be, *Abracadabra* might ſerve to pray with, as well as *Ave Maria*, and the old Womans ſaying of it, *Ave Maria gratia plinam dams ticum, beneditta tu in mulabs yeth Benedictus frictus frentris tui, ſweet Jeſus Amen* was as effectual a Prayer, if ſhe meant it ſo, as could be uttered by the moſt skilful Prieſt.

No univerſal conſent for Prayers in an unknown Tongue.

§. 5. 3. *But the univerſal conſent of the Chriſtian Church is pleaded for this Practice, Proteſtants only excepted; and therefore it is inſolent madneſs in them to oppoſe it, as* St. *Auſtin ſaith:* But we had however rather follow St. *Paul*, who ſaith, it were madneſs to practice it. But I aſſure you, *Madam*, we are not to take all things for granted which are told us by them, concerning the Opinions and Practices of the *Eaſtern Churches:* (as I may in time diſcover) *but in this*, he ſaith, *our own* Proteſtant *Authors of the* Bible *of many Languages* Lond. A. D. 1655. *do confeſs that in moſt of the Sects of the Chriſtians, they have not only the Scriptures: but alſo the Liturgies and Rituals in a Tongue unknown but to the Learned:* from which he concludes this to be an univerſal Practice both in the *Primitive Greek* and *Latin Churches*, and in theſe latter Sects of *Eaſtern Chriſtians*. It were a very pleaſant Enquiry, how in the *Primitive Greek* and *Latin Churches* the Service could be in an *unknown Language*, when *Greek* and *Latin* were the *Mother Tongues* of thoſe Churches? Doth he think they did not underſtand their own *Mother Tongues?* How many of their own Writers have confeſſed, that in the *Primitive Churches* all publick Offices of Religion were performed in the proper Language of every Country; which in expreſs words is affirmed by *Origen* againſt *Celſus:* and ſome of the *Church* of *Rome* have been ſo ingenuous to confeſs, it were much better that Cuſtom were reſtored again. So *Caſſander* affirms of *Cajetan*, and that he being reproved for it ſaid, *he learned this Doctrine from* St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 14. And the Title of the twenty eighth Chapter of *Caſſander* his *Liturgicks* is, *That the Antients read the Canonical Prayer, and the Conſecration of the Euchariſt, ſo as the People did underſtand it and ſay* Amen. *Lyra* ſaith, *That all publick Offices of Religion were in the Primitive Church, performed in the Vulgar Tongue.* So that it was not upon the account of any Sanctity in the *Greek* or *Latin*, that they were more uſed, but becauſe they were more generally underſtood. On which account *Pope Innocent* the Third gave ſtrict Command, that where People of different Languages did inhabit, care ſhould be taken to provide Men able to adminiſter Sacraments, and *inſtruct* them in their ſeveral Tongues; which Decree of his is inſerted in the *Canon Law*; and was not intended out of honour to the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues only, but for the advantage of the People. So likewiſe *John* the Eighth yielded to the Prince of *Moravia*, to have their *Liturgy* in the *Sclavonian* Tongue, becauſe St. *Paul* ſaith, *Let every Tongue praiſe the Lord*; which is the Reaſon given by the *Pope* in his Letter extant in *Baronius:* and not meerly on the account of a preſent neceſſity, for want of *Prieſts* who could read *Latin*, as *Bellarmin* conjectures; for he appoints it ſhould be firſt read in the *Sclavonian* Tongue. If this were then a *Catholick Practice*, theſe *Popes* were hugely to blame to give way to the Breach of it. And *Walafridus Strabo* ſaith, in his time *among* the *Scythians, the Divine Offices were performed in the German Tongue*; which was common to them and the *Germans. But our own Proteſtant Writers,* he ſaith, *own this to be in uſe in the moſt Sects of Chriſtians.* I have endeavoured to find this Confeſſion in the Preface cited by him, but I cannot meet with it; and the Learned Biſhop who writ it, underſtood theſe things, better than to write ſo. It is true he ſaith (not in the *Preface*, but *Proleg.* 13. *n.* 19.) *that the Syriack Tongue is the Tongue of the Learned among the Chriſtians throughout the Eaſt; as appears by the Liturgies and divine Offices, which are almoſt every where performed in this Language, although it be the Mother-tongue now, only to a few about Mount* Libanus: But any one who enquires into a *Catholick Practice*, muſt not meerly give an account of the moſt *Eaſtern Chriſtians*, of whom he there ſpeaks. For there are many conſiderable *Churches* beſides theſe, which do to this Day uſe their own Language in their *Liturgies*; as their own Writers atteſt: But I need not go about to prove this, ſince *Bellarmine* confeſſeth, *That the Armenians, Ethiopians, Egyptians, Ruſſians and others do it*; but he ſaith, *he is no more moved by theſe, than by the Practice of* Pro*teſtants:* But we cannot but be moved ſo far by it, as thereby to ſee, that the Practice of the *Church* of *Rome* is no more a *Catholick* Practice, than it is founded either on *Scripture* or *Reaſon*.

Orig. c. Cel. l. 8 *p.* 402.

Caſſandr. Conſult. art. 24.

Lyra *in* 1 Cor. 14.

Baron. Tom. 10. *A.* 880. *n.* 16.

Walafrid. Strabo de reb. Eccleſ. c. 7

Of their Doctrine of the efficacy of Sacraments.

§. 6. I ſaid the Sincerity of *Devotion* was obſtructed, by making the *Efficacy of Sacraments to depend on the bare Adminiſtration, whether our Minds be prepared for them or not. This,* he ſaith, *he had rather look upon as a Miſtake, than a Calumny, having never read* *any Council wherein this Doctrine is defined ; and as to the Sacrament of Penance (which he ſuppoſeth I chiefly mean) the Council of* Trent *hath determined it to be a Calumny for any to ſay, that according to their Doctrine it doth confer Grace, without the good Motion of the Receiver. Madam,* I either expected he ſhould have underſtood the Doctrine of his own Party better, or been more ingenuous in confeſſing it. For my Quarrel had no particular Reſpect to the *Sacrament of Penance*, more than to any other *Sacrament* of theirs ; and if I can make it appear that it is their Doctrine, that the Efficacy of Sacraments doth not depend upon the Preparation of the Receiver, but the bare Adminiſtration or the *external Work done*, I need not add much to ſhew how much this doth obſtruct the *Sincerity of Devotion.* It had been an Opinion long received in the Schools, although with different Ways of Explication, that the *Sacraments* of the new *Law* differed from thoſe of the old in this, that the Efficacy of thoſe of the old Law in conferring Grace, did depend upon what they called *opus operantis*, i. e. *by the Faith* and *Devotion* of the Receiver of them ; but that the *Sacraments* of the *new Law* did confer Grace *ex opere operato*, i. e. *by the thing it ſelf*, without any Dependance therein upon the internal Motion or Preparation of Mind in him that did partake of them. This Doctrine began to be in a particular manner applied to the *Maſs*, becauſe that contained *Chriſt* in a more eſpecial Way, than any other *Sacrament* ; thence it was believed and aſſerted, that it did produce ſaving Effects, as Remiſſion of Sins and true Grace, although we ſhould ſuppoſe it an impoſſible thing, that no Man in the World had any true Grace ; as Baptiſm takes away original Sin, and gives Grace to the Infant baptized, whatever the Sins of Men are. Theſe are the Expreſſions of one of their profound Doctors. And therefore they diſtinguiſhed the Efficacy of the *work done*, not barely from the *Dignity* of the *Prieſt*, and the *Merit* of the *Receiver*, but from the *Devotion* and *Preparation* of Mind, with which the Receiver came. Which *Bellarmin* himſelf cannot deny, only two things he ſaith to take off the *Odium* of it. One is, *That they do not wholly exclude them, but only from the Efficacy of Sacraments* ; *which*, he ſaith, *is effectually proved by the Caſe of Infants, that it doth not depend upon any Quality of the Receiver :* The other, *That though the Maſs, as a Sacrament, may not profit thoſe who are not duly prepared, yet as a Sacrifice it may.* By which theſe things are evident : 1. That the Efficacy of the *Sacraments* in conferring Grace, doth not at all depend upon the Qualification of the Receiver. 2. That although upon other accounts ſome Diſpoſitions are required in adult Perſons, to receive the Benefit of them as *Sacraments* ; yet the Effect of the *Maſs* as a Sacrifice, is not at all hindred by want of them. If it were a thing poſſible, I would willingly underſtand what they mean by *Sacraments* conferring Grace *ex opere operato* (which are not only the expreſs Terms of the *Council* of *Trent*, but an *Anathema* is denounced againſt any one who denies it.) For the manner of it is declared by themſelves to be unintelligible ; and no wonder, for they ſuppoſe *Grace* to be contained in the *Sacraments* (and it is defined with an *Anathema* by the *Council* of *Trent*) and by the *Sacrament* of it ſelf it is conveyed into the Heart of a Man : But whether it be contained as in an *univocal Cauſe*, as in an *Inſtrument*, or as in a *Sign* ; whether it be conferred by the

Gabr. Biel. ſup. Canon. Miſſæ lect. 26. lit. 6.

Bell. de effectu Sacram. l. 2. c. 1.

Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 7. Can. 8. Can. 6.

the *Sacraments* as *Phyſical*, or as *moral Cauſes*; Whether by a *Power inherent* in the *Sacraments* themſelves, or a *Power aſſiſtent* concurring with the *Sacraments*; whether it be conveyed as *Phyſick* in a *Cup*, or as *Heat* to Water by a *red hot Iron*, or as Healing to the Perſons who touched the Hemm of our Saviour's Garment; whether they produce only a next Diſpoſition to Grace, or not the Grace it ſelf, but the Union of Grace with the Soul, or (which is the moſt common Opinion) that Phyſical Action whereby Grace is produced, which doth truly, really, and phyſically depend upon the Sacraments (meaning thereby the external Action of adminiſtring them.) Theſe are looked on as great Riddles among them, and ſo they ought to be: *But theſe things*, ſay they, *need not be determined, nor the manner of the thing be underſtood, no more than thoſe who were miraculouſly healed, did the manner of the Cure*, a very proper Inſtance, if the Matter of Fact were as evident in one, as it is in the other. But if I ſhould ſay, that the wearing of a Cap of a certain Figure would certainly convey Wit and Underſtanding into a Man, and the meer putting it on was enough to produce the Effect; and a Perſon ſhou'd tell me, it was an unintelligible thing, were it enough think you, as *Bellarmine* doth in this Caſe, to run to other Myſteries of Faith and Nature, which are as hard as that? By this Conſequence, no Man ought to be charged with believing abſurd and unreaſonable Things; and the Trinity and Reſurrection ſhall ſerve to juſtify the *Fables* of the *Alcoran*, as well as the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* and the Efficacy of the Sacraments *ex opere operato*. We could eaſily diſpenſe with the barbarous Terms and Ungrammaticalneſs of them, if there were any thing under them, that were capable of being underſtood: But that is not the greateſt Quarrel I have with this Doctrine; for I ſay ſtill, notwithſtanding all the Tricks and Arts which have been uſed to palliate it, it doth obſtruct the Sincerity of Devotion, by making the Exerciſe of it by the Preparation of our Minds for the uſe of Sacraments to be unneceſſary. For if *Grace* be effectually conferred by the Force of the bare external Action, which is acknowledged by them all, what need can there be of a due Preparation of Mind by the Exerciſe of Faith, Prayer, Repentance, *&c.* in order to the receiving the Benefit of them? *Yes*, ſay they, *the internal Diſpoſition of the Mind is neceſſary to remove Impediments, and to make a Subject capable of receiving it: As Dryneſs in Wood to make it burn*: But what do they mean by this *internal Diſpoſition* of Mind? The Exerciſe of the Graces and Duties I mentioned? By no means: But that there be no mortal Sin unconfeſſed; that there be no actual Oppoſition in the *Will* to the *Sacrament*, as for inſtance, if a Man, when he is going to be baptized, reſolves with himſelf, that he will not be baptized, or while he is baptizing, that he will not believe in *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, nor renounce the *Devil* and all his Works. This indeed they ſay hinders the *Efficacy* of *Sacraments*, but not the bare *want of Devotion*; and if want of Devotion doth not hinder *Grace* being received, what Arguments can Men uſe to perſwade Perſons to it? Who will undergo ſo ſtrict an Examination of himſelf, and endeavour to raiſe his Mind to a due Preparation for the Participation of *Sacraments*, if he knows beforehand that he ſhall certainly receive *Grace* by the *Sacraments* without it? And ſurely they will not ſay, but what doth obſtruct the Exerciſe of theſe things, doth very much hinder Devotion. If Men had a mind to baniſh it out of the World, they could never do it under a fairer Pretence, than that *Grace*, and conſequently the Effects of it may be obtained without it: And I do not queſtion, but this Doctrine hath been one of the great Cauſes of the corrupt Lives of thoſe who believe it? From hence the Trade of ſaying *Maſſes* hath proved ſo gainful, and ſuch Multitudes of them hath been procured for the Benefit of particular Perſons; this being a much eaſier Way of procuring *Grace* and *Salvation*, than fervent Prayer, conſtant Endeavours after a holy Life, Mortification, Watchfulneſs, and other things we make neceſſary to enjoy the Benefit of what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered for us?

This proved to be the Doctrine of the Roman Church Caſſand. Conſult. art. 24.

Arnauld. de freq. Commun. præfat. Sect. 2. P. 3. c. 7. p. 554.

And theſe things have been complained of by Perſons of their own Communion, who have had any Zeal for Devotion, and the Practice of true *Goodneſs*. *Caſſander*, although he denies the Doctrine of the Efficacy of the *Sacraments* without the Devotion of the Receiver, to be the received Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, yet cannot deny, *but ſuch a Phariſaical Opinion* (as he calls it) *had poſſeſſed the Minds of many of thoſe, who did celebrate Maſſes, and were preſent at them: And that too juſt an Occaſion was given to thoſe who upbraid them with that Opinion; becauſe of the multitude of Maſſes which were celebrated by impure and wicked Prieſts, meerly for gain; at which thoſe who are preſent, think they depart from them with a great deal of Sanctity, although they never once reſolve to change their Lives, but return from thence immediately to their former Sins.* Monſieur *Arnauld* in his Book of *frequent Communion* (written upon that Occaſion) confeſſeth, that ſome in the *Roman Church*, by their *Doctrine* and Inſtructions given to Perſons, did deſtroy all Preparations, as unneceſſary to the partaking the Benefits of the *Euchariſt*; and that the worſt Perſons might come without Fear to it. And that the moſt required as neceſſary by them, is only the *Sacrament* of *Penance* to recover Grace by, which, he ſaith, they reduce to bare *Confeſſion*; and that this by them is not made neceſſary, neither by the more probable Opinion, but only that at that time they ſhould be free from the Guilt of mortal Sin. It is not to be denied, that Monſieur *Arnauld* had proved ſufficiently the other Opinion to be moſt conſonant to *Scripture* and *Fathers*, and the *Rules* of a *Chriſtian Life*; but when that is granted, the other Opinion is yet more agreeable to the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*. For although *Caſſander* produce ſome particular Teſtimonies againſt it, of Perſons in that *Church*; yet we muſt appeal for the Senſe of their Church, to the Decrees of the *Council* of *Trent*; which are ſo contrived, as not to condemn the groſſeſt Doctrine of the *opus operatum*. For when it doth determine, *That whoſoever ſhall ſay, that the Sacraments do not confer Grace* ex opere operato *ſhall be Anathema*, it cannot be interpreted according to the Senſe of *Caſſander* and thoſe he mentions, that the Efficacy of *Sacraments* doth not depend upon the *Worth of the Prieſt*: For the twelfth Canon relates to that, *Whoſoever ſhall ſay, that the Miniſter being in mortal Sin, although he uſeth all the Eſſentials to a Sacrament, yet doth not celebrate a Sacrament, let him be Anathema.* Thoſe Reverend *Fathers* were not ſure ſo prodigal of their *Anathema*'s, to beſtow two of them upon the ſame thing: Their meaning then in the *eighth*

eighth Canon, muſt be diſtinct from the *twelfth*; and if it be ſo, the *opus operatum* cannot have reſpect to the *Worth of the Prieſt*, but the *Devotion* of the *Receiver*, and it is there oppoſed to the Faith of the Divine Promiſe. This will appear more plain by the account given of it in the *Hiſtory* of that *Council*. "After, they treated of condemning thoſe, who deny *Sacraments* do confer Grace to him that putteth not a Bar, or do not confeſs, that *Grace* is contained in the Sacraments, and conferred, not by Virtue of Faith, but *ex opere operato*; but coming to expound how it is contained, and their Cauſality, every one did agree, that Grace is gained by all thoſe Actions, that excite Devotion, which proceedeth not from the Force of the Work it ſelf, but from the Virtue of Devotion, which is in the worker, and theſe are ſaid in the Schools to cauſe Grace *ex opere operantis*. There are other Actions which cauſe Grace, not by the Devotion of him that worketh, or him that receiveth the Work, but by Virtue of the Work it ſelf; ſuch are the *Chriſtian* Sacraments, by which Grace is received, ſo that there be no Bar of mortal Sin to exclude it, though there be not any Devotion: So by the Work of Baptiſm, Grace is given to the Infant, whoſe Mind is not moved towards it, and to one born a Fool, becauſe there is no Impediment of Sin. The *Sacrament* of *Chriſm* doth the like, and that of *extreme Unction*, though the ſick Man hath loſt his Memory. But he that hath mortal Sin, and doth perſevere actually or habitually, cannot receive Grace by reaſon of that Contrariety; not becauſe the *Sacrament* hath not Virtue to produce it *ex opere operato*, but becauſe the Receiver is not capable, being poſſeſſed with a contrary Quality. I dare now appeal to the moſt indifferent Judge, whether what I objected to them concerning the *Efficacy* of *Sacraments*, whether the Minds of the receivers of them, be prepared or no, were not ſo far from being a *Calumny*, that there is not ſo much as the leaſt *Miſtake* in it: If the Doctrine of the *Council* of *Trent* be embraced by them. And any one, who ſhall conſider their Number of *Sacraments*, and the admirable Effects of every one of them, may very well wonder how any Man among them ſhould either want *Grace* or have any *Devotion*? For *Grace* being conferred by the *Sacraments*, at ſo many convenient Seaſons of his Life, whether he hath any Devotion or no, he is ſure of *Grace*, if he doth but partake of their *Sacraments*, and need not trouble himſelf much about *Devotion*, ſince his Work may be done without it. Never certainly any Doctrine was better contrived for the Satisfaction and Encouragement of *impenitent Sinners*, than theirs is. Our *Saviour* ſeems very churliſh and ſevere, when he calls *Sinners* to *Repentance* that they may be ſaved; but they have found out a much eaſier and ſmoother Paſſage, like that of a Man in a Boat, that they ſleep all the while, and land ſafe at laſt. Not ſo much as the uſe of reaſon is required for the effect of that bleſſed *Sacrament* of extreme *Unction*, by which like a *Ship* for a long Voyage, a Perſon is pitched and calked for Eternity. Surely, 'tis the hardeſt thing that may be, for any one to want *Grace* among them, if they do but ſuffer the *Uſe of Sacraments* upon them; and they are the gentleſt givers of it imaginable, for all they deſire of their *Penitents* for *Grace*, is only for them to lie ſtill; but if they ſhould chance to be unruly, and kick away the *Prieſts*, or their Rites

The Hiſtory of the Council of Trent. l. 2 p. 237.

Rituale Roman. de Sacram. ext. Unct. Lucet. Pariſ. 1665.

of *Chriſms*, I know not then what may become of them. Yet the *Church* of *Rome* hath been ſo indulgent in this Caſe, that *ſuppoſing Men under a* Delirium, *or wholly inſenſible*; *if before*, *it be but probable they deſir'd it*, *or gave any Signs of Contrition*, *it ought not to be omitted*; *always provided*, *that thoſe who are mad*, *do nothing againſt the Reverence of the Sacrament*; and if they do, ſurely no Man in his right Wits can think they ſhall be damned for it: That being ſecured, their Work is done; and if any Sins have remained upon them they are taken off by Virtue of this ſacred *Unction*; and being thus anointed like the *Athletæ* of old they prepared to wreſtle with all the Powers of Air, who can then faſten no hold upon them. Yet to be juſt to them, the *Roman Ritual* ſaith, *that impenitent Perſons*, *and thoſe who die in mortal Sin*, *and excommunicate*, *and unbaptized*, *are to be denied extreme Unction.* A hard caſe for thoſe *who die in mortal Sin!* For if they could but expreſs any *Sign* of *Contrition*, by the Motion of an *Eye* or a *Finger*, all were well enough. And for the *impenitent*, we are not to imagine them ſo cruel to account any ſo, but ſuch who refuſe the *Sacrament* of *Penance.* The Sum of it then is, if a Man when he is like to live, and therefore to ſin no longer, doth but probably expreſs ſome *Signs* of *Contrition*, and doth not refuſe the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, if Time and the Condition of the *Patient* permit the uſing it, then he is to have Grace conferred on him by this laſt *Sacrament*, which he is ſure to receive, although he be no more ſenſible what they are doing about him, than if he were dead already. So that upon the whole Matter, I begin to wonder how any ſort of Men in the *Church* of *Rome* can be afraid of falling ſo low as *Purgatory*: I had thought ſo much *Grace* as is given them by every Sacrament (where there are ſo many, and ſome of them ſo often uſed) might have ſerved to carry one to Heaven; they receive a Stock of *Grace* in *Baptiſm*, before they could think of it; if they loſe any in Childhood, that is ſupplied again by the *Sacrament* of *Chriſm* or *Confirmation*; if they fall into actual Sins, and ſo loſe it, it is but *confeſſing* to the *Prieſt* and receiving *Abſolution*, and they ſet up again with a new Stock: And it is a hard Caſe, if that be not encreaſed by frequent *Maſſes*, at every one of which he receives more; and although *Prieſts* want the comfortable Grace that is to be received by the *Sacrament* of *Matrimony*, yet they may eaſily make it up by the Number of *Maſſes*: And to make all ſure at laſt, the extreme *Unction* very ſweetly conveys *Grace* into them, whether they be ſenſible or not. But all this while, what becomes of *Purgatory*? That is like to be left very deſolate; if the Intereſt of that Opinion were not greater, than the Evidence is for the *Sacraments* conferring Grace *ex opere operato.* Let them ſeek to reconcile them, if they can; it is ſufficient for our purpoſe, that both of them tend to deſtroy the Sincerity of Devotion, and the Neceſſity of a good Life.

Of their diſcouraging the reading the Scriptures.

§. 8. 3. I ſaid the Sincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed by diſcouraging the *reading* of the *Scriptures*, which is our moſt certain Rule of Faith and Life. To this he anſwers two ways: 1. *That their Churches prudential diſpenſing the reading of Scriptures to Perſons whom ſhe judges fit and diſpoſed for it*, *and not to ſuch whom ſhe judges in a Condition to receive or do harm by it*, *is no diſcouraging the reading of them*; *any more than a Father may be ſaid to diſcourage*

courage his Child, becauſe he will not put a Knife or a Sword into his hands, when he foreſees he will do miſchief with it to himſelf or others; *and the Scriptures,* he ſaith, *are no other, in the hands of one who doth not ſubmit his judgment, in the interpretation of it, to that of the Church; the doing of which he makes the character of a meek and humble ſoul, and the contrary of an arrogant and preſumptuous ſpirit.* 2. *That the ill conſequences of permitting the promiſcuous reading of Scripture were complained of by* Henry *the Eighth, who was the firſt that gave way to it; and if his judgment ought not to be followed in after times, let the dire effects of ſo many Sects, and Fanaticiſms as have riſen in* England *from the reading of it, bear witneſs. For all Hereſies ariſe, ſaith* St. Auſtin, *from miſunderſtanding the Scriptures; and therefore the Scripture being left, as among Proteſtants, to the private interpretation of every fanciful Spirit, cannot be a moſt certain rule of Faith and Life.* In which Anſwer are three things to be diſcuſſed: 1. Whether that prudential diſpenſing the *Scriptures*, as he calls it, be any hindrance to Devotion or no? 2. Whether the reading of the *Scriptures* be the cauſe of the numbers of *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms* which have been in *England?* 3. Whether our Opinion concerning the reading and interpreting *Scripture*, doth hinder it from being a moſt certain rule of Faith and Life?

1. Whether that prudential diſpenſing the *Scriptures* uſed in the *Church* of *Rome*, doth hinder *Devotion* or no? By this *prudential diſpenſing* I ſuppoſe he means, the allowing no Perſons to read the *Scriptures* in their own Tongue, without Licence under the Hand of the *Biſhop* or *Inquiſitor*, by the advice of the Prieſt or Confeſſor, concerning the Perſons fitneſs for it; and whoſoever preſumes to do otherwiſe, is to be denyed *Abſolution*. For this is the expreſs Command, in the fourth Rule of the *Index* publiſhed by order of the *Council of Trent*, and ſet forth by the Authority of *Pius* the Fourth, and ſince by *Clement* the Eighth, and now lately inlarged by *Alexander* the Seventh. And whether this tends to the promoting or diſcouraging the Sincerity of Devotion will appear, by conſidering theſe things.

Index libror. prohibit. Alexand. 7. Roma. A.D. 1665.

1. That it is agreed on both ſides, that the *Scriptures* do contain in them the unqueſtionable Will of that God whom we are bound to ſerve. And it being the end of *Devotion* (as it ought to be of our lives) to ſerve him; what is there, the mind of any one who ſincerely deſires to do it, can be more inquiſitive after, or deſirous to be ſatisfied in, than the rules, God himſelf hath given for his own Service? Becauſe it is ſo eaſie a matter for Men to miſtake in the ways they chooſe to ſerve him in; I ſee the World divided ſcarce more about any thing than this. Some think, God ought to be worſhipped by offering up Sacrifices to him of thoſe things we receive from his Bounty: Others, that we ought to offer up none to him now, but our ſelves in a holy Life and Actions. Some, that God is pleaſed by abſtaining from Fleſh or any living Creature, and others, that he is much better pleaſed with eating *Fiſh* than *Fleſh*, and that a full Meal of one is at ſome times Mortification and Faſting; and eating temperately of the other, is Luxury and Irreligion. Some think, no ſight more pleaſing to God, than to ſee Men laſh and whip themſelves for their Sins, till the Blood comes; others

that he is as well pleaſed at leaſt, with hearty Repentance, and ſincere Obedience without this. Some, that frequent croſſing themthemſelves; going in Pilgrimage to the *Images of Saints*, baptizing Bells, being ſprinkled with holy Water, and buried in a *Monks* Habit, are great acts of Devotion; and others, that they are ſuperſtitious Fooleries. Some think, that unleſs they make Confeſſion of their Sins to a *Prieſt*, they cannot be pardoned; others, that ſincere Confeſſion to God, is ſufficient, and the other never neceſſary to the Pardon of Sin, though it may be ſometimes uſeful to the eaſe of the Sinner. Some, that they honour God by ſetting up Images of him, and worſhipping them for his ſake, by addreſſing themſelves to Saints and Angels to be Interceſſors with him; and others, that they cannot diſhonour God more, than by theſe things. Some, that they may pray for what they do not underſtand, as well as what they do, others, that ſince Men expect to be anſwered in their Prayers, they ought to underſtand what they ſay in them. Since theſe and other Diſputes are in the World, not barely between *Chriſtians* and thoſe of other *Religions*, but among *Chriſtians* themſelves, what courſe ſhould a Perſon take, who deſires to be ſatisfied? For he finds the ſeveral Parties divided about them. Can any Man imagine a better way, if it could be hoped for, than that God himſelf ſhould interpoſe, and declare his own mind, according to what way they ought to ſerve him? And this is acknowledged by all *Chriſtians* to be done already, in the *Scriptures*; and after all this, muſt not all Perſons concerned, be allowed to enquire into that which is owned to be the Will of God? Or do they think, that ordinary People, that underſtand not *Latin* or *Greek*, ought not to be concerned what becomes of their Souls? If they be, and do in good earneſt deſire to know how to pleaſe God, and to ſerve him; what Directions will they give them? If they tell them, *they muſt do as they are bidden*; true, ſay they, if we were to worſhip you for Gods, we would do as you bid us, for we think it fitting to ſerve God in his own way. But we would know, whether that God whom we ſerve, hath given us any *Rules* for his Worſhip or no? *Yes*, ſay the Prieſts of the *Roman Church*, *he hath done ſo, but it is not fit for you to ſee them.* To what end, ſay the People then, were they given, if they may not be ſeen? How ſhall we know whether we keep them or no; or will you take upon you the guilt of our Sins in diſobeying his Will, ſince you will not let us know what it is? This ſeems to be a very juſt and reaſonable demand, and I fear it will one day fall heavy upon thoſe, who conceal that, which they confeſs to be the *Will of God*, from the knowledge of the People. And it hath been ingenuouſly acknowledged by ſome in the *Roman Church*, that the People would never be kept to that way of *Devotion* they are in there, if they were ſuffered to read the *Scriptures*; but the more ſhame, the mean time, for thoſe who impoſe ſuch things upon them, under a pretence of Devotion, which are ſo repugnant to the Will of God. But the ſame reaſon which hath made them leave out the *ſecond Commandment* in their Offices of Devotion, hath brought them to ſo ſevere a Prohibition of reading the *Scriptures* in a known Language, but where themſelves are already ſo ſecure of the Perſons that they dare to give way to it: And that is, leſt their Conſciences ſhould ſtart and boggle at the breaking a Command of *God*, when they pretended to ſerve him.

The Arguments againſt reading the Scriptures would have held againſt the publiſhing them in a Language known to the People.

§. 9. 2. That no Objection can be now made againſt the Peoples reading the *Scriptures*, but would have held againſt the publiſhing them in a Language to be underſtood by the People. For were the People leſs ignorant and heady, leſs preſumptuous and opinionative then, than they are now? Was not there the ſame danger of miſtaking the Senſe at that time? Was not the People of *Iſrael* as refractory and diſobedient, as any have been ſince? Were they not as apt to quarrel with Divine *Laws*, and the Authority *God* had ſet up among them? Did they not fall into Sects and divers Opinions, by miſunderſtanding the *Law*? Yet were theſe Reaſons then thought ſufficient for *God* not to make known his *Law* to all People; but to commit it only to *Aaron* and the *Prieſts*, for them prudentially to diſpenſe it to them? No; ſo far from it, that ſtrict Care was taken to make the People underſtand it; particular Commands given for this very End; and the *Law* on purpoſe declared to be eaſy and *intelligible*, that they might not make its obſcurity a pretence for their Ignorance. Was not this *Law* given them, as a *Rule* to direct themſelves by? Were not all ſent to this to learn to govern their Actions? *Wherewithal ſhall a young Man cleanſe his ways, by taking heed thereto according to thy Word?* Pſ. 119.9. Is not this *Law* ſaid to *convert the Soul, and to make wiſe the ſimple?* Pſ. 19. 7. and was that done by *not underſtanding* it? Was it not the Delight, Exerciſe, and continual Meditation of thoſe, who were truly devout among them? But how comes our Caſe to be ſo much worſe under *Chriſtianity?* Is the *Law* of *Chriſt* ſo much more difficult and obſcure, than the *Law* of *Moſes?* Is not his *Sermon* on the *Mount*, wherein he delivers the Rules of a *Chriſtian Life*, as plain as any Chapter in *Leviticus?* What doth the *Goſpel* teach Men, but to be and to do good, to love all Men, and to love *God* above all, to believe in Chriſt and to obey his Commands, to repent of Sins paſt, and to live no longer in them; and in ſhort, ſo to live in this World, as they hope to live with *God* in Happineſs hereafter? And are theſe things ſo hard to be underſtood, that the People ought not to be made acquainted with them, in their own Language? Or is there any Danger, they ſhould know them too well? Was ever the *Law* of *Moſes* more perverted by falſe Interpretations, than in our *Saviours* time by the *Scribes* and *Phariſees?* Why doth not he then take ſome other Care for his own *Law* to prevent this for the future, if that had been judged by him the proper way of Cure? But thereby we ſee the miſtakes of the People are owing to their Teachers, and there can be no means to prevent Errors in the People, but by ſtopping them at the fountain Heads, from whence they run down among them. For the common People might have had a better notion of *Religion*, if their Minds had not been corrupted by the Traditions and *Gloſſes* of the *Phariſees*. Therefore methinks, they have not gone the wiſeſt way to work in the *Church* of *Rome*; inſtead of this *prudential diſpenſing the Scriptures*, their only way had been to have deſtroyed them, as *Diocleſian*, their Predeceſſor in this kind of *Prudence*, once deſigned. For let them aſſure themſelves, they who underſtand *Greek* and *Latin* are the Perſons they have ten times more cauſe to fear, than the common People. And conſidering the advantage they once had by the horrible *Ignorance* of *Prieſts* and People, it muſt be imputed only to the watchful Eye of Divine Providence, that the *Scriptures* (being of ſo little uſe in the *Roman Church*) have been preſerved entire to our Days. There had been no ſuch means in the World to have prevented a *Reformation* as this; for they are not out, when they take the *Scripture* ſo much for their Enemy, as appears by the force and reſtraint they put upon it, and the Fear and Jealouſies they are in about it continually. If it had not been for this, would any one have compared the *Scriptures*, in the hands of the common People as my Adverſary doth, *to a Sword in a Mad-mans hand?* Is it of ſo deſtructive a Nature, and framed for no other uſe than a Sword is? Which nothing but diſcretion keeps a Man from doing Miſchief by; and all the way a Man hath (though never ſo meek and humble) to defend himſelf by it, is by deſtroying his Enemy with it, if he continues his Aſſault. Theſe Expreſſions do not argue any kindneſs to the *Scripture*, nor an apprehenſion of any great good that comes to the World by it; but that really Men might have been more at eaſe and fewer differences in Religion had happen'd, if all the Copies of the *Bible* had been loſt, aſſoon as the *Pope* had placed himſelf in his infallible *Chair*. This Deſign was once attempted, as I ſhall ſhew afterwards, but failed of Succeſs: And I know not how far the Principles of this *Prudence* may carry them, if ever ſuch a Seaſon ſhould fall into their Hands again; having found ſo much trouble to them from the *Scriptures*, and ſo little Benefit by them, their Church being once owned as *Infallible*. For I would fain know, whether the *Scripture* hath not done more Miſchief, according to them, in the Hands of the *Reformers*, than it can be ſuppoſed to do in the Hands of the *common People*. If it muſt be a *Sword in a mad Man's hand*, whether the more ſtrength and cunning ſuch a one hath, he be not capable of doing ſo much the more Miſchief by it? And if it were poſſible to get it out of ſuch a Man's hands, whether it were not the higheſt *Prudence* and Care of the publick Safety to do it? It can be then nothing but the impoſſibility of the Thing, which makes them ſuffer the *Scripture* to be in the Hands of any who are capable of doing Miſchief by it; and the more Miſchief they may do, the more deſirable and *prudential* it is to take it from them. But all Men ſee none are ſo capable of doing Miſchief thereby, as Men of the greateſt Wit and Learning, and that have the faireſt appearance of Piety to the World: The conſequence then of this Doctrine is, if purſued to the true Deſign of it, that the *Scripture* ſhould be kept if poſſible out of the Hands of the moſt ſubtile, learned, and pious Men above all others, if they be not true to the intereſts of the *Roman Church*? It is but a meer Shew to pretend only to keep the People in order, (for when are they otherwiſe, but when cunning Men have the managing of them?) The true meaning of this Principle is, that it will never be well with the World till the Books of *Scripture* are all burnt, which are abroad; and that only one *Original* be preſerved in the *Vatican* to juſtify the *Popes* Title to *Infallibility*, and that (as the *Sibylline Oracles* of Old,) never to be conſulted, but in caſes of great Extremity; and that under the inſpection of ſome very truſty Officers; nor to be interpreted but by the *Pope* himſelf. If I were of the Church of *Rome*, and owned the Principles of it, I muſt needs have condemned the great Men of it in former Times, for want of *Prudence* in this Matter: That would have ſerved their Turn much better than forgoing ſo many *decretal Epiſtles*, falſifying ſo many *Teſtimonies*, perverting ſo many *Texts of Scripture* to maintain the dignity of the *Papal Chair*. There was only one ſmall Circumſtance wanting, (their good will we have no Cauſe to queſtion) and that was the poſſibility of it; for although the *Roman Church* called it ſelf *Catholick*, they were wiſe enough to know, there were many conſiderable *Churches* in the World beſides theirs, where the *Scriptures* were preſerved, and from whence Copies might be procured by Perſons who would be ſo much the more inquiſitive, the more they were forbidden to get them. Therefore they pitched upon an eaſier way, and finding the People under a very competent degree of *Ignorance*, they indulged them and ſoothed them up in it, and told them, they could never miſs the way to Heaven, though never ſo narrow, in the dark. Their only Danger was too much Light, for then probably they might be in a great Diſpute, whether the *broad Way* was not the true; for there they ſaw moſt of their *Friends* and *Leaders*. And while they kept the People in this profound Ignorance and Superſtition, they jogged on in their Opinion, as ſecurely to Heaven, as *Ignatius Loyola*'s Mule did to *Mount-ſerrat*, when he laid his Bridle on his neck, to ſee whether he would take the way to purſue the *Moor*, which was the more beaten Track, or the more craggy and untrodden way to that place of *Devotion*; and by a mighty Providence, (and I ſuppoſe a little help of the Rider) the Beaſt took the more narrow Way. But when Perſons began to be awakened by Learning,and thereby grew inquiſitive into all Matters, and ſo by dgrees in thoſe of Religion; they then eſpied their Error, in letting ſuch a Book lie abroad in ſo many Hands, from whence ſo many irreſiſtable Arguments were drawn againſt the Doctrine and Practices of the *Roman Church*. This I aſſure my ſelf, is the true ground of the Quarrels againſt the reading of the *Scriptures*, but that being now irremediable, they betake themſelves to ſmaller Arts, and endeavour to hinder any one particular Perſon whom they have the leaſt ſuſpicion of, from meddling with a Book ſo dangerous to their *Church* and *Religion*.

Orlandis. hiſt. Societ. Jeſu. l. 1. *n.* 17. Maffeius vit. Ignat. l. 1. c. 3.

The practice of the Roman Church herein directly contrary to that of the Primitive Church.

§. 10. For if this were not it, what makes them to be more jealous of the *uſe* of the *Scriptures*, than ever the Chriſtians were in former Ages? Was there not much more danger of miſunderſtanding the Doctrine of the Goſpel at firſt, than ever after? Nay were there not very many who were falſe *Apoſtles*, and great and dangerous Hereticks, preſumptuous and arrogant, if ever any were? But did *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles*, for all this think it unfit to communicate the Doctrine of the *Goſpel* to the People; or were the Books containing it written in Languages not to be underſtood by them? No, they choſe the moſt popular Languages of that Time, moſt largely ſpread and generally underſtood. The *Apoſtles* never told their Diſciples, of the danger of reading the Divine Writings that were among them, when they were firſt ſpread abroad; and never ſo proper a ſeaſon to give them Caution, as then. But inſtead of that, they adviſe them, *to take heed to the ſure word of Prophecy*, and tell them that they did well therein, that *the Scriptures were written for their Inſtruction and Comfort*, that *being divinely inſpired they were able to make them wiſe unto Salvation*. What, did the *Apoſtles* never imagine all this while, the ill uſe that might be made of them by Men of perverſe

2 Pet. 1. 19.

Rom. 15. 4.

2 Tim. 3. 15, 16.

Minds? Yes, they knew it as well as any, and did foretell *Schiſms* and *Hereſies* that ſhould be in the *Church*, and ſaw them in their own Days; and yet, poor Men, wanted that *exquiſite Prudence of the Roman Church*, to prevent them, by ſo happy an Expedient, as when they had written *Epiſtles* to ſeveral *Churches* to forbid the promiſcuous reading of them. But it may be, it was the Awe of the *Apoſtles* and their infallible *Spirit* in interpreting *Scripture*, made this Prohibition not ſo neceſſary in their own time, did the *Church* then find it neceſſary to reſtrain the People, after their Deceaſe? We have an occaſion ſoon after given, wherein to ſee the Opinion of the *Church* at that time; the *Church* of *Corinth* fell into a grievous Schiſm and Oppoſition, to their ſpiritual Governours: upon this *Clement* writes his Epiſtle to them; wherein he is ſo far from forbidding the uſe of *Scripture* to them to preſerve Unity, that he bids them *look diligently into the Scriptures which are the true Oracles of the Holy Ghoſt:* and afterwards, *take* St. *Paul*'s Epiſtle *into your hands, and conſider what he ſaith; and he commends them very much for being skilled in the Scriptures: Beloved*, ſaith he, *ye have known, and very well known, the holy* Scriptures; *and ye have throughly looked into the Oracles of God, therefore call them to mind.* Which Language is as far different from that of the R*oman* C*hurch*, as the Church of that *Age* is from theirs. Nay the counterfeit *Clements* (whom they can make uſe of, upon other Occaſions) is as expreſs in this Matter; as the true. For he perſwades private Chriſtians *to continual Meditation in the Scriptures*, which he calls the *Oracles of Chriſt*; *and that this is the beſt employment of their* R*etirements*. But we need not uſe his Teſtimony in this matter, nor the old Edition of *Ignatius*, wherein Parents are bid *to inſtruct their Children in the holy Scriptures*; nor that ſaying of *Polycarp* to the *Philippians* out of the old *Latin Edition, I am confident you are well ſtudied in the Scriptures*; for in the *Greek* yet preſerved, he exhorts them *to the reading of* St. *Pauls Epiſtles, that they might be built up in the Faith.* So little did theſe holy Men dream of ſuch a *prudent diſpenſing the Scriptures* among them, for fear of Miſchief they might do themſelves or others by them. *Clemens Alexandrinus* mentions the *reading the Scriptures among Chriſtians before their Meals, and Pſalms, and Hymns at them; and Tertullian* mentions the ſame Cuſtom. *Origen*, in the *Greek Commentaries*, lately publiſhed, perſwades Chriſtians *by all means, by attending to Reading, Prayer, Teaching, Meditation therein Day and Night, to lay up in their Hearts not only the new Oracles of the Goſpel, Apoſtles and Apocalypſe, but the old ones too of the Law and the Prophets.* And elſewhere tells his Hearers, *they ought not to be diſcouraged if they met with Difficulties in reading the Scriptures: For there was great Benefit to be had by them.* But leaſt it ſhould be thought, he ſpeaks here only of publick reading the *Scriptures*, in his Homilies on *Leviticus* he ſpeaks plainly, *that he would not only have them hear the Word of God in publick, but to be exerciſed and meditate therein in their Houſes Night and Day; For Chriſt is every where preſent, and therefore they are commanded in the Law to meditate therein upon their Journies, and when they ſit in their Houſes, and when they lie down and riſe up.* But had not the *Church* yet Experience enough of the Miſchief of permitting the *Scriptures* to the People? Were there ever greater and more

Clement. Epiſt. ad Corinth. P. 58.

P. 61.

P. 68.

Conſtit. Clement. l. 1. c. 4.

Ignat. ep. ad Philadelph. Polycarp. ep. ad Philip. p. 16. ed. Uſher.

Clem. Alexand. Strom. p. 728. Tertul. de anim. c. 9.

Origen. Comment. in Matthæum. p. 220.

Comment. in Joſ. p. 27.

Hom. in Levit. 9.

more notorious Hereſies than in thoſe firſt Ages of the *Church*, and thoſe ariſing from perverting the Words and Deſign of the *Scriptures?* But did the *Church* yet afterwards grow wiſer, in the Senſe of the *Roman Church?* In the time of the four *general Councils* they had tryal enough of the Miſchief of *Hereſies*, but did the *Fathers* of the *Church* forbid the reading the *Scriptures*, on that account? No, but inſtead of that, they commend the Scriptures to all, *as the beſt Remedy for all Paſſions of the Mind*; ſo St. *Baſil* and St. *Hierome* call it; and this latter commends nothing more to the Women he inſtructed in Devotion, *than conſtant reading the Scriptures*; and withal they ſay *that infinite Evils do ariſe from Ignorance of the Scriptures; from hence moſt Part of Hereſies have come, from hence a negligent and careleſs Life, and unfruitful Labours.* Nay, ſo frequent, ſo earneſt, and vehement is St. *Chryſoſtome* in this Matter of recommending the reading of *Scriptures*, that thoſe of the *Roman Church* have no other way to anſwer him but by ſaying, *he ſpeaks hyperbolically*; which in plain *Engliſh* is, he ſpeaks too much of it. But how far different were the Opinions of the wiſe Men of the *Church* in thoſe times, from what thoſe have thought who underſtood the Intereſt of the *Roman Church* beſt? We may ſee what the Opinion of the latter is, by the Counſel given to *Julius* III. by the *Biſhops* met at *Bononia* for that end, to give the beſt advice they could for reſtoring the Dignity of the *Roman See*; *that which was the greateſt and mightieſt of all* they ſaid, *they reſerved to the laſt; which was, that by all means as little of the Goſpel as might be, eſpecially in the vulgar Tongue, be read in the Cities under his Juriſdiction; and that little which was in the Maſs ought to be ſufficient; neither ſhould it be permitted to any Mortal to read more. For as long as Men were contented with that little, all things went well with them, but quite otherwiſe ſince more was commonly read. For this, in ſhort is that Book*, ſay they, *which above all others hath raiſed thoſe Tempeſts and Whirlwinds, which we are almoſt carryed away with: And in truth, if any one diligently conſider it, and compares it with what is done in our Churches, will find them very contrary to each other; and our very Doctrine not only to be different from it, but repugnant to it.* A very fair and ingenuous Confeſſion! And if ſelf-condemned Perſons be Hereticks, there can be none greater than thoſe of the *Roman Church*; eſpecially the *prudential Men* in it, ſuch as theſe certainly were, whom the *Pope* ſingled out to give advice in theſe Matters. But how different is the Wiſdom of the *Children of this World* from that of the *Children of Light!* We have already ſeen what other kind of Judgment the ancient Fathers had of the Uſefulneſs of *Scriptures* to the People, than they have in the *Roman Church*: But we need not more to prove it, ſince it is acknowledged by thoſe who are againſt reading the Scriptures by the People that it was otherwiſe in the *Primitive Church*; ſo *Alphonſus à Caſtro* and *Sixtus Senenſis* confeſs. *Eſpencæus* quotes many plain Places from St. *Auſtin*, and St. *Chryſoſtom* to prove, that the People ought to be very diligent in reading the *Scriptures* in their own Houſes, and that nothing ſhould excuſe them from it: And confeſſeth that St. *Paul's* Precept, Col. 3. *Let the Word of God dwell richly in you* was intended for the *People*; and that they ought to have it among them, not only ſufficiently, but abundantly. The Sum of this Argument

Baſil. in Pſal. 1. Hieron. præfat. com. in ep. ad Epheſ.

St. Chryſ. præfat. in Epiſt. ad Rom.

Conſil. de ſtabilienda Rom. ſede p. 6.

Alphonſ. à Caſtro adverſ. hæret. l. 1. c. 23. Sixti Senenſ. Biblioth. l. 6. Annot. 152. Eſpencæus in Tit. c. 2. p. 517.

gument is, that the Reaſons now urged againſt the Peoples reading the *Scriptures* would have held againſt the publiſhing of them in a Language to be underſtood by the People; that they ſaw the ſame Inconveniencies which are objected now, and yet commended the reading the *Scriptures* to all; that in all the Primitive *Church*, the Practice was not only retained, but vehemently urged, after all the Hereſies which had riſen in the *Church* in their time; and therefore for the *Church* of *Rome* to account it *Wiſdom* to keep the People from it, is to charge not only the *Fathers* of the *Church* with Folly, but the *Apoſtles*, and our *Saviour*, and *God* himſelf.

g.

CHAP. IV.

84:2H

Of the Fanaticiſm of the Roman *Church.*

The Unreaſonableneſs of objecting Sects and Fanaticiſms to us, as the Effects of reading the Scriptures. Fanaticiſm countenanced in the Roman *Church, but condemned by ours. Private Revelations made among them the grounds of believing ſome Points of Doctrine; proved from their own Authors. Of the Revelations pleaded for the Immaculate Conception. The Revelations of St.* Brigitt, *and St.* Catharin *directly contrary in this Point, yet both owned in the Church of* Rome. *The large Approbations of St.* Brigitts, *by Popes and Councils; and both their Revelations acknowledged to be divine, in the Leſſons read upon their Days. St.* Catharine's *wonderful Faculty of ſmelling Souls, a Gift peculiar to her and* Philip Nerius. *The vain Attempts of reconciling thoſe Revelations. The great Number of Female Revelations approved in the* Roman *Church. Purgatory, Tranſubſtantiation, Auricular Confeſſion proved by Viſions and Revelations. Feſtivals appointed upon the Credit of Revelations: The Feaſt of* Corpus Chriſti *on the Revelation made to* Juliana, *the Story of it related from their own Writers: No ſuch thing can be objected to our Church. Revelations ſtill owned by them; proved from the Fanatick Revelations of Mother* Juliana *very lately publiſhed by Mr.* Creſſy: *Some Inſtances of the blaſphemous Non-ſenſe contained in them. The Monaſtick Orders founded in Enthuſiaſm. An Account of the great Fanaticiſm of St.* Benedict, *and St.* Romoaldus: *Their Hatred of Humane Learning, and ſtrange Viſions and Revelations. The Carthuſian Order founded upon a Viſion. The Carmelites Viſion of their Habit. The Franciſcan and Dominican Orders founded on Fanaticiſm, and ſeen in a Viſion of* Innocent *III. to be the great Supporters of the* Roman *Church. The* Quakeriſm *of St.* Francis *deſcribed from their beſt Authors. His Ignorance, Extaſies, and Fanatick Preaching. The Viſion of* Dominicus. *The blaſphemous Euthuſiaſm of the Mendicant Fryers. The Hiſtory of it related at large. Of the* Evangelium æternum, *and the Blaſphemies contained in it. The Author of it ſuppoſed to be the General of the Franciſcan Order, however owned by the Fryers, and read and preached at* Paris. *The Oppoſition to it by the Univerſity: But favoured by the* Popes. Gul. S. Armour *writing againſt it,* *it, his Book publickly burnt by Order of the* Court *of* Rome. *The* Pope's *horrible Partiality to the Fryers. The Fanaticiſm of the Franciſcans afterwards. Of the Followers of* Petrus Johannis de Oliva. *The Spiritual State began (ſay they) from St.* Francis. *The Story of his Wounds, and* Maria Viſitationis *parallel'd. The canting Language uſed by the Spiritual Brethren, called* Beguini, Fraticelli, *and* Begardi. *Of their Doctrines about Poverty, Swearing, Perfection, the Carnal Church and Inſpiration: By all which, they appear to be a Sect of Quakers, after the Order of St.* Francis. *Of the Schiſm made by them. The large ſpreading, and long Continuance of them. Of the* Apoſtolici *and* Dulciniſtæ. *Of their numerous Conventicles. Their high Opinion of themſelves. Their Zeal againſt the Clergy, and Tythes; their Doctrine of Chriſtian Liberty. Of the* Alumbradoes *in* Spain: *Their Diſobedience to Biſhops; obſtinate adhering to their own Fancies, calling them Inſpirations, their being above Ordinances.* Ignatius Loyola *ſuſpected to be one of the* Illuminati, *proved from* Melchior Canus. *The Jeſuits Order founded in Fanaticiſm, a particular Account of the Romantick Enthuſiaſm of* Ignatius *from the Writers of his own Order. Whereby it is proved, that he was the greateſt Pretender to Enthuſiaſm, ſince the Days of* Mahomet *and St.* Francis. Ignatius *gave no Reſpect to Men by Words, or putting off his Hat; his great Ignorance and Preaching in the Streets: His glorifying in his Sufferings for it; his Pretence to Mortification; the Ways he uſed to get Diſciples. Their Way of Reſolution of Difficulties by ſeeking God; their itinerant Preaching in the Cities of* Italy. *The Sect of Quakers a new Order of Diſciples of* Ignatius, *only wanting Confirmation from the Pope, which* Ignatius *obtained. Of the Fanatick Way of Devotion in the* Roman *Church. Of Superſtitions and Enthuſiaſtical Fanaticiſms among them. Of their myſtical Divinity. Mr.* Creſſy's *canting in his Preface to* Sancta Sophia. *Of the Deiform Fund of the Soul; a ſuper-eſſential Life, and the Way to it. Of contemplating with the Will. Of Paſſive Unions. The Method of Self-annihilation. Of the Union of nothing with nothing. Of the feeling of not being. The Miſchief of an unintelligible Way of Devotion. The utmoſt Effects of this Way is groſs Enthuſiaſm. Mr.* Creſſy's *Vindication of it examined. The laſt ſort of Fanaticiſm among them, reſiſting Authority under pretence of Religion. Their Principles and Practices compared with the Fanaticks. How far they are diſowned at preſent by them. Of the Vindication of the* Iriſh Remonſtrance. *The Court of* Rome *hath always favoured that Party, which is moſt deſtructive to civil Government, proved by particular and late Inſtances.*

The Unreaſonableneſs of objecting Sects and Fanaticiſm to us, as the effect of reading the Scriptures.

§. 12. WE come to conſider, whether the reading the *Scriptures* be the Cauſe of all the *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms* which have been in *England*? He might much better have charged the *Philoſophers*, eſpecially *Ariſtotle*, with all the Diſputes in the World; for they not only by their Writings have occaſioned many, but have taught Men the pernicious Uſe of reaſoning, without which, the World might be as quiet as a *Flock* of *Sheep*. If they could but perſwade Men to lay aſide that miſchievous Faculty, I dare undertake for them, that let the People have the *Bible* never ſo much among them, they ſhall never hurt the *Church* of *Rome*. Do they not tell us, that the Words of *Scripture* are plain for *Tranſubſtantiation*, (*This is my Body*.) Why do not then the People as readily believe that, as any other Propoſition? By which we ſee, it is not meerly reading, but a more dangerous thing, called conſidering or reaſoning, which makes them embrace ſome things as they lie in Words, and interpret others according to the cleareſt Evidence, which the Nature of the thing, the comparing with other Places, and the common Senſe of Mankind will give. *But why are we not all of a Mind?* I would fain know the time when Men were ſo. This Variety of *Sects* was objected againſt the *Philoſophers*, and thought no Argument then; it was objected againſt the *Primitive Chriſtians*, and thought of no Force then; why muſt it ſignify more in *England* than ever it did in any other Age or Place? But ſay they, *It was otherwiſe in* England, *before the Scriptures came to be read by all; it was, and is otherwiſe in all Churches where they are not read; therefore theſe Sects and Fanaticiſms are the dire Effects of the promiſcuous reading the Scriptures.* This is the common and popular Argument. *All things were well with us when we offered up Cakes to the Queen of Heaven; when all joined in the Communion of the* Roman *Church, then there were no Fanaticiſms, nor new Lights, no Sects as there are now in* England: *Therefore why ſhould any one make any doubt, but he ought to return to the Church of* Rome? This neceſſarily leads me into the Examination of theſe two things. 1. Whether there be no Danger of *Fanaticiſm* in the *Roman Church*? 2. Whether the *Unity* of *that Church* be ſo admirable to tempt all Perſons, who prize the *Churches Unity*, to return to it?

Fanaticiſm countenanced in the Roman *Church.*

§. 2. Concerning the Danger of *Fanaticiſm* in the *Roman Church*. By *Fanaticiſm* we underſtand either an *Enthuſiaſtick Way of Religion*; or *reſiſting Authority, under a pretence of Religion*. In either Senſe it ſhall appear, that the *Church* of *Rome* is ſo far from being cleared from it, that it hath given great Encouragement to it.

1. As to an *Enthuſiaſtick* Way of *Religion*: I ſhall now prove, that there have not been greater *Enthuſiaſts* among us in *England*, than have been in the *Roman Church*; all the difference is, they have been ſome always, others for a time, allowed, and countenanced, and encouraged by thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*; but among us they have been decryed and oppoſed by all the Members of the *Church* of *England*. I ſhall not inſiſt upon their Reſolution of Faith, and the Infallibility of their *Church*, which muſt be carried to *Enthuſiaſm* at laſt; but I ſhall prove it by plain *Revelations*, which have been made the grounds among them of believing ſome Doctrines in Diſpute, and the Reaſons of ſetting up a more *perfect way of Life*, which in the higheſt Strain of their *Devotion*, is meer *Enthuſiaſm*.

Private Revelations pleaded for Matters of Doctrine.

1. *Revelations* have been pleaded by them in Matters of Doctrine; ſuch I mean, which depend upon immediate Impulſes and Inſpirations, ſince the *Canon of Scripture* and *Apoſtolical Traditions*. Of this we have a remarkable Inſtance, in a late Controverſy managed with great Heat and Intereſt on both ſides, *viz.* Of the *immaculate Conceptions* of the *Virgin Mary*: about the ending of which, a ſolemn *Embaſſy* was ſent from the Kings of *Spain*, *Philip* the third, and *Philip* the fourth, to the *Popes*, *Paul* the fifth, and *Gregory* the thirteenth; and an Account is given of it by one, concerned himſelf

Lucas Waddingus Legutien. de Concept. Virg. Mariæ. præfat. Sect. 3. Tract. 11. Sect. 1. n. 3. Baron. not. in Martyrolog. Rom. 8. Decem.

ſelf in the Management of the Theological Part of it, *which*, he ſaith, *is therefore publiſhed, that the World may underſtand upon what grounds the Doctrines of Faith are eſtabliſhed among them.* One of the chief whereof inſiſted upon was, *ſome private Revelations, made to ſome Saints, about the immaculate Conception, which being once received in the Church, adds no ſmall Strength*, he ſaith, *to any Doctrine, and gives a ſolid Foundation for a Definition*; *i. e.* that the Matter may be defined to be of Faith, and neceſſary to be believed by all Chriſtians. Upon this he reckons up ſeveral *Revelations*, publickly received in the *Church*; one mentioned by *Anſelm*, being *a divine Apparition to an Abbot in a Storm* (a fit time for Apparitions) *whereby he was admoniſhed to keep the Feaſt of the Conception of the bleſſed Virgin*; upon which, as Baronius obſerves, *that Feaſt was kept in* England. Which Revelation, *Wadding* tells us, *is publickly recited in the Office for the Day*; *and was not only extant in ſeveral Breviaries of* England, France, Spain, *and* Italy; *but he had divers himſelf authorized by the Pope, wherein it was recommended as true and piouſly to be believed*; *and accordingly hath been publickly ſung and uſed in the Church about an hundred Years. And what*, ſaith he, *is the Conſequence of diſbelieving this, but to ſay in effect, that the Pope and the* Roman *Church are eaſily cheated and abuſed by Impoſtors, and Forgers of falſe Revelations to inſtitute new Feſtival Solemnities upon the Credit of them?* Another Revelation was made to *Norbertus*, the Founder of the Order of the *Præmonſtratenſes*; in which, *the Virgin* Mary *appeared and commended her Veneration to him, and gave him a white Garment, in token of her Original Innocency*; which Revelation is believed by all of that Order, and taken as the Reaſon of their Habit. Beſides theſe, *there are ſeveral other Revelations to St.* Gertrude; *and others to the ſame purpoſe reckoned up by ſeveral Catholick Authors, which no Man ought to reject, unleſs he intends to be as great a Heretick* (or therein as a wiſe Man) *as* Eraſmus *was. Nay, theſe Revelations were ſo frequent*, he ſaith, *that there hath been no Age ſince the tenth Century, wherein there hath not been ſome made to devout Men or Women, about this Matter.* But above all theſe, moſt remarkable were thoſe to St. *Brigitt*; *who had not one or two but many to this purpoſe*; *and the lateſt were of* Joanna a Cruce, *which* it ſeems *were at firſt eagerly oppoſed, but at laſt came out with the Approbation of two Cardinals, and ſeveral Biſhops of the Inquiſition in* Spain. But now who could imagine a thing ſo often revealed, ſo publickly allowed, ſo many times atteſted from Heaven, ſhould not be generally received? But the Miſchief of it was, the contrary Doctrine had Revelations for it too. For *Antoninus* and *Cajetan* ſay, St. *Catharine* of *Siena* had it revealed to her, that ſhe was conceived with Original Sin. What is to be done now? Here we have Saint againſt Saint, Revelation againſt Revelation, St. *Catharine* againſt St. *Brigitt* and all the reſt of them. Here to ſpeak truth, they are ſomewhat hard put to it; for they grant God cannot contradict himſelf, and therefore one of theſe muſt be falſe, but which of them is all the Queſtion. Here they examine, which of theſe Doctrines is moſt conſtant to *Scripture* and *Tradition*, which is moſt for the Benefit of the *Church*, which were Perſons of the greater *Sanctity*, and whoſe *Revelations* were the moſt approved. For St. *Brigit*'s they plead ſtoutly, that when they were delivered by her to her Confeſſors, they were ſtrictly examined, and after them by the *Biſhops* and *Divines* of *Sueden*, and approved as *divine Revelations*; from them they were ſent as ſuch to the *Council of Baſil*; from whence they were examined over again at *Naples*, and there allowed, and preached in the Preſence, and by Command of the *Queen* and *Archbiſhop*, before all the People of the City; again examined at *Rome* by *Prelates* and *Cardinals*, *A. D.* 1377. by the Popes Appointment; and there approved: And *A. D.* 1379. they are declared by thoſe to whom *Urban* the ſixth committed the new Examination of them, to be authentick, and to have come from the Spirit of God: And ſo much is declared by *Boniface* the ninth, in the Bull of her Canonization; and *at laſt approved*, ſaith *Wadding*, *at the general Council of* Baſil. What could be expected leſs after this; than that they ſhould have been received as *Canonical Scriptures*, they having never taken ſo much Pains in examining and approving any controverted Books of the Bible, as they had done about theſe Revelations? And no Man knows how far their Authority might have prevailed, if the whole Sect of *Dominicans* had not been engaged in the oppoſite Opinion. For nothing elſe, that I can find, hath given any Diſcredit to her *Revelations* but this; which makes *Cajetan* call them *old Wives Dreams*, as *Wadding* confeſſeth. But it falls out very conveniently, that St. *Catharine*'s Revelation was juſt in the *Dominican* Way, in which ſhe had been educated; and for all that I can ſee, wants little of the Reputation of St. *Brigit*. For they were both very wonderful Perſons, and had more familiar Revelation, than any of the Prophets we read of. St. *Brigit* in her Childhood (if we believe the account given of her, in the Bull of Canonization by *Bonifacius*, and her Life by *Vaſtavius*) had Viſions as frequently as other Children have *Babies*, and was as well pleaſed with them; the *Virgin Mary* was once her *Midwife*, as the *Pope* very gravely tells us; but her Revelations (after *Chriſt* took her for his Spouſe) have filled a great Volume. Wherein a Perſon that hath leiſure enough, may ſee ſtrange Effects of the Power of Imagination, or a religious Melancholly; and to that Book the *Pope* in his Bull refers us; and if any thing can be more conſiderable than the *Pope's* Authority, the whole *Roman Church* in the Prayers upon St. *Brigit*'s Day, *do confeſs theſe* Revelations *to have come immediately from God to her*; and in one of the Leſſons for that Day, *do magnify the Multitude of her Divine* Revelations. But to ſay truth, the *Church* of *Rome* allows fair Play in the Caſe, for it magnifies St. *Catharine* as much as St. *Brigit*; for her *holy Extaſies* are mentioned in the *Leſſons* upon her Day, in one of which *were five* Rayes, *coming from the five Wounds of our Saviour to five Parts of her Body; and ſhe* (being wonderful humble) *prayed our Lord that the Wounds might not appear* (for fear ſhe ſhould have been thought as holy as St. *Francis*) *and immediately the Colour of the Blood was changed into pure Light upon her Hands, and Feet and Heart.* And her *Confeſſor* Raimund (who is always a principal Man in theſe things, as *Matthias a Suecia* was to St. *Brigit*) *without whom ſhe was adviſed from Heaven to do nothing, ſaw theſe ſplendid Wounds upon her Body*; (but by what Inſtrument did he ſee the Wound in her Heart?) Well, though we Hereticks are not apt to be too credulous in theſe Caſes, the *Church* of

Wadding l. c. Sect. 24 p. 357.

Revelationes St. Brigittæ. Antw. 1611.

Brev. Rom. 8. Octobr. p. 1017.

Brev. Rom Apr. 30. p. 808.

of R*ome* very gravely tells us in the next Leſſon, *that her Learning was not acquired, but infuſed; by which ſhe anſwered the moſt profound Doctors, in the moſt difficult Speculations in Divinity*; but theſe were nothing to *her* Revelations, and the Service ſhe did the Church of Rome by them in a time of *Schiſm*. But one Gift ſhe had above St. *Brigit*, which was, that while ſhe was on Earth ſhe could not only ſee, but *ſmell Souls* too; and could not endure *the ſtench of wicked Souls*, as *Raynaldus* tells us from her Confeſſor *Raimund:* a Gift very few had, beſides her and *Philip Nerius* the Father of the *Oratorians*; for *Raynaldus* one of his Order, tells us from *Bacius* the Writer of his Life, *that he was ſometimes ſo offended with the ſmells of filthy Souls, that he would deſire the Perſons to empty the jakes of their Souls*. Such divine *Noſes* had theſe two *Saints* among them! A degree of *Enthuſiaſm*, above the *Spirit* of *diſcerning* any *Quakers* among us have ever pretended to. Pope *Pius* the ſecond in the Bull of *Canonization* of St. *Catharine*, not only acknowledgeth a *gift of Prophecy* to have been in her, but that ſometimes her Extaſies were ſo great, that ſhe was ſenſible of no kind of Pain in them. And St. *Brigit* was often ſeen much above Ground in her Devotions; and one ſaw *Rivers*, and another *Fire* come out of her mouth; but I think not at the ſame time. Theſe are things we rake not the old Kennels of the *golden Legends* for, but are at this Day allowed and approved of in the R*oman Church*; and *their days kept*, and they *prayed to*, upon the account of ſuch things as theſe are.

Raynald. Annales Eccleſiaſt. A. D. 1380. *n.* 25.

Raynald. ib.

Bzou Annales A. D. 1370. *n.* 20.

Revelations contrary to each other approved by the Roman Church.

§. 3. Yet ſtill we are to ſeek what is to be done, when two Revelations contradict each other? For the *Dominicans* are as peremptory for the Revelation of St. *Catharine*, as their Adverſaries are for that of St. *Brigit*. Two bold Fellows called *Henricus de Haſſia* and *Sybillanus* knew no other way, but to reject both as *Illuſions* and *Fancies*; but what becomes then of the *Popes* and *Councils* Infallibility, who have approved both? *Franciſcus Picus Mirandula* being a learned and ingenuous Man, confeſſeth himſelf at a loſs; both being concerning a thing paſſed, there muſt be Truth on one ſide, and Falſhood on the other: For the caſe is not the ſame, ſaith he, as to paſt and future Things, in which a Condition may be underſtood. By which means S. *Bernard* eſcaped, when he promiſed great Succeſs to an Expedition into the Holy Land, and they who went in it found the quite contrary. But at laſt he gives us leave to conjecture his meaning when he ſaith, *That if any thing be falſe in a Prophecy, though ſome prove true, we have cauſe to ſuſpect all; eſpecially if it come from Women, whoſe judgments are weak, and their Paſſions vehement, and Imaginations eaſily poſſeſſed with what they are moſt deſirous of, and leaſt able to diſtinguiſh between the ſtrength of Imagination, and a divine Revelation:* But as to that particular Caſe of St. *Catharine* and St. *Brigit*, where both were Women; he ſaith, *The Divines were generally for the former, and the Monks for the latter; but which was in the Truth, he thinks cannot be known upon Earth.*

Del. Rio. diſquiſ. Mag. l. 4. c. 1. q. 3. Sect.

Joh. Franciſ. Picus Mirand. de rerum prænot. l. 9. c. 2.

c. 4.

Martin Del R*io*, diſcourſing of the R*evelations* of Canonized Saints, who were Women in the *Church* of *Rome*, reckons St. *Angela* a *Carmeliteſs*, whoſe Book of R*evelations* came out above four hundred Years ago; St. *Gertrude*, *A. D.* 664. St. *Hildegardis* in *Germany*, *A. D.* 1180. and about the ſame time St. *Elizabeth* of *Sconaugh*, all whoſe Revelations were publiſhed, and the laſt collected by *Roger*

Del Rio. ib.

an *Engliſh Ciſtercian*; and in latter times he mentions St. *Brigit*, and St. *Catharine*, *whoſe* Revelations, he ſaith, *were oppoſed by ſome*, *but he declares for his part*, *that he is not at all moved with their Arguments*, *for that would diminiſh too much the Honour due to thoſe holy Spouſes of Chriſt*, as he calls them; but in truth he confeſſes, *the honour of their Church is concerned in it*; *for*, ſaith he, *ſeveral Popes upon diligent Examination have allowed and approved theſe* Revelations, *as* Eugenius *the* 3*d did thoſe of* Hildegardis, *as well as* Boniface *the ninth*, *thoſe of* St. Brigit. For the Argument from the contradiction of theſe Revelations, he knows not how to come off, but by a charge of Forgery on the *Dominican ſide*; and why might not they as well return it on the other? unleſs *Matthias a Suetia*, Confeſſor to St. B*rigit*, were more infallible than *Raimundus*, or thoſe who believed St. *Catharine*.

But this is not the only caſe, wherein theſe *Female* R*evelations*, ſo much approved by the *Church of* Rome are contradictory to each other, in thoſe things whereon the proof of a point of Doctrine depends. For who knows not, to what end the R*evelation* of St. G*regories* delivering the Soul of *Trajan* by his Prayers, is ſo frequently urged? And this is confirmed by a Revelation of St. *Brigit* to that purpoſe; from whence S*almeron* calls it *an unanſwerable Argument*, and *Alphonſus Ciaconius*, publiſhed by the *Popes* Authority, an *Apology* for that R*evelation*. Yet *Baronius* tells us, that St. *Mathildis* had a R*evelation to the contrary*, *and if it were not contradictory to St.* Brigits, *it muſt be contradictory to it ſelf*. And therefore he very fairly rejects them all, but with what Honour to his *Church* (which had before approved them) I can by no means underſtand. And *Bellarmin* to the Revelation of *Mathildis*, (wherein ſhe deſired to know what became of the Souls of S*ampſon*, *Solomon*, *Origen*, and *Trajan*; *and God anſwered her*, *that none ſhould know what he had done with them*) oppoſes *another Revelation* wherein the Soul of *Origen* was ſeen, together with that of *Arius* and *Neſtorius*, in Hell. So infallible are theſe *Revelations*, even when they contradict each other.

Brigittæ Revel. l. 4. c. 13.
Salmeron in 1. ad Cor. 15. diſp. 27. Baron. Annal. A. D. 604. *n.* 5.
Bell. de Purgat. l. 2. c. 8.

How often have *Viſions* and *Apparitions* of Souls been made uſe of, to prove the Doctrine of *Purgatory*? Witneſs the famous Teſtimonies to this purpoſe out of St. *Gregories* Dialogues, and *Bedes Hiſtory*; which latter is at large recited (being very proper for it) in the late *great Legend* publiſhed by Mr. *Creſſey* under the name of a *Church Hiſtory*; who juſtifies the ſubſtance of the Story, as far as it concerns the Doctrine of *Purgatory*; although he doth not think the Perſon really dead, but only in a *Trance*, which is all one to our purpoſe, as long as ſuch Arguments as theſe are made uſe of, to prove matters of Faith by.

Bellar. de Purg. l. 1. c. 7.
Creſſy's *Church Hiſtory*. l. 20. c. 10.

We need not go ſo far back as *Gabriel Biel*, to ſhew that the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* hath been proved by the appearance of *a Child in a Hoſt*; ſuch an Argument hath been lately publiſhed to the World: and Bellarmin reckon up ſeveral to this purpoſe; one, *wherein inſtead of Bread*, *was ſeen real* Fleſh; and another, *wherein Chriſt was ſeen in the form of a Child*. Which are well attended with St. *Anthony of* Padua's *Horſe*, which would never have left his Provender to worſhip the *Hoſt*, unleſs he had ſeen ſome notable ſight there.

Biel in Canon Miſſæ lect. 51. Bellar. de Sacram. Euchar. l. 3. c. 8.

And he very doughtily proves *Auricular Confeſſion*, *by a certain Viſion of a tall and terrible Man with his Book in his Hand*; *which blotted*

blotted out preſently all the ſins which the humble Thief confeſſed upon his Knees to the Prieſt: but he hath not proved, that terrible Man did not repreſent the *Devil*, who by that Ceremony might ſhew, that he turned over the keeping of his Books of *Accompts* to the *Prieſt*, who upon Confeſſion, might tell Mens Sins, as well as he could do without.

Feſtivals appointed on the credit of Revelations.

Legatio de Concep. V. Mariæ. Sect. 3. n. 42. p. 371.

But they have not only attempted to prove matters of Doctrine, by theſe things; but things have been defined in the *Church*, meerly upon the *credit of private Revelations.* So the *Spaniſh Ambaſſador* urges the *Pope* ſmartly upon the Revelations of St. *Brigit*, *That there were many of his Predeceſſors that had determin'd more things in the Church, partly relying upon private* Revelations *therein, whoſe Authority was not greater than hers were.* Pius I. he ſaith, *determined the Controverſy of* Eaſterday, *upon the credit of a* Revelation *made to* Hermes. Urban IV. *inſtituted the* Feſtival *of* Corpus Chriſti, *in oppoſition to the denyers of Tranſubſtantiation, upon the Inſtinct and* Revelation *of a certain Woman.* Paul *the Hermite was Canonized for a Saint upon the authority of a Viſion and* Revelation *to* Anthony; *the one of his Soul flying to Heaven, the other of his being there. The* Feaſt *of the Apparition of the Arch-Angel* Michael, *which is conſtantly obſerved in the Church of* Rome, *depended upon a* Revelation *to the Biſhop of* Siponto, *and a few Drovers upon the Mountain* Garganus. Theſe are things briefly touched by the *Ambaſſador*; but it will not be amiſs, to give a more particular account of thoſe Inſtances which concern the *Inſtitution* of *Feſtival Solemnities*; by which it will appear, that they are F*anatical* even in their *Superſtitions*. Pope *Urban* IV. in the *Bull* ſtill extant for the Celebration of *Corpus Chriſti day*, mentions that as one of the great Reaſons of appointing it; *that while he was in a lower Capacity, he underſtood that a* Revelation *had been made to certain Catholicks, that this* Feaſt *ſhould be obſerved in the Church.* This which is only intimated here, is at large explained by *Joh. Dieſtemius* Blerus, *prior of* St. *James* in *Liege*, where theſe things happened. "In an *Hoſpital* hard by the Town, he tells us, there was a famous *Virgin* called *Juliana*, which had many Extaſies and Raptures, and ſo Prophetical a Spirit as to diſcern the Thoughts and Intentions of her Neighbours hearts; ſhe wreſtled with Devils, and diſcourſed with the Apoſtles, and wrought many Miracles. But one thing peculiar to her was, that in her Prayers ſhe almoſt always ſaw the Moon in her Brightneſs, but with a ſnip taken off from her Roundneſs: at which ſhe was much troubled, but by no means could get it out of her Phancy. At laſt *God* was pleaſed to reveal to her, that the Moon ſignified the preſent Church, and that Fraction the want of one Solemnity more to be obſerved in it: upon which ſhe received a Command from Heaven, to proclaim the obſervation of this Solemnity. For twenty Years, ſhe prayed that God would excuſe her, and make choice of a more worthy Perſon; but none being found ſhe communicates it to *Johannes de Lauſenna*, and he to *Jacobus de Trecis* then *Arch-deacon* of *Liege*, and afterwards *Urban* IV. But although all the Perſons to whom it was communicated, highly proved it; yet ſhe was not ſatisfied till (*one of her Goſſips*,) named *Iſabella*, after a whole Years praying for it, had the ſame thing revealed to her, with that Circumſtance, that this Feaſt had always been among

Bullar. Rom. Tom. 1. p. 147. Cherubine.

Apud Bzov. Annal. Tom. 13. A. D. 1230. n. 16.

“the ſecrets of the Bleſſed Trinity; but now the time was come, that it ſhould be publiſhed to the World; and ſhe, in one of her extaſies ſaw very diſtinctly all the heavenly orders upon their faces, ſupplicating God, that to confirm the Faith of Chriſtians, this day might be ſpeedily obſerved. This *Iſabella* was ſo much intoxicated by this Viſion, ſaith the Author, that out of the abundance of her ſpiritual drunkeneſs (they are his own words) ſhe declared ſhe would promote the obſerving this Feaſt, although the whole World ſhould oppoſe her. Which (we may well think) *Juliana* rejoyced to hear; and hence forwards, they joyned counſels to advance this ſolemnity. *Juliana* gets an ignorant young Prieſt, to draw up an Office for it; and while he writ, ſhe prayed, by which the Office was ſo well compoſed, that it would melt (ſaith he) the hardeſt hearts into Devotion: And when it was ſeen by Divines, they ſaid it was not written by Man, but inſpired by God himſelf. And yet when Pope *Urban* publiſhed his Bull, upon the credit of theſe Revelations, for the Celebration of this Feaſt, he appointed *Thomas Aquinas* to compoſe an Office for it, and rejected that Divine Office of *Juliana*. The Epiſtle of *Urban* to *Eva*, one of the *Nuns* of *Liege*, and a Companion of the two Virgins, is ſtill extant in *Dieſtemius*, and *Binius* about the Inſtitution of this *Feaſt* of *Corpus Chriſti*. And that this was the occaſion of this Feſtival, is not delivered alone by *Dieſtemius*, but by *Arnoldus Boſtius* and *Petrus Præmonſtratenſis*, by *Vignier* and *Molanus*, (as *Bianus* confeſſeth of this laſt,) who can no more be ſuſpected of partiality in this caſe than *Dieſtemius*; but we need no other evidence than the *Popes* own *Bull*. The Story of the other is remarkable too, for it is read conſtantly in the *Roman Breviary*, upon the eighth of *May*. *It came to paſs that among the Droves of Cattle, the Bull of a certain Inhabitant wandred from the reſt, which having long ſought for, they found in the entrance of a Cave. And when one ſhot an Arrow at him to deſtroy him, the Arrow was driven back again to him that ſhot it. Which thing ſo affrighted them all, that they durſt not come near the Cave;* the Sipontines *conſult their Biſhop, who appointed three days faſting and prayer to ſeek God in the caſe; after the three days, the Arch-angel* Gabriel *admoniſheth the Biſhop, that place was in his cuſtody, and by that act he ſhewed that they ought to worſhip God there, in remembrance of him and his fellow Angels. The Biſhop and People go accordingly thither, and they find the place already formed into the faſhion of a Temple, and there they perform Divine Offices, where many Miracles were afterwards wrought. Not long after, Pope* Boniface *Dedicated the Church of St.* Michael, *the third of the Calends of* October, *in which the Church celebrates the memory of all Angels, but this day is conſecrated to the Apparition of* Michael *the Arch-angel.* Thus far the fifth and ſixth Leſſons of the preſent *Roman Breviary*; whereby we underſtand what infallible grounds the *Church* of *Rome* proceeds upon, in all her definitions and obſervations.

Breviar. Roman. 8. *Maij p.* 835.

Revelations ſtill owned by them.

§. 5. And is it not a hard caſe now, we ſhould be ſo often told of *Fanaticiſm* among us, by the Members of the *Roman Church*? Where are the Viſions and Revelations ever pleaded by us in any matter of *Doctrine*? Did we ever diſcard any of the *Roman Opinions*, or Practice upon the account of *Revelations*, made to Women, or to any private Perſons? Do we reſolve the grounds of any Doctrine of ours, into any Viſions and Extaſies? have we any *Feſtivals* kept upon ſuch occaſions? Do we collect *Fanatical* Revelations, and ſet them out with comments upon them, as *Gonſalvus Durantus* hath done thoſe of St. *Brigitt*? Have we any Mother *Juliana*'s among us? Or do we publiſh to the World the *Fanatick* Revelations of *diſtempered Brains*, as Mr. *Creſſy* hath very lately done to the great honour and ſervice of the Roman Church, *the ſixteen* Revelations *of Divine Love ſhewed to a devout ſervant of our Lord* (and Lady too) *called Mother* Juliana? We have, we thank God, other ways of imploying our devout retirements, than in reading ſuch fopperies as thoſe are. Excellent Men! that debar the People reading the *Scriptures* in their own Tongue, and inſtead of them put them off with ſuch Fooleries, which deſerve no other Name at the beſt than the *efforts* of *Religious madneſs*. Were we to take an eſtimate of *Chriſtian* Religion from ſuch Raptures and Extaſies, ſuch Viſions and Entertainments as thoſe are, how much muſt we beſool our ſelves to think it *ſenſe*? Did ever *H. N. Jacob Behmen*, or the higheſt *Enthuſiaſts* talk at a more extravagant rate than this *Juliana* doth? As when ſhe ſpeaks of *our being becloſed in the mid-head of God, and in his meak-head, and in his benignity, and in his benignity, and in his buxomneſs, tho' we feel in us wrath, debate, and ſtrife:* Of *being ſubſtantially united to God; and that, God is that goodneſs which may not be wrath, for God is not but goodneſs: our ſoul is owned to him, unchangeable goodneſs; and between God and our ſoul is neither wrath nor forgiveneſs in his ſight, for our ſoul is ſo fulſomely owned to God of his own goodneſs, that between God and our ſoul may be right naught.* That *in Mankind that ſhall be ſaved is comprehended all; that is to ſay, all that is made and the maker of all; for in Man is God, and God is all, and he that loveth thus he loveth all:* That *our ſoul is ſo deep grounded in God, and ſo endleſly treaſured that we may not come to the knowing thereof, till we have firſt knowing of God, which is the Maker to whom it is owned; and therefore if we will have knowing of our ſoul, and commoning, and dalliance therewith, it behooveth to ſeek into our Lord God in whom it is incloſed: and that worſhipful City that our Lord Jeſu ſitteth in, it is our ſenſuality, in which he is incloſed; and our kindly ſubſtance is becloſed in Jeſu with the bleſſed ſoul of Chriſt, reſting in the Godhead: and notwithſtanding all this, we may never come to the full knowing of God till we know firſt clearly our own ſoul; for into the time that it is in the full mights, we may not be all holy, and that is, that our ſenſuality by the virtue of Chriſt's paſſion be brought up into the ſubſtance, with all the profits of our tribulation, that our Lord ſhall make us to get by mercy and grace. I had in party touching, and it is grounded in kind; that is to ſay, our reaſon is grounded in God which is ſubſtantially kindneſs.* Afterwards ſhe diſcourſeth *of three properties in the Holy Trinity, of the* Fatherhead, *of the Motherhood, and of the Lordſhip; and ſhe further ſaw that the ſecond Perſon which is our Mother ſubſtantially, the ſame dear worthy Perſon is now become our Mother ſenſual; for we be double of God's making, ſubſtantial and ſenſual.* We may juſtly admire, what eſteem Mr. *Creſſy* had of that *Lady*, to whoſe devout retirements he ſo gravely commends the blaſphemous and ſenſleſs tittle tattle of this *Hiſtorical* Goſſip. It were endleſs to repeat the Canting and Enthuſiaſtick Expreſſions, which

16 *Revelations of divine love*, *Ch.* 49. p. 112. *Ch.* 5. p. 12. *Ch.* 46. p. 105.

Ch. 9 p. 24.

Ch. 56. p. 144.

P. 145.

Ch. 58. *l.* 151.

ſignifie nothing in Mother *Juliana*'s Revelations; and one would wonder to what end ſuch a Book were publiſhed among us, unleſs it were to convince us of this great truth, that we have not had ſo great *Fanaticks* and *Enthuſiaſts* among us, but they have had greater in the *Roman Church.* And by this means they may think to prevail upon the *Fanaticks* among us, by perſwading them, that they have been ſtrangely miſtaken concerning the *Church of Rome*, in theſe matters; that ſhe is no ſuch Enemy to *Enthuſiaſms* and *Revelations*, as ſome believe; but that in truth ſhe hath not only always had ſuch, but given great *approbation* and *encouragement* to them. So that among all their Viſions they do but mix ſome that confirm their particular Doctrines; as the *Viſions* of *Juliana* concerning *the great Worſhip of the Bleſſed Virgin from her Son, the holy Vernacle at* Rome, and ſuch like *fopperies*; theſe make all the reſt very acceptable among them.

The Monaſtick orders founded on Enthuſiaſm

§. 6. 2. That which they account the *moſt perfect way of life*, hath been inſtituted by *Enthuſiaſtick Perſons*, and upon the credit of *Viſions* and *Revelations*; and the higheſt way of Devotion in that Church, is meer Enthuſiaſm.

1. That the *Religious Orders* were inſtituted among them by *Enthuſiaſtick Perſons*, upon the credit of their *Viſions* and *Revelations.* The moſt Celebrated Orders at this day in the *Roman* Church are the *Benedictines*, *Carthuſians*, *Dominicans*, *Franciſcans*, and *Jeſuits*, and if I can prove this concerning each of theſe, we ſhall ſee how much *Fanaticiſm* hath contributed to the ſupport of the *Roman Church.* And it is a very fair way towards the proof of it, that Bellarmin confeſſeth concerning the four firſt, and that of *Romoaldus*, *that they were at firſt inſtituted by St.* Benedict, *St.* Romoaldus, *St.* Bruno, *St.* Dominick, *St.* Francis, *by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*; and for *Ignatius Loyola*, if he do not appear as great a *Fanatick* as ever hath been in the World, we ſhall be contented to be upbraided with the charge of *Fanaticiſm* among us. It is obſervable in the life of St. B*enedict*, as St. Gr*egory* relates in the ſecond Book of his *Dialogues*, that he was a great hater of humane learning; and that was the firſt occaſion of his retiring from the World, being very much afraid a little knowledge ſhould have deſtroyed him. He therefore forſook, not only his Studies, but his Father's Houſe and Buſineſs; being as St. Gr*egory* ſaith, *knowingly ignorant, and wiſely unlearned:* he might as well have ſaid ignorantly learned, and fooliſhly wiſe. One might have ſuſpected, it had been rather hatred of his Book than Devotion, at his Age, which made him run away from School, and his Father's Houſe; but one of his Viſions in his Cave, makes it more probable there was ſome other occaſion of it. But however, away he goes, and only an old *Nurſe* with him, and he requited her ſoon for it, for he by his Prayers ſet together the winnowing ſieve which ſhe had broken in pieces, which was after hanged up before the Doors of the *Church* to the *Lombards* times. But this is nothing to his being three Years in a *Cave* without the knowledge of any but S. *Roman*, who let him down Victuals by a Rope and a B*ell*; and the *Devil* owing him a great ſpight, threw a huge Stone and broke the Bell. Here he lay ſo cloſe, that he was fain to be diſcovered by a Viſion; and was ſo devout, that he had forgotten *Eaſter-day*, till he was put in mind of it by a Perſon, who

Bellarm. de Pontif. Rom. l. 3. c. 18.

Gregor. Dial. l. 2.

by a Viſion was ſent to him: And was ſo little like a Man, that the Shepherds took him for a *Beaſt* lying in a Den. But at laſt he is brought to light, and found to be a wonderful Perſon; (for among ſuperſtitious People, Ignorance and Devotion are moſt admired together) and now many are ſent to him for Education; having conquered his amorous Paſſions, by rowling himſelf naked among Thorns and Nettles; which Thorns, a long time after, St. *Francis* grafted Roſes upon, (as *Bollandus* well obſerves) which bear in the coldeſt Part of Winter, and of them *Roſe-water* is made, which is ſent as a Preſent to the *greateſt Princes*. He had an admirable Sagacity in ſpying *Devils*: For he ſaw a little *black Devil*, which led away a *Monk* from Prayers; and was fain to pray two days with *Pompeianus* and *Maurus*, that God would afford them the Grace to ſee him too: And at laſt *Maurus* being young, and his ſight good, ſaw him; but *Pompeianus* being older and wiſer, could not. However, St. *Bennet* ſent the *little Devil* packing with a Stroke of his Rod; as he did at other times with the Sign of the Croſs; and eaſily cauſed a Stone to be lifted up whereon the Devil ſate, which could not be ſtirred before his coming. It would take up too much time to tell of his Miracles; my Buſineſs is only with his *Viſions* and *Revelations*, by which he could not only foretel things to come, but could diſcover abſent things; ſo that the *Monks* could not eat out of his ſight, but he could tell as well as if he ſaw the Meat in their Teeth, when they denyed it. He diſcovered *Riggo*'s Fraud, when he came to him in *Totila*'s Habit; and told *Totilas* how long he ſhould reign; nay, if we believe St. *Gregory*, he knew the *Secrets* of the *Divinity*, being one *Spirit* with God: No wonder then the unhappy Boy could not hide one Flaſk of Wine, nor the *Monks* receive Handkerchiefs of the Women, but he found it out: But admirable was his Sight of his Siſter *Scholaſtica*'s Soul, entring into Heaven in the Shape of a Dove: And another time of the Soul of *Germanus* *Biſhop* of *Capua*, in a fiery Circle carryed by *Angels* to Heaven: And above all, was his ſeeing all the World under one Ray of the *Sun*; which he could not do, *Gregory* concludes without a Divine internal Light; upon which a Diſpute hath been raiſed in the Schools, whether St. *Benedict* ſaw the *Divine Eſſence* or no? *Aquinas* thinks not, but only that he had an extraordinary Revelation; *Vaſquez* doth not ſeem much to oppoſe it, but upon two grounds; the one very conſiderable, that we never read the *Virgin Mary* did it, who ought to have the higheſt Share in Revelations and Viſions: The other only a plain Place of *Scripture*; *no Man hath ſeen God at any time; the only begotten Son of the Father he hath revealed him*: As though that were intended to exclude St. *Benedict*, and other Founders of *Religious Orders*, and not rather the *Patriarchs*, *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* who came not near them in *Viſions* and *Miracles*. But no one hath handled this profound Queſtion, with that Care and Accuracy which *Angelus de Nuce* hath done in his *Notes* upon St. *Gregory*'s Life of St. *Benedict*: He tells us therefore, the *Queſtion* is not concerning the higheſt ſort of abſtractive Contemplation of any thing ſhort of the Divine Eſſence, for that, he ſaith, none doubt of; but of an *intuitive Viſion*, by which the Divine Eſſence is ſeen clearly in it ſelf immediately, and not in any created Image: the *Negative*

Bollandi Acta Sanctorum Martii. 21. not. invit. Bened. c. 1.

c. 4.

c. 9.

c. 12. 13.

c. 14. 15.

c. 16.

c. 18. 19.

c. 34.

c. 35.

Poſſevin. Appar. v. S. Benedict. Aquin. Sum: 2. 2. qu. 180. art. 5. ad 3. Vaſquez in 1, 2. diſp. 56. n. 5.

Joh. 1. 18.

Chronicon. Monaſt. Caſſinenſ. p. 65. Lut. Pariſ. 1668.

he grants is held by *Aquinas*, and many of the *School-men*; but yet he ſaith, many School-men of great note are for the *affirmative*; and he deduces many Arguments to prove it, from St. *Gregory's* Words: But that which adds moſt Weight to it, beſides the Number of Authors quoted by him, is that *Urban* VIII. in a Bull upon the Feaſt of St. *Benedict*, A. D. 1632. doth expreſly aſſert it. And *John Bona*, a preſent *Cardinal* at *Rome*, ſaith, *that St.* Benedict *was rapt up into the third Heavens, where he heard the Chore of Angels, and ſaw God Face to Face:* For which, beſides *Gregory*, he cites St. *Bernard*, *Rupertus Tuitienſis*, *Bonaventure*, *Dionyſius Carthuſianus*, *Maximilian Sandæus*, and others. And adds to this as extraordinary a thing as any hath been yet ſaid of him, *that he and his Siſter* Scholaſtica *ſung very diſtinctly in their Mothers Wombs*; *a Preſage* (ſaith he) *of the cheerful ſinging of their Orders.* For which he quotes ſeveral Authors of the *Benedictines*; and although he grants it may be ſuſpected, becauſe it doth not occur in the more ancient Writers; yet he juſtifies it by many parallel Stories. Theſe things are enough for St. *Benedict's Enthuſiaſm.* St. *Romoaldus* was as happy as St. *Benedict*, in his Ignorance. For, as *Petrus Damiani* reports in his Life, when he firſt entred himſelf under the Diſcipline of *Marinus* the *Eremite*, he could hardly read his *Pſalter*; though he had been a *Monk* three Years before; and he adds it as a great Inſtance of his Patience, that when *Marinus* in teaching him, did often beat him with a Wand upon the left ſide of his Head, for his Dulneſs, he deſired his Maſter that he would now change his ſide, for he had by his Strokes quite loſt his Hearing in his left Ear: And yet he met with a worſe Companion than *Marinus*; for, for five Years together, he ſaith the *Devil* lay upon his Feet and his Leggs in the Night, that he could not eaſily ſtir himſelf. He was ſo poſſeſſed with the Thoughts of him, that a *Monk* could not knock at his Cell Door, but he aſked the *Devil* what he did there in the Wilderneſs? And was ready to encounter with the *Devil*, when he found him to be one of his *Brethren*. But the *Devil* once got him down (as he imagined) while he was ſaying his *Pſalms*, and wounded him and bruiſed him ſadly; but of a ſudden he roſe up as ſound as ever, and went on juſt where he left. All the Crows and ugly Birds he ſaw in the Wilderneſs, he fancied to be *Devils*, and challenged to fight with them; and exceedingly triumphed when at his loud Cries they fled away. He was converted by a *Viſion* of St. *Apollinaris*, as his Father *Sergius* ran ſtark mad with a Viſion of the *Holy Ghoſt*; he wept ſo abundantly that he never durſt ſay *Maſs* in publick, and bid his Brethren have a Care of ſhedding too many Tears, becauſe they hurt the Sight and the Brain. Yet, by immediate Revelation, he writ an excellent Commentary, ſaith *Mugnotius*, on the Book of *Pſalms*; though not very agreeable to *Grammar*, ſaith *Petrus Damiani*; and being led by the Divine Spirit to the top of a Mountain, in his Sleep he ſaw Ladders reaching from thence to Heaven, and a great many Monks going up to Heaven upon them. A divine Viſion indeed! And he meeting with *Maldulus*, who by great Fortune had the ſame Viſion, they preſently agreed about erecting a *Monaſtery* there: If the Order of *Carthuſians* did not begin, upon the Story of the *Doctor* of *Paris* ſpeaking thoſe dreadful Words after his Death, which is delivered, ſay the Defenders

Joh. Bona de divinâ Pſalmodiâ. cap. 18. ſ. 3.

Petri Damiani vit. St. Romoaldi cap. 4.

cap. 7.

cap. 16.

cap 17.

c. 2.

c. 14.

c. 31.

Andreas Mugnotius de Eremo Camaldulenſi. lib. 1. Pet. Damiani vit. S. Romualdi c. 50.

ders of it, by *ſixty Authors of the Roman Church*; yet it is agreed on all hands among them, that *Hugo*, who joined with *Bruno* in laying the Foundations of that Order, *had a Viſion of God's building a Houſe of ſeven Stars conducting them* to the Place called *la grand Chartreuſe*, from whence the whole Order hath taken its Name. The *Carmelites* have an eſpecial Viſion of *Simon Stock*, wherein the *bleſſed Virgin*, upon his devout Prayers to her, appeared with the Habit in her Hand, which ſhe would have them wear, with a Promiſe greater than ever her Son made, that *whoſoever dyed in that Habit, ſhould not periſh by everlaſting Flames.*

Launoy de verâ cauſâ ſeceſſus Brunonis in Eremum. c. 5. p. 165.
Launoy ib. p. 32, 69. 71. &c.
Launoy de viſo Simonis Stockii. cap. 1.

The Franciſcan *and* Dominican *Orders founded in* Fanaticiſm.

§. 7. But St. *Francis* and St. *Dominick*, were the Perſons whom *Innocent* III. ſaw in a Viſion, ſupporting the tottering *Fabrick*, of the *Lateran Church*; whereby he underſtood what Props and Supporters thoſe two Orders would be to the *Church* of *Rome*. From hence thoſe high *Elogiums* are given of thoſe two Perſons, by *Bonaventure*, *Antonius*, *Bezovius* and others, that they were the *two great Lights of Heaven*, *the two Trumpets of Moſes*, *the two Cherubims* (or *rather the two Calves of Dan and Bethel*) *the two Breaſts of the Spouſe*, *the two Olive Branches*, *the two Candleſticks*, *the two Witneſſes*; almoſt all the noted *two's* of the Bible, but the *two Thieves*, and *the two Teſtaments*; and theſe, as will appear preſently, were in no great Eſteem among them. But St. *Francis* got the ſtart of the other; for (if a *Canonized Saint* may be believed upon his Oath) *Bonaventure* did publickly ſwear at *Paris*, ſaith *Bernardinus à Buſtis*, that *Chriſt did reveal to him, that St.* John (Apocalypſ. 7. 2.) *by the Angel aſcending from the Eaſt having the Seal of the living God, meant no other than St.* Francis. And therefore that is the *Motto* placed under his Picture; and is applied the ſame way by *Pope Leo X.* I ſhall not take the Advantage, that is ſufficiently given us by the Book of *Conformities*, the *Alcoran of the Franciſcans*, and by the declared Enemies of thoſe Orders, to repreſent St. *Francis* by; but only take the Account given of him by Perſons of the greateſt Reputation in the *Roman Church*, *Cardinal Vitriaco*, who ſaith he ſaw him when he went to *Damiata*, calls him, *a ſimple and illiterate Man*. *Cardinal Bonaventure* is received as the moſt approved Writer of his Life; and he deſcribes him as an *ignorant Enthuſiaſt*; being bred a kind of a *Woolendraper*, as appears by the ſelling his Cloth and his Horſe at *Foligno*, after he left off trading upon the Viſion of building Churches. His firſt Converſion to *Quakeriſm* was by *Dreams and Viſions*, in which he was ſometimes *ſwallowed up in God*, as Bonaventure's Expreſſion is, *and his Soul melted at the Sight of Chriſt*; *and was ſo tender hearted to the poor, that he ſometimes put off his Cloathes to give them, ſometimes unript them, ſometimes cut them in pieces*, I ſuppoſe that he might give to the more. *All this while, he had no Teacher but Chriſt, and learnt all by Inſpiration; but went beſides himſelf at hearing the Voice come from a Crucifix* (as any one almoſt would have done) and it ſeems he was not well recovered when he came from the Cave; *for the People flocked about him as a mad Man, and gave him the common Civility to ſuch Perſons of Dirt and Stones*: And his *Father* entertained him with *dark Rooms* and *Chains*, as the fitteſt for him, whom neither Words nor Blows could bring to himſelf. But finding no Amendment, he made him renounce his Patrimony, and ſo diſchar-

Rainald. Annal. Eccleſ. A.D. 1215. n. 7.
Bonavent. vit. Franciſci. c. 3. Sect. 8.
Sedulius in Elogiis St. Franc.
Bernard à Buſtis Roſar. p. 2. ſerm. 27.
Sedul. 16.
Jac. de Vitriaco Hiſt. Occident. c. 32.
Rainald. A. 1219. n. 14.
Bonav. vit. Franciſ. c. 2.
cap. 1. ſect. 6.
cap. 2. ſect. 1.
ſect. 2.

diſcharged him; which St. *Francis* did ſo readily, that he would not ſo much as keep the Cloathes on his back: Whereby ſaith *Bonaventure*, in a wonderful Zeal, and being *drunk in the Spirit*, caſting away his very Breeches, and being ſtark naked before them all, ſaid thus to his Father, *hitherto I called thee* Father *on Earth*; *but henceforward I can ſecurely ſay*, *Our* Father *which art in Heaven.* As though his Duty to *God* and his *Parents*, had been inconſiſtent.

S.ſect. 4.
Brev. Roman. 4. Octob. Lect 4.

The *Biſhop*, in whoſe preſence all this was done, gave order to have his Nakedneſs covered, highly admiring his Zeal; and he no ſooner had got ſome Rags about him, but he falls *to making Crucifixes in Mortar with his own Hands*, as Children do Babies in the Dirt. In this height of F*anaticiſm* he goes about, and preaches to the *People*, *whoſe Words pierced their Hearts*, much ſooner than Senſe and Reaſon would have done; and he ſoon brought the ſuperſtitious and ignorant Multitude, to a great Admiration of him; for his very way of ſaluting the People he pretended, *he had by Revelation*; and as our *Quakers* keep on their Hats, ſo he might put his off by the Spirit. At laſt one *Bernard* joyns with him, but St. F*rancis* tells him, *They muſt ſeek God for Direction what to do*; and after Prayers, *he being a great worſhipper of the Trinity, in honour to it opens the Goſpel three times, and the firſt three Sentences he met with, were to be the Rule of their Order:* Their ſecond Brother was F. *Gyles*, *who though an Ideot and a ſimple Man, was full of God*, as he ſaith, *and had ſo many extaſies and raptures, that he ſeemed to live rather among Angels than Men.* One day when St. F*rancis* was alone in a ſolitary Place, *he fell into an Extaſy of Joy, and had full Aſſurance of the Remiſſion of his Sins, and being tranſported beyond himſelf, he was catched up into a wonderful Light, wherein his Mind being enlarged, he foreſaw all that ſhould come to paſs concerning his Order.* His Number being encreaſed, to Rome he goes, to confirm his *Order*; the *Pope* rejected him with ſcorn, *but in the Night he ſaw a Palm growing between his Feet into a goodly Tree*, which he wiſely interpreting to be St. F*rancis*, ſent for him, and promiſed him fair things; and upon the other *Viſion* of his ſupporting the *Lateran Church*, he approves his Rule, and eſtabliſhes his *Order.* And his whole Life afterwards was agreeable to this beginning: And the Rule of his Order he called, as *Poſſevine* tells us, *The Book of Life, the Hope of Salvation, the Marrow of the Goſpel, the Ladder of Heaven, the Key of Paradiſe, the eternal Covenant.* Let any F*anaticks* be produced among us, (though we are far from looking on them as *the Supporters of our Church*) who have exceeded St. F*rancis*, in their Actions, or Expreſſions. St. *Brigit* ſaith the Rule of St. F*rancis*, *that it was not dictated or compoſed by the Wiſdom of Man, but by God himſelf, nay, every Word therein, was inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, which* ſhe ſaith likewiſe *of all the other* Rules *of* Religious *Orders.* What horrible Blaſphemy is this, which is ſo ſolemnly approved in the *Church* of Rome for *Divine* Revelations? But leaſt *Dominicus* ſhould ſeem to come behind St. F*rancis* in *Viſions*, he tells him at Rome where they met, *That it was revealed to him in a Viſion, that Chriſt was juſt coming to deſtroy the World for the Wickedneſs of it; and his Mother ſtopt him, and told him ſhe had two Servants would reform it, whereof himſelf was one, and Chriſt approved of him, as one that would do his*

Cap. 3. ſect 1.
Sect. 2.
ſect. 3.
ſect. 5.
ſect 7.
Poſſevin. Appar. v. Franciſcus
Brigittæ Revel. l. 7. c. 20. p. 559. Col. 1.
Rainald. A.D. 1216 n. 48.

his Work; but his Companion he did not know till he met St. Francis, *and ſo they embraced one another.* Which Viſion out of his great Humility St. *Francis* reported, having it from the others own Mouth. I ſhall not inſiſt on any more of *Dominicus*; nor on the blaſphemous Images ſet up in St. *Mark*'s *Church* of *Venice*, one of which was of St. *Paul*, with this Inſcription, *By him we go to Chriſt*; the other of *Dominicus*, with this, *but by him we go eaſier to Chriſt*; but I ſhall proceed to their followers, among whom we meet with one of the moſt blaſphemous pieces of *Enthuſiaſm* the World hath ever known.

Wolfii Lection. Memorab. cent. 13. p. 509.

§. 8. For which we are to underſtand, that in the beginning of the thirteenth *Century*, one *Almaricus*, a Student in *Paris*, was ſuſpected for ſome dangerous Opinions, for which he was ſentenced to recant; and ſoon after dyed. Among theſe Opinions he broached this Blaſphemy, which was privately inſtilled into his followers; *That every Perſon of the Trinity had his ſucceſſive Time of ruling the World; that the Law of the Father continued till Chriſt's coming; the Law of the Son to their time; and then the time of the Holy Ghoſt was to begin. In which the Uſe of Sacraments was to ceaſe, and all internal Adminiſtrations; and every one then was to be ſaved by the Inſpiration and inward Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, without any external Actions. They ſo highly extolled Love, that what would have been a Sin without it, they thought to be nothing with it; as Fornication, Adultery,* &c. *and promiſed Impunity to the Women with whom they committed theſe things, becauſe they ſaid God was only good and not juſt.* That theſe were their Opinions, is delivered by *Rigordus* who lived iu that Age, and was upon the Place, being a *Monk* of St. *Denys*, and *Phyſician* to the *King of France*; and by *Emericus* and *Pegna*, and many others. But by the care and endeavour of the *Biſhop* and *Univerſity* of *Paris*, though they had ſpread very far abroad, and with a great deal of Secrecy, yet by the Fraud and Artifice of one employed among them, who pretended to *Revelations* and the *Spirit* as highly as they could do, they were convicted, condemned, and ſome of them executed. Notwithſtanding which Severity, about fifty Years after this, came forth a Book with the Title of *Evangelium æternum*, or the *Eternal Goſpel* publiſhed by the *Mendicant Fryers*, and ſuppoſed to be written by *Johannes de Parma* about *A. D.* 1254. who was *General* of the *Franciſcan Order*, but the Book was received and defended by both Orders, as will preſently appear. But it will be firſt neceſſary to conſider what the Doctrines are, which are contained in this Book; and if ever there were higher *Fanaticiſm* than is herein, or rather greater *Blaſphemies*, let them leave to triumph. The moſt perfect Account we have of it, is from *Nicholas Eymericus*, who was himſelf an Inquiſitor, and tell us theſe Hereſies or Errors are contained in it.

The blaſphemous Enthuſiaſm of the mendicant Fryers.

Nancler. Chronog. Vol. 2. Gen. 40. p. 900. Spondani Annales Eccleſ. A. D. 1204. n. 17. Bellarm. Chronol. ad A. D. 1209. Cæſar. Bulæus in Hiſtor. Univerſ. Pariſ. Tom. 3. p. 49. Rigordus in vita Philip. Auguſt. A. D. 1209. Eymmeric. Di-rect. Inquiſit. p. 2. a. 7. Franciſc. Pegna. Not. in Direct. p. 1. pag. 6

That the Doctrine of *Abbot Joachim* (a great *Fanatick*) excelled the Doctrine of *Chriſt*, and conſequently the New and Old Teſtament.

2. That the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* is not the *Goſpel* of the *Kingdom*, and therefore is not edifying.

3. That the New *Teſtament* is to be evacuated or loſe its Force, as the Old hath already.

Eymeric. Direct. Inquiſit. p. 2. Bulæi Hiſt. Univerſit. verſit. Pariſ. To. 3. ſ. 5. p. 330.

4. That the New *Teſtament* ſhall not remain in Force above ſix Years longer; *viz.* to *A. D.* 1260.

5. That they which ſhall live beyond that time, ſhall be in the *State of Perfection.*

6. That the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* ſhall give way to another *Goſpel*, and ſo inſtead of the *Prieſthood of Chriſt*, another *Goſpel* ſhall ſucceed.

7. That no ſimple Man is fit to inſtruct Men in ſpiritual and eternal things, but they that *walk bare foot.*

8. That although God afflict the *Jews* in this World, yet he will ſave them, though they remain in *Judaiſm*; and will in the end deliver them from all the Oppoſition of Men, remaining ſuch as they are.

9. That the *Church* hath not yet brought forth *Children*, nor will do, before the End of the temporal Reign, which ſhall be after ſix Years; and by this we are to underſtand, that the *Chriſtian Religion*, which hath brought forth many called to the Faith of Chriſt, is not the Church.

10. That the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* brings no Man to *perfection.*

11. That the *Goſpel* of the *Holy Ghoſt* coming, or *Joachims* Work obtained (called the *Everlaſting Goſpel*, or of the *Holy Ghoſt*) the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* ſhall be done away.

12. That no Man in *Religious Orders* is bound to expoſe his Life for defence of the Faith, or preſerving the Worſhip of Chriſt, but other Men are.

13. That as when *John Baptiſt* came, the things that were before muſt needs be confuted, becauſe of new things coming in their Places; ſo when the time of the *Holy Ghoſt* ſhall come, or the third State of the World, the things that were before muſt be confuted, for the ſake of the *New* which are to come; from whence it muſt be underſtood, that the *New Teſtament* muſt be refuted, and the Old caſt away.

14. That *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* were not perfect in the contemplative Life.

15. That the *Order* of the *Clergy* ſhall periſh; but one of a *Religious Order* ſhall be preferred above all in Dignity and Honour; and that as the Authority under the *Father* was committed to one of the married Order, ſo under the *Holy Ghoſt* to one or ſome of the Order of *Monks.*

16. That thoſe who are over the *Colledges* of *Monks*, ought in thoſe Days to think of departing from the *Seculars*, and prepare themſelves to return to the ancient People of the *Jews.*

17. That the Preachers which ſhall be in the *laſt State* of the World, ſhall be of greater Dignity and Authority, than the Preachers of the *Primitive Church.*

18. That the *Preachers* and *Doctors* of *Religious Orders*, when they ſhall be infeſted by the *Clergy*, ſhall go over to the *Infidels*; and it is to be feared, leſt they go thither for that End, to bring them in battel againſt the *Roman Church*, according to the Doctrine of St. *John*, *Apocalypſ.* 15.

Theſe may ſuffice out of Twenty ſeven, to let the World know, where the heighth of Blaſphemy and Fanaticiſm was firſt hatched; and no one could imagine, that any who had the Face or Name of *Chriſtians* ſhould own theſe things; yet they came from thoſe excellent and inſpired Perſons of the newly founded *Religious Orders*. And if it had not been for the mortal Hatred that then was between the Univerſity of *Paris*, and the *mendicant Fryers* (who uſurped the *Profeſſors* places in the *Univerſity* againſt their Will) God knows how far this Doctrine might have prevailed without the leaſt Cenſure. For the Popes were extreamly partial to the *Fryers*, and would hear no ill of them; they now finding them their moſt uſeful Inſtruments in all their quarrels with Princes, the ſecular Clergy and the People. So *Matth. Paris* relating the ſtory of the Quarrels between the Univerſity and the *Fryers*, tells, *That though the King and the City were for preſerving the Priviledges of the Univerſity; yet the* Fryers *being at the Popes Devotion, and doing them a great deal of Service, were more acceptable in the Court of* Rome, *and therefore got the better of the Univerſity.* Nay, ſo zealous was *Alexander* the Fourth, in the Cauſe of the *Fryers* againſt the *Univerſity*, that in the ſix Years of his Popedom, he ſent out near *forty Bulls* againſt the *Univerſity*, of which not one now appears in the *Bullarium*: But moſt of them are preſerved in that accurate Preface, before the Works of *Gul. de Sancto Amore*, the zealous Defender of the *Univerſity* againſt the Encroachments of the *Fryers*, and in the late Hiſtory of the *Univerſity* of *Paris*. In the midſt of theſe Heats, ſome Intimation was given the *Divines* of the *Univerſity*, of ſuch a Book, which was in great Eſteem among the *Fryers*, called *Evangelium æternum*, wherein were very dangerous Doctrines, *which were* (ſaith *Matthew Paris*) *preached, read and taught by the* Fryers: *and were put together by them in a* Book *called* Evangelium æternum, *and taken* (ſaith he) *chiefly out of the* Books *of Abbot* Joachim; *and Richerius* acknowledgeth, *that the Book was compoſed by the* Fryers, *and that the Divines of* Paris *by ſome Art got a Copy of it*, and extracted ſome Heads out of it, *which were contrary to* Faith: And upon that (as *Du Boulz* ſaith) *they cauſed it to be burnt publickly at* Paris. But not being ſatisfied therewith, they preached againſt it, as appears by a *Sermon* of *Gul. de Sancto Amore*, at the end of his Works; wherein he ſaith, *That he had ſeen no ſmall part of that* Book, *and he had heard, that it doth in all contain more than the* Bible; *and therein*, he ſaith, *it is taught that the Sacraments of the Church are nothing, that the Goſpel of Chriſt is not the true* Goſpel; *and that the* Book *it ſelf is the* Goſpel *of the Holy Ghoſt; and the everlaſting* Goſpel; *and that the* Goſpel *of Chriſt ſhould be preached but for five Years to come; that then Men ſhall have another Rule of Life, and the Church ſhall be otherwiſe managed. Which*, ſaith he, *is execrable and abominable to be ſpoken.* but not content with bare preaching againſt them, he writ a very ſmart Book in the name of the *Univerſity* of *Paris*, *De periculo noviſſimorum temporum, of the Dangers of the laſt Times*; wherein he doth at large ſet forth *the Hypocriſie, Idleneſs, Flattery, and Baſeneſs of the Fryers*; but coming to ſhew the near approach of the Dangers he mentions, he ſaith, *It is now fifty five Years* (for about that time *Almaric* broached his Doctrine:) *that ſome have endeavoured to change the Goſpel of Chriſt into another Goſpel which they ſaid would be better, more perfect and worthy, which they call the Goſpel of the Holy Ghoſt, or the everlaſting Goſpel; which will by its coming turn the Goſpel of Chriſt out of Doors*; as, ſaith he, *we are ready to prove out of that curſed Goſpel*; and a little after he adds, *That this Everlaſting Goſpel was publickly explained at* Paris, A. D. 1254. *from*

Matthew Paris. Hiſt ad A. D. 1255. p. 909.

Oper. Gul. de S. Amore præfat. p. 63.

Buleæ Hiſt. Univerſit. Paris. A, 1255. Tom. 3.

Matthew Paris ibid.

Richerii Chron. Senonenſ. l. 4. c. 37.

Bulæi Hiſt. p. 229.

Gul. de S. Amore oper. p. 500.

Gul. de Amore de petic. noviſ. temp. c. 8. p. 38

Q *whence*

whence it is certain, that it would be preached, unleſs there were ſome other thing which hindred. And afterwards he ſaith, *That in that* Book, *this Everlaſting Goſpel is ſaid to exceed the Goſpel of Chriſt, as much as the Light of the Sun doth that of the Moon, or the Kernel doth the Shell.* This Book of his extreamly incenſed the *Fryers*, and they preſently ſent Informations againſt him to the *Pope*; and by their intereſt got his Book to be condemned, and burnt publickly before the *Pope* and the *Court* at *Anagnia*, and afterwards at *Paris:* to which purpoſe the *Pope* publiſhed a *Bull*, and denounced the ſentence of Excommunication againſt any who ſhould preſume to defend it: and the Writer of it was deprived of his *Eccleſiaſtical Promotions* and baniſhed *France*, as far as the *Popes* Power could do it. All this was done in great haſte before the *Legats* from the *Univerſity* could appear; and when they came, three of them recanted, and returned; only *Gul. de Sancto Amore*, reſolved to ſtand it out, and anſwered all their Objections, and perſiſted ſtill in the Accuſation of that *horrible* Book*:* And at laſt prevailed ſo much, that the P*ope* was fain to condemn the *Evangelium æternum* together with St. *Amours* Book; but it appears how unwillingly he did it; by his Carriage in it, which is related by *Matthew Paris*, for *he condemned the other* Book *ſolemnly, and cauſed the ſentence to be publickly executed; but he gave order that this* Book *ſhould be ſecretly burnt, and as much as might be without any offence to the Fryers.* Lo here the true zeal of the *Head* of the *Church*! A Book only writ againſt the *Mendicant Fryers* is condemned as *impious*, *wicked*, *execrable*, and what not, in the B*ull* againſt it; and a Book againſt *Chriſtian Religion* in the higheſt manner, hardly procured to be condemned; and when it is, with great Fear of diſpleaſing the *Authors* and *Approvers* of it. And ſince that time, they have been very careful to ſuppreſs the leaſt mention of the *latter*, but very forward to ſet forth the other. For in the R*oman* B*ullarium*, the B*ull* againſt St. *Amours* Book is ſet forth at large; but not the leaſt intimation of any ſuch Book condemned as the *Evangelium æternum.* So much dearer to the *Pope* is the honour of *Fryers*, than of *Chriſt* and the *Chriſtian* R*eligion*! And therefore St. *Amour* ſaid well in the Univerſity of *Paris*, before they went, *That it was to no purpoſe to go about to procure the condemning that* Book *at* Rome, *where it had ſo many Favourers*; the Deſign of it being to advance the honour of Religious Orders, though to the overthrow of the Goſpel of *Chriſt*. It is well theſe things were written and preſerved by Writers of their *own Church*, and Perſons of the ſame *Age* (out of whom only I have given account of them) for otherwiſe according to their uſual Method of confuting things which do not pleaſe them, they would be denyed with a mighty Confidence, and the World ſhould be told, that theſe are only the *Lies* and *Forgeries* of *Hereticks*. But theſe are to their ſhame preſerved in their own Books, and we can ſhew them the very words, if occaſion requires it.

Chronicon. Nichol. Trivetti ad A.D. 1256

Matthew. Paris. A. D. 1257. p. 939.

Bullar. Rom. Tom. 1. Alex. 4. Bull. 8. p. 137.

Bul. ep. p. 330.

The Fanaticiſm of Franciſcans afterwards.

§. 9. Yet we are not to think, that only the preaching Fryers fell into theſe Extravagancies; for the *Franciſcans* had a great hand in them too, and were as forward to promote that which they accounted their common Intereſt. And notwithſtanding the Popes condemning the Book, ſaid to be taken out of *Abbot Joachims* Writings, yet his Doctrine did in no long time after break forth again in the *Franciſcan* Order. For toward the latter end of the ſame Century, or as moſt think, in the beginning of the next, in the time of *Clement* V. appeared one *Petrus Johannis de Oliva* a great Diſciple of *Joachims*, as *Guido Carmelita*, *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, and *Franciſcus Pegna* affirm. All the difference ſaith *Alphonſus*, between them was, that *Joachim* made the *ſpiritual State* to commence from the founding the *Benedictine* Order, but *Petrus Johannis* would have it begin only from St. *Francis*: Which *State*, as *Eymericus* relates, where he recants his Errors, *began with the* Franciſcan *Order, when the Angel of Chriſt, that is, St.* Francis, *did ſet his mark upon his Souldiers*; *and that St.* Francis *appeared as Chriſt did with his wounds upon him.* For we are to underſtand, that St. Francis in one of his Viſions upon the very day of the Exaltation of the Croſs, had the ſame *bleeding Wounds* on his *Hands*, Feet, *and Side*, *which Chriſt had upon the Croſs, and carried them for two Years together before his Death*; and leſt this ſhould be ſuſpected, *Pope Alexander the Fourth* preached it in St. Bonaventures hearing, that himſelf *ſaw them*, as the ſixth Leſſon on St. *Francis* Day in the Roman *Breviary*, and Bonaventure aſſure us. And who dares queſtion the infallibility of the Popes Eye-ſight? Unleſs the Story in latter times of *Maria Viſitationis*, as ſhe was called, *Abeſſe* of the *Annunciation* in *Liſbon*, may give ſome ſuſpicion of it. For this *Virgin* had gained ſo great a Reputation for ſanctity, not only in *Portugal*, but in *Spain*, *Italy* and the *Eaſt-Indies*, that ſhe ſeemed to be a fit match for St. *Francis*. And ſhe out-did him in the number of her Wounds, for ſhe had Thirty Two upon her Head, cauſed by *Chriſt*'s putting his *Crown of Thorns* upon her; and in her Hands, and Feet, and Side, they were as exact as in St. *Francis*; ſhe made no difficulty of ſhewing them, if her Confeſſor bid her, but never otherwiſe; leſt ſhe ſhould ſeem too much to glory in the honour which *Chriſt* had done her. This Confeſſor was no leſs a Man, than *Lodovicus Granatenſis*, a Man highly commended for Learning and Piety, who as verily believed them, as *Pope Alexander* did thoſe of St. *Francis*. One day in the Week ſhe laid *Rags* to her Wounds, upon which the print of the Wounds was made. Theſe *Rags* with incredible Devotion, ſaith the Writers of the Story, were ſent to the *Pope* himſelf, and to the greateſt and moſt religious Perſons in all parts, by whom they were received with great Veneration. And when he was *Inquiſitor* in *Sicily*, he ſaith, he ſaw many of them with her Picture, and a Book of her Life and eminent Sanctity by a Perſon of great Authority, which were preſerved as precious things by the Vice-roy's Lady. But this is nothing to *Gregory the thirteenth* then *Pope*, who writ a Letter of encouragement to her, to go on in the ſame way of ſanctity ſhe had begun. She had been examined by the *Inquiſition*, and her Wounds were allowed by them after diligent ſearch: But at laſt they found what ſhe aimed at, which was the *Revolt* of *Portugal* from *Spain*: Which being once ſuſpected, ſhe is brought before the *Inquiſition*, and her *Sanctity* is condemned, her Wounds declared to be a meer Impoſture, being artificially made by *red Lead*, and her ſelf ſentenced by the *Inquiſitors* to a very ſevere Pennance all her days *December* 8. *A. D.* 1588. I ſuppoſe, my Adverſary having been upon the Place, hath often heard the truth of this; but if he doubts it, he may find it, as I have related it, in *Ludovicus à Paramo*. By which it is very eaſie to gueſs what it is, which gives and preſerves the Reputation of theſe things in the *Roman Church*; for if this *Saint* had dyed before her Deſign brake forth, we might

Guido Carmelit. de hæreſ. Abb. Joachim & Pet. Joh. Alphonſus à Caſtro adverſ. hæreſ. v. Apoſt. hær. 1. Pegna in direct. Inquiſit. p. 2. q. 9. Eymeric. ib. Hæreſ. 6.

Brev. Rom. 4. Octob. Lect. 6. Bonavent. vit. Franciſ. c. 18. Sect. 9.

Lud. à Paramo de Origine Inquiſit. l. 2. tit. 2. c. 15. n. 11. tit. 3. c. 5. n. 16.

have heard of her Wounds in the *Roman Breviary*, as well as thoſe of St. *Francis*, and a *Feſtival* might have been kept in commemoration of her Sanctity, and her ſelf as religiouſly invocated, as the reſt of the *Popes* making. But ſuppoſing *Pope Alexander* the fourth's Authority prevailed ſo much upon the People, to believe that St. *Francis* had the ſame Wounds which *Chriſt* had, *&c.* No wonder then, it ſhould be written in the Book called, *The Flowers of St.* Francis, that *thoſe only were ſaved by the Blood of Chriſt, who lived before St.* Francis; *but all that followed, were redeemed by the Blood of St.* Francis. No wonder, this *Petrus Johannis made the Rule of St.* Francis, *to be the very ſame with the Goſpel, and that which Chriſt and his Apoſtles lived by: Of which St.* Francis *was the greateſt obſerver, next to Chriſt and his Mother; and that as Chriſt when he was to reform the World, choſe Twelve Apoſtles, ſo St.* Francis *had Twelve* Brethren, *by whom the Evangelical Order was founded; that thoſe who oppoſed this Order, were the carnal perſecuting Clergy, in whom the Seat of the Beaſt is much more, than in the People; that in the time of this Myſtical Antichriſt, the Carnal Church ſhall oppoſe the Doctrine, Life and Zeal of the Saints, and burn as it were with fire againſt them; but it ſhall be dryed up from all ſpiritual Wiſdom, and Grace, and the riches of Chriſt, and be expoſed to Errors and Deluſions as it was with the Jews and* Greeks. Thoſe who will not take the pains to ſee how faithfully I have tranſlated theſe words out of *Eymericus*, would imagine I have borrowed ſome of the canting Language of the modern *Quakers*. But he goes on: ſaying, *That as* Vaſthi *the Queen being caſt off from the Kingdom and Marriage of* Ahaſſuerus, *the humble* Eſther *was choſen to ſucceed in her place, and the King made a great Feaſt to Princes, and Servants: So in this laſt ſtate of the Church, the adulterous* Babylon, *the carnal Church being rejected, the ſpiritual Church muſt be exalted, and a great ſpiritual Feaſt be kept to celebrate theſe Nuptials with; that under the Myſtical Antichriſt, there ſhall be overturnings and commotions, by which the carnal Church ſhall be terribly ſtirred up and moved againſt the Evangelical Spirit of Chriſt; but that the Whore of* Babylon, *the carnal Church ſhall fall; in which time the Saints ſhall preach, ſaying, from this time it is no longer the Church of Chriſt, but the Synagogue of Satan, and the habitation of Devils, which before ſaid in the pride of her heart, I ſit as a Queen in great honour and glory, I rule over my Kingdom, I ſit at eaſe, I am no Widow,* i. e. *I have Biſhops and Kings on my ſide*; that, *the* Roman *Church is that great Whore ſpoken of in the* Revelations, *which hath committed fornication with this World, having departed from the worſhip, and ſincere love, and the delights of Chriſt her Spouſe; and embraced the World, the riches and pleaſures of it, and the Devil, and Kings, and Princes, and Prelates, and all the lovers of this World.* That, *the Teachers of this ſpiritual State, are more properly the Gates to lead Men into the wiſdom of Chriſt than the Apoſtles themſelves.* Theſe things are expreſly delivered concerning the Doctrine of this *Franciſcan* Fryer by the Inquiſitor *Eymericus*; I know, *Wadding* in the *Franciſcan Annals* to preſerve the Reputation of his Order, would clear him from all ſuſpicion of Hereſies; I ſuppoſe the credit of an Inquiſitor, having ſuch opportunities to know the truth, ſo near his own time, and having the examination of many of

Wolſii Lect. Memor. Cent. 13. *p.* 522.

Wadding. Annales Minorum ad A.D. 1297.

of his followers, is to be relyed on rather than the teſtimony of one at ſuch a diſtance, and partial for the honour of his order. Eſpecially, that being conſidered which *Poſſevin* ſaith of *Eymericus*, that moſt of his accounts of the times a little before his own, were the very ſame with what was contained in a Manuſcript in the *Vatican Library*, both as to order and words; which is thought to have been brought from *Avignon* to *Rome*, where he was made *Inquiſitor* General by *Gregory* XI. *A. D.* 1358. But it is not denyed by *Wadding* or others, that the *Beguini* and *Fratricelli*, the *Beguardi* and others were his *Followers*; and we ſhall find ſo great an agreement in their Opinions, that it would be ſtrange they ſhould be accounted the Diſciples of any other. *Eymericus* gives this account of them, that in the time of *Clement* V. there aroſe in the Province of *Narbonne*, one *Petrus Johannis* a *Franciſcan* Fryer, who publiſhed by Writing and Preaching a great many Errors and Hereſies in the ſame *Province*, and drew many after him, who had ſpread themſelves over *France*, *Italy*, *Germany*, and other Places, and continued in his time, being daily ſearched for, and condemned by the *Inquiſitors*. They all agreed that, *that their Doctrine was from* God *by immediate Inſpiration; and that all the Writings of* Petrus Johannis *were revealed to him from the Lord, and that he had declared this to ſome of his Friends; that he was ſo great a Doctor that from the time of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, there have been none greater than he in Learning and Holineſs: And that his Writings, theirs only excepted* (wherein they fell ſhort of the former *Sect*) *were the moſt uſeful to the Church.*

Poſſevin. Appar. v. Nicol. Eymeric.

Eymeric. direct. Inquiſit. p. 2. quæſt. 15.

Error. 36.

§. 10. Their Doctrines may be reduced to theſe Four heads. 1. Evangelical Poverty. 2. Unlawfulneſs of Swearing. 3. The Doctrine of Perfection. 4. Oppoſition to the carnal Church, which being joyned with that greater degree of Light, which they ſuppoſed themſelves to have above all the reſt of the World, makes up a *Sect* of *Quakers* after the Order of St. *Francis*.

Of the Doctrines of the ſpiritual Brethren.

1. Their Doctrine of *Evangelical Poverty*; about which they ſaid, *That our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as Man, and his Apoſtles had nothing in proper, or in common, becauſe they were perfectly poor in this World; and that this is perfect Evangelical Poverty; but the enjoying any thing, though in common, takes off from the Perfection of it; and that the Apoſtles themſelves could not without Sin have any Property in any thing, and that it is Hereſy to ſay otherwiſe; therefore the Rule of St.* Francis *preſcribing this Poverty, was that which Chriſt obſerved and preſcribed to his Apoſtles, and was the ſame with the Goſpel of Chriſt, and therefore whoſoever adds to it, or takes from it (be it the Pope himſelf) he is a Heretick in ſo doing*; on which account they condemned, *John* XXII. and all the *Prelates* and *Fryers* for Hereſy, who oppoſed this Doctrine. For we are not to imagine a Doctrine ſo contrary to the beloved Intereſts of the *Roman Church*, ſhould eſcape Oppoſition: Nay, it was ſo far from it, that it immediately cauſed a Breach in their own Order. For as *Papirius Maſſonus* well obſerves from *Petrarch*, *none hate Poverty more, than they who profeſs it moſt*; and the *Franciſcan* Order had gotten into their Hands goodly Poſſeſſions, and built magnificent Houſes, and laid up great Proviſions of *Corn* and *Wine*; which theſe Followers of *Petrus Johannis* declare againſt as directly contrary to the Rule which they

Papir. Maſſon. de Epiſc. Urbis, l. 6 v. John 22.

they profeſſed, being the *ſtricteſt Poverty*; which this was as like, as Hypocriſy is to Sincerity, or St. *Francis* to *Chriſt*. Upon this a great Diviſion happens in the Order: Between the Brethren that followed *Petrus Johannis de Oliva*, who were called the *Spiritual Men*, and the *Brethren* of the *Community*; both Parties appeal to *Clement*. V. *Alexander de Alexandriâ*, *General* of the Order appears in behalf of the *Community*, and *Ubertinus de Caſali*, on the other ſide: But the *Spiritual Brethren*, fearing hard Uſage at *Rome*, and from their other *Superiors*, chooſe new ones to themſelves, and ſo make an open *Schiſm*. In the *Council* of *Vienna*, *A. D.* 1311. a Decree was made, to declare the *Rule of* St. *Francis*, which is extant in the *Canon Law*, under the Title of *Clementines*, but this by no means effected a Cure for the People, favouring the Diſſenters in the Province of *Narbon*, they turned out all the *Brethren* of the *Community*; and took upon themſelves new *Habits*, to be diſtinguiſhed from the reſt. During this Heat, *Gonſalvus General* of the *Order*, favouring the *ſtricter Friers* dyed at *Paris*, not without Suſpicion of Poiſon from the *looſer Brethren*. *John* XXII. being *Pope* reſolves to take a ſeverer Courſe with the *Diſſenters*, and *A. D.* 1318. employs the *Inquiſitors* for that end; the Fruit of which was, that they brake out into a more open *Schiſm* and chooſe one *Henricus de Ceva*, or *de Sena* for their *General*, and kept their *Conventicles* as *John* XXII. in his Conſtitution, *Sancta Romana*, declares, and every day added to their Sect. And the more *Conſtitutions* he publiſhed, the greater Oppoſition was made; in ſo much that *Michael de Cæſena*, *Gul. Ockam* and others found out *Hereſies* at laſt in them, and plain Contradictions to thoſe of his Predeceſſors, eſpecially that of *Nicolaus* IV. which *Bellarmine* confeſſeth cannot in all things be reconciled. No fewer than eighteen Errors *Franciſc. Pegna* confeſſeth he was charged with in one *Conſtitution*, to which he anſwered in another Decretal not publiſhed, in which they found 32 Errors; but *William Ockam* went farther, and charged him with no fewer than 90. A goodly Number for an infallible Head of the *Church*! In which there ought to be ſome Allowance for human Frailty, as *Benedict* XII. his Succeſſor pleaded in behalf of *Nicolaus* IV. when he anſwered the Objections of the *Fraticilli* againſt *John* XXII. as may be ſeen in *Eymericus*. And his Anſwers are thought ſo inſufficient by *Pegna*, that he ſaith, *there are ſome doubtful and ſome falſe; which ought not to be paſſed over without Animadverſion; and therefore ſolemnly invocates God, that he may be able to anſwer them better:* And yet this *Benedict* was accounted a *notable Divine* for a *Pope*; which made the *Diſſenters*, ſaith *Pegna*, hate him the more. The Subſtance of his Anſwer which *Pegna* is ſo much diſpleaſed with is, *that though* Nicolaus *IV. had determined contrary to* John *XXII. yet the former Definition, being contrary to Scripture, ought not to ſtand.* Thus when *Popes* fall out, the *Scripture* comes by its own; which is, to be the ſtanding Rule of all Controverſies.

Clementis l. 5. tit. 11

Bulæi Hiſt. Univerſit. Pariſ. Tom. 4. p. 152. p. 166.

Bell. de Pontif. Rom. l. 4. c. 14. Fran. Pegna in direct. Inquiſ. comment. 42. Gul. Ockam Compend. error. Popæ.

Direct. Inquiſit. c. 17 ſ. 5.

2. They thought it unlawful upon any occaſion to ſwear; this *John* XXII. in his Decretal, *Glorioſam Eccleſiam*, charges them with, and that thoſe were guilty of mortal Sin, and liable to Puniſhment, who were under the Obligation of any Oath whatſoever: The ſame is reported by *Wadding*, and others concerning them.

3. The Doctrine of *Perfection* was ſtiffly maintained by them. This *Spondanus* would have to be one of the Opinions of *Beguardi*, whom he diſtinguiſhes from the *Beguini*; but not only *Eymericus* and *Pegna* make them to be the ſame, but *John* XXII. in the *extravagant Sancta Romana* condemns both together, as the Title is in *Eymericus*; and in the Body of it, it appears that they went under divers Names in ſeveral Places, being ſometimes called *Fraticelli*, ſometimes *Fratres de Pœnitentiâ*, ſometimes *Fratres de paupere Vitâ*, ſometimes *Bizochi*, ſometimes *Beghini*, and ſometimes *Beguardi*; which latter ſeems to be the Name that they were known in *Germany* moſt by. *Eymericus* ſpeaking of *Petrus Olerii* and *Bononatus*, two of the *Beguardi* in *Spain* that were burnt for their Hereſy by the *Inquiſitor* and *Biſhop* of *Barcelona*, ſaith, that they held the Opinion mentioned before concerning *Evangelical Poverty*, which *Spondanus* thinks peculiar to the *Beguini*. About Perfection their Opinions were theſe, as *Alvarus Pelagius*, *Joh. Turrecremata*, *Bzovius*, *Spondanus*, and *Raynaldus* all agree, *that a Man in this Life may attain to ſo great Perfection, as to live without Sin; that a Man who hath attained to ſuch a Degree is above Ordinances*, i. e. *he need not faſt and pray as others do; that ſuch as are perfect have the Spirit of Liberty, and are not ſubject to any human Ordinances, either of Church or State: That every intellectual Being hath enough within it ſelf to make it happy*, or a Light within; *ſo that it doth not need any external Light of Glory in order thereto. That to live in the Exerciſe of moral Virtues, is an Argument of a State of Imperfection*; and that *one truly perfect is above them*. From hence *they accounted all Actions, which were deſigned to ſatisfy natural Inclinations to be indifferent; and ſo looked on unclean Mixtures as no Sins. Alvarus* ſaith, he ſaw one of them who was a *German*, and ſeemed a very *ſpiritual Man*, in a very mean Habit and looking ſowerly with Tears in his Eyes, and full of raptures; and thought himſelf a *Contemplator* and a *Taſter*; Names not yet taken up, by any *Fanaticks* among us. And to let others underſtand how eaſily Men were impoſed upon, by *Viſions* and *Raptures* among them; he ſaith, *that he knew a Woman, who was afterwards known to be naught, that had raptures at her Pleaſure, whom he had honoured as a Saint himſelf, and the very Ground ſhe ſtood on; and not only he, but many others, even Prelates and Cardinals too: By which he ſaw evidently how eaſily the Devil could transform himſelf into an Angel of Light; and after ſaith of the* Beguinæ, *that under the ſhew of Sanctity, they committed many vile things.* A ſtrange Inſtance of the Impoſtures of one of the *Beguinæ*, who gained a great Reputation for Sanctity by her Conſtancy and Devotion at Prayers, her pretending to raptures and extaſies, wherein her Soul was carryed to Heaven, her long faſtings whereby ſhe impoſed upon the *Biſhop*, the Friers, and all the People, to ſo great a Degree, that the *Biſhop* was about building a *Church* on purpoſe to lay her in, that all Comers might behold her who led ſuch an *Angelical* Life; and how accidentally the Impoſture was diſcovered, to the great Diſſatisfaction of them all, but eſpecially the *Biſhop* is at large related by *Richerius*.

Spondan. Annales Eccleſ. A. D. 1311. n. 7.

Eymeric. p. 2. q. 11.

Alvarus de Planctu Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 52. Turrecremata Sum. l. 4. c. 36. part. 2. Bzov. Annal. A. D. 1309. n. 12 Spondan. Ann. A. D. 1311. n. 7. Raynald. Ann. A. D. 1312. n. 17

Alvarus l. 2. c. 45. p. 87.

Richerii Chronic. Senonenſe l. 4. cap. 18

4. But notwithſtanding all this, they had a mighty Zeal againſt the *Carnal Church*; and *called all thoſe blind, who were not of their way*, as *Eymericus* ſaith of them; in theſe Matters they followed

Emeric. p. 2. q. 15. err. 41.

Petrus Johannis, of whoſe Opinions about the *Church* we have already ſpoken, any that ſuffered among them, were cried up as *Martyrs*; and Four of the *Brethren* ſuffering at *Marſeilles A. D.* 1316. they ſaid *they were ſo far from ſuffering as Hereticks, that they were as good Martyrs as St.* Laurence, *or* Vincentius; that *Chriſt was ſpiritually crucified in them*; that *all who approved or conſented to their Death, Pope, Prelates or others were all Hereticks for it; and loſt all Right of governing the Church, or adminiſtring Sacraments; and are out of the Church, and therefore not in a State of Salvation, and they only are the true Church.* Theſe are the chief of their *Doctrines*, although *Eymericus* reckons up no fewer than fifty five Errors and Hereſies among them. And notwithſtanding all the Care uſed by *Popes* and *Inquiſitors* againſt them, in the time of *Clement* V. *John* XXII. *Benedict* XII. *Clement*. VI. *Innocent* VI. and afterwards, they not only continued, but ſpread themſelves ſtill further. *John Garſon*, who lived in the beginning of the next Century, mentions not only the Doctrines of the *everlaſting Goſpel*, but thoſe of the *Begardi*, the Subſtance of which he ſaith is, *that a perfect Soul being reduced to* God, *loſeth its own Will, ſo that it hath no other Will, but the divine Will, which it had from Eternity in that Ideal Being which it had in* God; *which being ſuppoſed, they ſay, they may do any thing which their Affection puts them upon, without Sin; becauſe they have no Will of their own.* The way of renouncing their own Will was ſomewhat different, he tells us, for the more cunning pretending to do it only to *God*; but theſe prevailed upon the other, to renounce their own Wills before them, which when they had done, they told them they could now ſin no longer; and ſo did what they pleaſed together. Under which Pretext of renouncing their own Wills, all manner of Wickedneſs was committed among them. Neither were they only in *France*, *Italy*, *Sicily* and *Germany*, but they prevailed much in *Spain* too; for in the time of *Benedict* XII. in *Catalonia* there were many *Beguardi* ſaith *Eymericus*, the chief of whom was *Frier Bononatus*, who was burnt for his Hereſy: In the time of *Clement* VI. there aroſe many of them in the *Province* of *Valencia*, whoſe Leader was *Jacobus Juſti*, and was therefore immured and ſo dyed. In the time of *Innocent* VI. *Urban* V. *Gregory* XI. appeared in *Catalonia*, one *Arnoldus Montanerius*, who publickly preached for Nineteen Years together, the Opinions of the *Begardi* about *Poverty*, and added theſe of his own, that *no one can be damned who wears the Habit of St.* Francis, *that St.* Francis *once a Year goes down into Purgatory, and thence draws the Souls of all that have been of his Order, and carries them to Paradiſe.* Theſe we have from *Eymericus*, who ſaith that by Order of *Urban* V. and *Gregory* XI. he ſate as *Inquiſitor* upon him. And leaſt we ſhould think this *Sect* inconſiderable among them, *Ludovicus de Paramo*, the *Inquiſitor* of *Sicily*, declares, that *the Fratricelli carrying an Appearance of Sanctity with great Poverty drew the Hearts of all Men to them, and drave* John *XXII. into great Streights, and by the Schiſm they raiſed gave a great Diſturbance to the whole Church.* Neither was it of any ſhort continuance, if we *conſider* the fundamental Principles of this Sect, which were *immediate Revelations*, *renouncing Property*, and *Liberty of Actions*, for ſo it began with *Almerick* at *Paris*, and we have ſeen how much afterwards promoted by the *Mendicant Fryers*; and eſpecially by thoſe who called themſelves of the *third Order* of St. *Francis*, and pretended

Error. 20.

Q. 16. ſ. 2.

Gerſon. oper. To. 1 p. 1. pag. 574.

Eymeric. p. 2. q. 11. ſ. 5.

Lud. de Paramo de orig. ſanctæ Inquiſ. l. 2. tit. 3. cap. 4. n. 23.

tended to far greater ſtrictneſs as to their Rule than others: On which account *Celeſtine* V. *A. D.* 1294. gave them firſt *liberty* to *ſeparate themſelves* from the *Community* which was afterwards pleaded by the *Fratricelli* againſt *Clement* V. and *John* XXII.

Spondan. Annales A. D. 1294 *n.*9. *Bullæ hiſt. Univerſit. Pariſ. Tom.* 3. *p.* 510.

Of the continuance of this Sect.

§. 11. But beſides theſe who before were of this order, others took up the ſame way and opinions, which were never originally of it; as the followers of *Geraldus Segarelli*, and *Dulcinus*, in *Italy*, who are called *Fratricelli* by *Platina*, by others *Pſeudo-Apoſtolici* and *Dulciniſtæ*. *Spondanus* confeſſeth thoſe in *Italy*, who were the followers of one *Hermanus* of *Ferrara*, to be the ſame with the *Fratricelli* and *Beguini*; whoſe Body ſaith *Prateolus*, *after he had been Twenty Years worſhipped for a Saint, was by the command of* Boniface VIII. *taken up and burnt for an Heretick*: *Ludovicus de Paramo* ſaith that it was *Thirty Years after*, *he had been publickly worſhipped by the People of* Ferrara; and he reckons up this, as one of the great Bleſſings which comes by the *Inquiſition*, *that they are thereby undeceiv'd in many, whom they worſhip for Saints*; of which he gives ſeveral other inſtances. But the burning of *Hermanus* bones, did not extinguiſh the Sect of *Fraticelli* there; the only effect of this ſeverity was, that they grew more numerous and bold as *Prateolus* and *Spondanus* confeſs. They kept their *Conventicles* more frequently, and ſpread the further; inſomuch that great multitudes of People fell in with them: Among whom as their chief Leaders were ſeveral of the Order of St. *Francis*, as *Spondanus* proves from the *Extravagant Sancta Romana* of *John* XXII. And of the ſame Sect were the *Pſeudo-Apoſtolici*, whoſe chief Leaders were *Geraldus Segarelli* and *Dulcinus* one of his Diſciples; the one of *Parma*, the other of *Novara*: theſe *filled all the Country thereabouts with their Errors*, ſaith *Eymericus*, and made an *Independent Congregation among themſelves*, which acknowledge *obedience* and *ſubjection*, as he adds, *to none but God himſelf*; and ſaid that they followed the *Apoſtolical Rule*, in a very ſingular manner. This *Geraldus*, ſaith Paramo, *and his followers*, *by a ſhew of extraordinary Sanctity*, *drew many to their* Party: But *Frier Salimbenus* (in a *Manuſcript* ſeen by *Pegna*, in the *Library* of *Cardinal Savelli* at *Rome*) being himſelf a *Franciſcan*, gives this account of him, whom he calls *Gherardinus Segalellus*; that being deſirous to be admitted into their Order, he was refuſed by them; after which he ſpent ſome time in the *Franciſcans* Church, where obſerving the Pictures of the *Apoſtles*, and the *Habits* they were drawn in, he put himſelf as exactly as he could into the very ſame Habit; and having ſold his Houſe, and received the Money for it, he diſtributed it all among the People; and afterwards got a Companion, who was a Servant to the Franciſcans: But by degrees their number increaſed, ſo that in a ſhort time *they ſpread over many Cities in* Italy: *And from thence were diſperſed over almoſt all* Europe: *They went up and down in the Streets*, ſaith Eymericus, *preaching Repentance with a white Mantle, a white Coat, and long hair, bareſoot and bareheaded, and what they eat, was publickly in the Streets, and only what was given to them*: After forty Years in which they mightily prevail'd, *Boniface* VIII. caused *Gerald* to be taken and burnt; upon this *Dulcinus* with Six Thouſand of his Companions retired into the *Alps*, *where they increaſed ſo much*, ſaith *Pegna*, that *Clement* V. *was forced to ſend a Croiſado* againſt

Platina in vit. Clem. 5. *Spondan. Annales. A. D.*1297 *n.* 9. *Prateolus de hæreſ. l.*8. *v. Herman. Paramo de orig. inquiſit. l.*2.*tit.*3 *c.* 4 *v.* 38.

*Direct. Inquiſit. p.*2. *q.* 12.

Paramo l. 2 *tit.* 3. *c.* 4. *n.* 19.

Pegn. not. in direct. p. 2. *q.* 12.

R

againſt them: Where they ſtarved a great part of them; but *Dulcinus* and his Wife *Margareta,* as *Patreolus* calls her, were taken and burnt. *It is not credible,* ſaith *Bzovius, how long they endured upon the* Alps, *all extremities of hunger and cold, rather than they would yield to their Adverſaries.* But notwithſtanding all the endeavours could be uſed, they could not wholly extinguiſh that Sect, ſaith *Prateolus*; but the remainders of it were ſtill left in the Mountains, about *Trent,* and continued to his time, which was about *A. D.* 1560. Theſe were of the ſame Opinions with the **Fratricelli** before-mentioned, as to the *Roman Church*; that by reaſon of the wickedneſs of the *Clergy* and *Religious Orders,* it was a *reprobate Church*; and the *Whore* of *Babylon*; but being no more content with this; than the greateſt Fanaticks of our *Age,* they pretended to great things themſelves, that *they were the only ſpiritual Congregation, ſent, and choſen out by God to bear teſtimony to his truth, in the laſt Ages; and that they, and only they, had the power which St.* Peter *had; that* Geraldus Segarelli, *was a Plant of God's own planting, growing up from the root of faith; by whom God began the work of Reformation of his Church to the purity, perfection, life, State and Poverty of the primitive Church, in that ſtate wherein Chriſt committed his Church to St.* Peter. *That they only are the Church of God, and in that perfection wherein the Apoſtles were, and therefore are bound to live in ſubjection to none, becauſe their rule which was immediatly from Chriſt, is free, and hath the greateſt perfection; that no one can be ſaved, who is not of their Order; that it is a ſign any one is in a ſtate of Damnation, to perſecute them: That all the Popes from* Silveſter *downward, and all the Prelates, were Impoſtors and Deceivers, excepting only* Celeſtine *V. who renounced his Popedom, and gave leave to the Spiritual Brotherhood to ſeparate from the reſt in the* Franciſcan *Order. That the Orders of Clergy and Religion are dangerous to the Church. That no Lay-men ought to pay any Tythes to Prieſt or Prelate, who lives not in the ſame perfection and poverty which the Apoſtles did. That it was as well to Worſhip God in Woods or Stables, or Barns, as in conſecrated Churches: That it was unlawful for Chriſtians to ſwear at all,* ſaith Prateolus; *or never but in caſe of the Articles of faith, or the divine commands, ſay,* Turrecremata *and* Eymericus; *but in all other caſes, it was lawful to uſe equivocations and mental reſervations, and to deny their Sect with their mouthes, as long as they kept true to them in their hearts. That nothing was unlawful which was done out of a principle of Love: And that all things, in the worſt ſenſe, were to be common among them; and therefore they are charged with allowing and practiſing promiſcuous mixtures among themſelves,* if their Adverſaries do not charge them as unjuſtly in this point, as the *Primitive Chriſtians* were charged by the Heathen. This is the ſumm of their Principles and Practices, as they are reported by *Turrecremata, Eymericus, Prateolus, Spondanus, Raynaldus,* and others. But that which is ſtill obſervable to our purpoſe is; that theſe were looked on as a ſort of **Friers** in the *Roman Church*; for when *Honorius* IV. condemned them by his *Bull* extant in *Eymericus,* he doth it upon this account, *that they were a ſort of* Mendicant Friers *not approved by the Roman See, whereas* Gregory *X. in the Council of* Lyons *had abſolutely forbid all Orders of* Mendicants *after the* Lateran

Bzov. Annales. A. D. 1309. n. 13.

Prateolus de hær. l. 4. *v. Dulcinus*

Turrecremata Sum de Eccle. *l.* 4. *p* 2 *c.* 37. *Eymeric. p.* 2. *q.* 12. *Prateolus l.* 14 *n.* 41. *Spondan. A.D.* 1370. *n.* 16. *Raynald. A.D.* 1311. *n.* 66. *Naucler. Gen.* 44. *p.* 986. *Gualtieri Chronol. ſec.* 1300. *c.* 8.

teran *Council, that ſhould not receive expreſs Confirmation from the Pope*; *but his Holineſs was informed, that ſome who called themſelves of the Apoſtolical Order, had ſince that time aſſumed to themſelves a new Habit of Religion without due Applications being made to his See; and a great number of theſe went up and down, as Mendicants, into many parts of the World, doing unſeemly things to their own Peril and the Scandal of others; eſpecially ſome among them being guilty of Hereſie: therefore all Eccleſiaſtical Officers are required, to admoniſh and compell them to lay down their Habits, and to enter themſelves among ſome of the approved Religious Orders; and in caſe of refuſal they ought to proceed judicially againſt them, and to deliver them over to the Secular Power.* By which we underſtand the true ground of the Quarrel againſt them; *viz.* not yielding Subjection enough to the *Roman See*, and how eaſily all their Blaſphemies and Villanies might be forgiven, if they entred themſelves into any of the approved *Religious Orders*.

§. 12. As we ſee all the Care uſed could not root out this Sect wholly, but the Remainders of them continued in ſome of the *Mountains of Italy*; ſo I am very much miſtaken if the *Alumbrado's* in *Spain*, or the *Sect* of *Illuminati*, were any other than a Remainder of the *Beguini* and *Fratricelli* whom we obſerved before to have got footing there. *Spondanus* indeed and ſome others from him, ſay, *they were detected in the Dioceſſes of* Sevil *and* Cadiz. A. D. 1623. *and were condemn'd by* Andreus Pachecus, *the general Inquiſitor in* Spain, *in Twenty ſix Articles, and the Seven chief of them were burnt: but withal* he ſaith, *they were not ſo much a new Sect, as a renewal of an old one with ſome Additions.* Nay we meet with the very ſame name of the *Sect*, long before that: For *Ludovicus de Paramo* ſaith, that *ſeveral Prieſts were taken by order of the Inquiſition, in the Town of* Lerena; *who under pretence of extraordinary Illumination from* God, *did gain upon the People, and ſpread dangerous Opinions among them.* And afterwards he particularly deſcribes them, under the Names of the *Illuminati*, by their *Pride* and *Diſobedience* to their *Superiours*, by *their obſtinate adhering to their Illuſions*, and *indulging themſelves in their ſenſual Luſts*; all which fully agree to the Character already given of the *Fratricelli* and *Beguardi*. For the firſt he ſaith, *they choſe rather to be broken in pieces, than give Obedience to their Biſhops*; for the ſecond he proves, *that as long as they gave way to ſenſual Luſts, their Illumination could not be from* God; *for they who would ſleep in the Divine Light*, as he ſpeaks, *muſt have their Eye-lids ſhut as to all worldly Vanities and* Pleaſures; *therefore we ought to ſhun ſuch illuminated, or rather blind* Perſons, *who transform themſelves into Angels of Light, ſpreading divers Doctrines and Revelations which they have*; of whom he interprets the *Epiſtle* of St. *Jude*. By all that hath been ſaid, this Sect ſeems to be nothing elſe but *Gnoſticiſm*, revived under new Shapes and Names; and with a difference of Opinions, ſuitable to the Age wherein it appeared. *Spondanus* gives this account of the Opinions and Practices of the Modern *Alumbrado's*, that *under a pretence of mental* Prayer *and Divine Contemplation, and Union with* God, *they deſpiſed the uſe of Sacraments,* Preaching *the Word of* God, *and all holy Exerciſes; and did extol the other ſo highly, that they ſaid theſe things would not be ſins in them, which were ſo in others, and by this means committed all Impurities.* Of this Sect *Ignatius Loyola* was

Of the Alumbrado's in Spain.

Spondan. Annales. A. D. 1623. *n.* **7.**

Lud. de Paramo de origine Inquiſit. l. 2. tit. 3. c. 5. n. 15.

Lib. 3. q. 5. n. 186, *&c.*

N. 211.

N. 238.

Maffeius in vit. Ignatii c., cap. 17.

Schiopp. Infam. Famiani p. 62.

Orlandin. Hiſt. Societ. Jeſu l. 8. *n.* 46.

2 Tim. 3. 1. *to* v. 8.

was vehemently ſuſpected to be, and upon that account was caſt into Priſon by the *Inquiſition* in *Spain*. Which *Maffeius* himſelf doth not deny, *that it was upon the account of the* Illuminati, *and his Enthuſiaſtical Preaching in the Streets*, that he was queſtioned. But *Melchior Canus* that learned *Biſhop* of the *Canaries* puts the matter out of Diſpute, for in a Diſcourſe of his, *concerning the Foundation of the Society of Jeſus*, preſerved entire in the hands of *Dominicus Canus Biſhop* of *Cadiz* his Nephew, and publiſhed in part by *Schioppus*, he ſaith, *that the General of that Order was one* Innico *who fled out of* Spain, *leſt he ſhould be laid hold on by the Inquiſition, being ſuſpected for the Hereſie of the* Illuminati; *and coming to* Rome, *he deſired to be judged by the Pope, where no Accuſer appearing he was abſolved.* He gives him the Character of a *vain Man*; for, *being once in his Company at* Rome, *he preſently without any Occaſion began to boaſt of his Righteouſneſs, and the unjuſt Perſecution he had ſuffered in* Spain; *and ſpake many and great things of the Revelations he had from God, without any Neceſſity; upon which account he ſaith, he believed not any thing at all concerning them. Another Day*, he adds, *when he went to dine with him, he commended one of his Brethren for a great Saint, who coming into the Room where they were, he preſently ſuſpected the Man to be mad: and when he talked with him about matters of Religion, he anſwer'd heretically, not out of Deſign, but becauſe he was an Ideot, a rude, ignorant Fellow.* Ignatius *being confounded at this, ſaid he was no Heretick, but a* Fool; *but he believed he had ſome lucid Intervals; and at that time by reaſon of the Conjunction of the Moon, he was not a very ſound Catholick.* See from what *Man*, the *Jeſuits* derive the Infallibility of their Faith! But although *Canus* was a Perſon of more Learning and Judgment than a Thouſand *Ignatius*'s; yet the *Jeſuits* decry him as very partial againſt them: For *Orlandinus*, in his *Hiſtory of the Society*, complains of him *as one of the bittereſt Enemies they had in the beginning of their Society*; for he every where ſet them forth as the *Fore-runners of Antichriſt*, and explained the Prophecy of them, concerning the Men *that ſhould be in the laſt Times.* Wherein it is ſaid, *Men ſhall be lovers of themſelves, Covetous, Boaſters, Blaſphemers,* &c. *Traytors, heady, high-minded, Lovers of Pleaſures, more than Lovers of God, having a form of Godlineſs, but denying the Power thereof: For of this ſort are they which creep into Houſes, and lead captive ſilly Women laden with Sins, led away with divers Luſts,* &c. The ſame thing (ſaith *Orlandinus* and truly) was charged upon the *Orders* of the *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans, as well as them:* And we ſhall not quarrel with them, which Order of them all hath the greateſt ſhare in the accompliſhment of this Prophecy.

The Jeſuites Order founded in Fanaticiſm.

§. 13. That which is our preſent Buſineſs is to ſhew, that this Order was inſtituted as the other were, upon the credit of *Viſions* and *Revelations*; for *Ignatius* was certainly as *Ignorant* and *Enthuſiaſtical* as St. *Francis* himſelf; and to prove this, I ſhall only make uſe of thoſe of his own Order, who have writ his Life (*Maffeius, Orlandinus* and *Ribadeneira*) and purſue it no farther than the Inſtitution of the Order, as I have done with the other. The firſt remarkable thing in him was, that he was converted by reading the *Legends* of the *Saints*, as *Don Quixot* began his *Errantry* by reading *the old Romances:* I wonder how *Ignatius* did to read them, for *Maffeius* deſcribes

Maffeius vit. ignat. l. 1. c. 1.

ſcribes him, *as one that had hardly ever learnt his Letters:* But it is poſſible St. *Peter* taught him, for they all write that St. *Peter appeared to him before he was ſo far recovered as to be able to read.* But this Country-man was not more moved with the Adventures of former *Knights*, than *Ignatius* was with the Stories of St. *Dominick* and St. *Francis*; for theſe, *Maffeius* tells us, did *particularly work upon him:* In ſo much that before he took up a firm Reſolution of *Religious Errantry*, he would put Caſes to himſelf of the difficult *Adventures* of thoſe two *illuſtrious Heroes*; and found himſelf to have Mettle enough, to *undertake any of them:* And therefore in a fit of Zeal, one Night *he gets out of his Bed, and fell down upon his Knees, before an Image of the Bleſſed Virgin, and in that poſture vowed himſelf* her *Knight*. Which is a Circumſtance ſo conſiderable, I admire that *Maffeius* omits it; as he doth likewiſe *the ſtrange noiſe in the Houſe, the trembling of the Room, and the breaking of the Glaſs Windows that time:* an Argument, ſaith *Orlandinus*, that the *Devil then took his leave of him*; although there be ſome Reaſon to doubt it. After this, the *Virgin Mary* appeared to him with a great deal of Glory, with her Child in her Lap, (and all this while, for the Viſion continued for ſome time, he thought himſelf awake) by which ſight he was hugely animated for all his future Adventures. The firſt whereof was to a place of great Devotion to the *Bleſſed Virgin*, called *Montſerrat*; and in the way thither, he was like to have begun his firſt Adventure with a *Moor*, who allowed the *Bleſſed Virgin* to have been ſo till her Delivery, but would not yield it afterwards; at which *Ignatius*, conſidering whoſe *Knight* he was, began to be ſo inraged, that he thought it neceſſary to revenge her Quarrel upon him; but diſputing with himſelf what to do, and the *Moor* being gone another way, he leaves the Cauſe to the wiſdom of the *Mule*, and puts the Reins in his neck, that if he took the *Moors* way at the parting of the two ways he would have his Life; but the good *Mule* underſtanding his Riders mind, left the beaten Road, and went on to *Montſerrat:* Where a remarkable Ceremony was performed by him, for as *Orlandinus* and *Maffeius* expreſly ſay, Ignatius *having read in the Books of Chivalry, that the antient Knights at the firſt entring upon that honourable Employment, were wont to watch all Night in their Arms*, he thought it fit to begin his *Errantry* in the ſame manner; he therefore hangs up his *Sword* and *Dagger*, before the *Altar* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, and puts on his Habiliments; but inſtead of his ſhining Armour, he had gotten a long *Coat* of Sack-cloath, with a Cord about it, at which he hangs his Bottle for water; and inſtead of his *Lance* a plain Crab-tree ſtaff, with a wicker Shoe upon one Foot, and the other naked; having no *Morrion* on his Head, but expoſed that to the violence of the Weather. All theſe Habiliments (having procured them by the way) he hung at the pummel of his Saddle, when he entred the *Town*, ſaith *Maffeius*, (for fear the People ſhould think him in his Wits) but he puts them not on, till he came to the ſacred place where he was, by the *Laws* of *Chivalry*, to watch in them; and ſo he did, ſay they, *ſometimes ſtanding, ſometimes kneeling, and devoting himſelf with all his might to the Service of the bleſſed Virgin.* Which having done, *early the next morning* (for that is a neceſſary Circumſtan ce too in the Adventures of Chivalry) *away he goes for Manreſa*; where he takes his Lodging in the

Ribadeneira vit. Ignat. c. 1.

Ribadeneira c. 1.

Orlandin. hiſt. l. 1. *n.* 12.

Orlandin. hiſt. l. 1. *n.* 18. Maffei l. c. 4.

Maffeius l. 1. c. 3.

the *Town-Hoſpital*, and lets his Hair and Nails grow, and begs
from door to door (and yet faſted ſix days in the Week) he whips
himſelf thrice a day, was ſeven Hours every Day in vocal Prayer,
lay upon the bare Ground, and all to prepare himſelf for his *Adventures*
tures to *Jeruſalem*. Which ſort of Life growing very uneaſy to him,
he was once near, ſaith *Maſſeius*, throwing himſelf out of a Window,
Maſſeius to put an end to it; but *God* (having deſigned his Order, for a further
l. 1. c. 6. puniſhment to the World) not permitting that; not long after, he
had ſuch clear *Divine Revelations*, that in a moment of Time, ſaith
C. 7. *Maſſeius*, he underſtood the greateſt Myſteries of *Religion*, and the
moſt ſubtle Speculations in *Philoſophy* (eſpecially the way of *Gods*
making the World, was made clear to him, but not ſo as he could
expreſs it to others) which other Men cannot attain to with the
Orland. hardeſt ſtudy and pains. In one of his Viſions, ſaith *Orlandinus*,
l. 1. *n.* 27. while he was repeating the Horary Prayers of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, he
ſaw the *Bleſſed Trinity*, as plainly as we do one another, under *a*
corporeal Repreſentation; and was ſo full of Joy at it, that he could
not hold weeping before all the People; and was ſo enlightened by
it, that although he was yet very ignorant, he began to write a Book
N. 28. *of the Glory of the Bleſſed Trinity*. In one of his Extaſies, he continued
tinued *eight Days*; in which it is probable, ſaith the ſame Author,
he ſaw *the frame and model of the Society of Jeſuits*. A bleſſed
Sight! If he ſaw all the conſequences of it too. After this, in order
N. 32. to his voyage to *Hieruſalem*, away he goes for *Barcelona*; where
Elizabeth Roſella eſpying him at Church ſitting among the Boys,
Ribadeneira. c. 4. ſhe ſaw a great ſhining about his Mouth, and heard a Voice
within her, which bid her call that Man to her Houſe. While he
was in *Italy* in his way to *Hieruſalem*, Chriſt appeared to him again at
Orlind. l. 1. *n.* 34. *Padua*, as he was wont to do at *Manreſa:* at *Venice*, one of the
Senators had a Viſion concerning him, checking him for lying in ſo
N. 35. much State, while that holy Man *Ignatius* lay in the open Air. Viſions
ons were grown ſo familiar with him now, that it is to no purpoſe to
recount thoſe, which he had at *Hieruſalem*, and elſe where. In his return
through *Italy*, the *Spaniſh* Souldiers uſed him hardly, taking him for
a Spy, and carried him to their Commander, now ſaith *Orlandinus it*
N. 44. *had been his Cuſtom, not to give Men any titles of Reſpect, but to call them*
only by their common Names; and he queſtioned a little with himſelf, whether
ther he ought to break that Cuſtom, now he was to appear before the Commander;
mander; and reſolves in the Negative, becauſe to do it proceeded
Maff. c. *from too great fear of Men: Therefore being brought before him, he*
gives him no Teſtimony of reſpect either in his Words or Actions;
and particularly (both *Maſſeius* and *Orlandus* teſtifie) *he would not put*
off his Hat to him. By which we underſtand, who was the firſt
Founder of that *Fanatick* Sect among us, which is diſtinguiſhed ſo
much from others, by denying *common Civilities* to Men. Upon this,
the Commander ſeverely rebuked the Souldiers for bringing a *mad*
Man to him, at which they were ſo enraged, that he might have
ſaved himſelf the labour of whipping himſelf that Day, they doing
him that Office very effectually. Being returned to *Barcelona*, at Thirty
three Years of *Age*, he begins to learn his *Grammar*; to enable him,
Maff. l. 1. I ſuppoſe to expreſs thoſe *Myſteries* of *Religion* and *Philoſophy*, which
c. 16. he underſtood ſo clearly by Revelation: But as *Maſſeius* obſerves,
he could not have *Amo* in his Mouth, but his Mind was carried he

knew not whither, and was ſo full of *Viſions* all that while, that he could not remember one Word that he learnt; upon which he begs his *Maſter*, falling in great Humility at his Feet (having it ſeems more Reverence for him, than he had for the *Spaniſh Officer*) that he would tie him punctually as he did the Boys to his Leſſons; and if he could not ſay them, that he might be *whipt* as they were. But as dull as he was at his Book, he had ſo great *Elevations* in his *Prayers*, that (if we believe him) one *John Paſchal*, ſaith *Orlandinus*, ſaw him raiſed up from the Ground in a dark Night; but that being a ſuſpicious Circumſtance, he adds that the Room at the ſame time was filled with a great Light. Havin ſtayed out his two Years at *School* in *Barcelona*, to the *Univerſity* he goes, where he privately ſtudies *Logick*, *Phyſick*, and *Divinity* together, to very little purpoſe, as *Maffeius* confeſſeth; and in the mean time, *preaches, and begs in the Streets*. Here he was ſeveral times under Examination by the Inquiſition, and once impriſoned for forty one days; out of which he was not diſmiſſed, till they had commanded him not to diſcourſe of *Divinity* again, till he had ſtudied four Years, and to wear the ſame *Habit* with other *Students*. Upon this he removes to *Salamanca*, where he finds no kinder Entertainment, being put into Chains in the *Dungeon* and ſtrictly examined; for here he follows his former Courſe; he and his Companions in an *Enthuſiaſtical* manner (being meer *Lay-men*, as *Maffeius* acknowledgeth) *going up and down the Streets, preaching in all Places, and to all ſorts of Perſons*; and being examined by the *Sub-prior* of the *Dominicans*, what *Studies* they followed, *Ignatius* very fairly confeſſed the Truth, that they were *unlearned*. He then aſked him, why they took upon them to *preach*; *Ignatius* very ſubtilly told him they did not *preach*; they did only *hold* forth to the People in a familiar manner, concerning *Virtue* and *Vice*; and thereby endeavoured to bring them to the Hatred of one and Love of the other. The *Superior* told him, this was Preaching; which no one could pretend to do, but either by Learning or immediate Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt; and ſince you do not pretend to Learning, you muſt pretend to be inſpired; Here *Ignatius* finding himſelf caught; reſolutely denied to give him any Anſwer, unleſs he were legally impowred to examine him. *Say you ſo*, ſaid the *Dominican*? I will take care of that ſuddenly: So they were three days kept in the *Convent*, and after that by order of the *Biſhop* of *Salamanca*, were committed to cloſe Priſon; where he preached to the People with great Zeal, who now flocked in great numbers to him, and gloried as much in his Sufferings, and talked at the ſame rate, that the Ring-leaders of the *Quakers* are wont to do among us: And juſt with the ſame Reſolution; for when the reſt of the Priſoners made their eſcape by the negligence of the Keepers, *Ignatius* and his Companions would not ſtir: When they were called to anſwer, *Ignatius* preached at large upon ſeveral Points of Divinity to them, under pretence of anſwering Queſtions. After twenty two days, promiſing to ſubmit themſelves to the Judgment of the *Church*, they are diſmiſſed; but with a Charge, in four Years time *not* to meddle with nice Caſes of Conſcience; which *Ignatius* took with ſo much Indignation, that he had a preſent Impulſe upon his Mind to be gone; and no Conſideration whatever could hinder

Orland. hiſt. l. 1. n. 47.

n. 49.

Maffei. l. 1. c. 17.

Orland. l. 1. n. 56.

n. 61.

Maffei l. 1. c. 17.

hinder him, but away he muſt go to *Paris*, to ſee if he could meet with any better Succeſs there. And accordingly he begins his Journy, driving all his Learning before him, which was an *Aſs laden with Books* as *Maffeius* relates; and ſo reaches *Barcelona*, and afterwards arrived ſafe at *Paris*. Where being ſenſible of his own Ignorance and Dulneſs, he reſolves to ply his Book better; and to that end, enters himſelf among the Boys in the *School*, and begins his *Grammar* again. A ſad caſe! That after two Years *Schooling* at *Barcelona*, having been at two *Univerſities* in *Spain*, and having had ſo many *Revelations*, he ſhould be yet ſo great a *Dunce* that he could not tell the Rules of *Grammar*. Now he finds it neceſſary to *pray* and *whip* leſs, and to *ſtudy* more. Here he meets with ſo cold a Reception, that Hoſpitals begging, help from Country-men, were all little enough to keep him at firſt from *ſtarving*; but however, after eighteen Months ſpent in learning a little *Latin*, he applies himſelf to *Philoſophy*; but the *Enthuſiaſtick* Heat of his Brain was ſo great, that he had much ado to keep his Mind to it; yet at laſt he obtained his Degree in *Philoſophy*, after three Years and a half Study, or at leaſt ſo much time ſpent there. Then he goes to the *Dominican School*, to learn *Divinity*; where he got *juſt enough to keep him from being a Heretick*; for ſo much *Maffeius's* Words imply. All this while, his *Enthuſiaſtick Head* was full of *Projects*, in order to the drawing *Diſciples* to himſelf; that he might in Imitation of former *Heroes*, found a *new Order*: For this it is apparent he aimed at, and for the ſake of this he went through ſo many Difficulties and pretended ſo much to *Enthuſiaſm*, without which he knew his Deſign could not be compaſſed. *Orlandinus* therefore tells us, that being at *Antwerp*, (as he uſed to make Excurſions ſometimes from *Paris*, to beg a Subſiſtence) being in a Company of Merchants, he looked ſtedfaſtly upon a young Merchant, and (not knowing what Effects ſuch Words might have upon him afterwards) he called him aſide, and told him, *he ought to thank God, who had choſen him to build a Colledge for the Society of Jeſus, in his own Country*. By which it is plain, what he deſigned at that time, before he had yet formed any thing like a *Society*; and the ſame Author would have Men believe, that *God* had then revealed it to him, that he ſhould found that *Society*; otherwiſe, he ſaith well, *no Man would have taken ſo much Pains as he did, unleſs he had ſuch a thing in his Head*. During his abode at *Paris*, he had prevailed upon three *Students*; and the firſt thing he perſwaded them to, was to give away all that they had and their *Books* too, and to beg their Bread; which cauſed a great Heat in the *Univerſity*, he being ſuſpected to have made them mad, and by force they took them away, from the *Hoſpital*, whither he had drawn them. I omit his flying, or rather being carried, as it were in a rapture, from *Paris* to *Rouen*, and the Joy and extatick Expreſſions he had in it, his ſtanding up in Dirt and Mire to the Neck, to repreſent to his Companion the *Filthineſs of the Sin he lived in*, his ſo narrowly eſcaping being publickly *whipt* in the Univerſity for ſeducing the *Students*, that *Orlandinus* makes it almoſt a Miracle: But we are now to take notice that his Deſign being to form a *Society*; he had, for that purpoſe, uſed himſelf to all the Arts of *Inſinuation* imaginable; accommodating himſelf to the Humors of the Perſons

Maffei. l. 1 c. 18.

Orlandin. hiſt. Soc. Jeſ. l. 1. n. 96.

Orlan. n. 68, 69.

n. 71.

Maffeius l. 1. cap. 21. Orland. n. 75

ſons he had to do with, endeavouring to oblige all Men with Expreſſions of the greateſt Kindneſs, bearing all Affronts with a wonderful Diſſimulation, as *Maffeius* deſcribes him. By theſe Arts he labours to get ſome of the moſt hopeful *Students* in the Univerſity to him; and at laſt prevails upon Nine, to joyn with him: He ſtudies their Humours and applies himſelf accordingly, not acquainting them at firſt with his Deſign, but by degrees prepares them for it: Among them, *Xaverius* at firſt laughed at him, and deſpiſed him; but was at laſt won by his Obſequiouſneſs, Flattery, n. 84. and Inſinuation. And finding his former Diſciples ſoon grow weary of him and forſook him, he reſolves to tie theſe faſter; and to that end, appoints a meeting in a *Church*, dedicated to the *Bleſſed Virgin*, in the *Suburbs* of *Paris*; where they all ſolemnly vow before receiving the *Euchariſt* (none but themſelves being preſent) either to go to *Jeruſalem*, or to offer themſelves to the *Pope's* Service; which was done, *A. D.* 1534. upon the day of *Aſſumption* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, to whoſe *Patronage* they particularly devoted themſelves. After this, *Ignatius* fearing their Relapſe, kept them together as much as might be, and uſed all means to prevent any Differences happening among them, having now gotten Perſons to his Mind; and for fear the Friends of ſome of his chief Confidents in *Spain* n. 96. ſhould take them off, he offers to go himſelf, and diſpatch their Buſineſs for them. In his return to *Spain*, he obſerves his former Courſe of *preaching* and *begging*; and was followed by ſuch a multitude of *People*, that he was fain to preach in the *Fields*, where (which deſerves Admiration, in ſo weak and mortified a Man) tho' Maffeius l. 2. cap. 1. he could not raiſe his Voice, yet it was heard diſtinctly above a *quarter of a Mile*, ſay *Orlandinus* and *Ribadeneira*; but *Maffeius* Orlandin. l. 1. n. 116. more prudently omits it. But he helps us with as good a Paſſage inſtead of it; *Ignatius* was prevailed upon now by his Diſciples, to Ribaden. c. 8. make uſe of a *Horſe* in his Journy to *Spain*; which when he was Maff. l. 2. c. 1. come thither, he left to an *Hoſpital* where the People looked on him with ſo much Reverence, that no Man durſt uſe him afterwards but as a *conſecrated Horſe*; he was preſerved in eaſe and good Paſture all his Life time. At *Venice*, at the time appointed, his Companions meet him, where they debate their Voyage to *Hieruſalem*; and their Cuſtom, *Orlandinus* ſaith, was this, *in any* Orland. l. n. 111. *Matter of Debate, they were to joyn together in Prayer; and after ſeeking God, what Opinion the moſt were of, that they reſolve upon; which they obſerved*, ſaith he, till the ſelf-denying *Ignatius* was, after much *ſeeking God* in their way, made the *General*; and then *his Will was to rule them*: After a Years ſtay about *Venice* (their Courage being now cooled, as to *Hieruſalem*) in which time *Ignatius*, and the reſt that were yet *Lay-men*, entred into *Orders*; they determine to go to *Rome*, and ſubmit themſelves wholly to the *Popes* Pleaſure: And in the mean time, wander about the Country, preaching Maff. l. 2. c. 4. in the *Streets* and *Market-places*, and making uſe of the *Bulks of Shops* for their *Pulpits*; and they *invited the People to hear them*, ſaith *Maffeius with a loud Voice, and whirling their Caps over their Heads*; and tho' few underſtood them being ſtrangers, yet all admired and commended them; and no doubt they converted many, as their followers have done, from the Uſe of Laces and Ribbands. All this while, ſince *Ignatius* began to have any ſmattering of Learning, we read little of his *Viſions* and *Revelations*; but the time coming near, that he hoped for a Confirmation of his Order from the *Pope*, now ſaith *Maffeius*, he began to have them again as frequently as he had at *Manreſa* (which in a kind of a *religious Jeſt*, he ſaith, l. 2. c. 5. he was wont to call his *primitive Church*) and ſuch as much exceeded the former: For what he now ſaw, being above humane Nature, cannot be expreſſed; only one *Viſion* did him a great deal of Service, which was, that lying in a Trance which was frequent with him as well as *Mahomet*, he ſaw *God the Father commending* Ignatius *and his Brethren to his Son Jeſus bearing his Croſs*; *whom he very kindly received, and ſpake theſe Words with a Smile to* Ignatius, *I will be favourable to you at* Rome: Which gave him and his Companions great Comfort. At *Rome*, hearing the ſame of St. *Benedict* and his *Revelations*, or remembring them in their *Legends*, he withdraws to the ſame Place, *Monte Caſſino*, and there it fell out luckily, (that he might come behind none of them in *Viſions*) that as St. *Benedict* ſaw the Soul of *Germanus* go to Heaven, ſo did he in the very ſame manner, the Soul of *Hozius*, one of the *Society*; and a little after as he was praying to the *Saints*, he ſaw *Hozius* among them all. Notwithſtanding all this, they met with great Difficulties at *Rome*; but *Pope Paul* III. being throughly ſatisfied in the main Point of their being *ſerviceable* to the *Intereſt* of that *Church*, all other Difficulties were ſoon conquered; and the *Pope* himſelf became *Enthuſiaſtical* too, and cryed out, *having read*, ſaith *Maffeius*, Maff. l. 2. c. 12. *the firſt Draught of the Rules of the Society made by* Ignatius, *The Spirit of the Lord is here*, and many things to the ſame purpoſe. But one of the *Cardinals*, to whom the Examination of them was committed, ſtill oppoſing the eſtabliſhing this *Order*, *Ignatius* flies to his uſeful Refuges; for beſides *Faſtings*, *Prayers*, *keeping of Days*, &c. he and his Friends offered *three thouſand Maſſes* for this end alone: (And it muſt be a hard Heart indeed, that would not yield with ſo much ſupplying) this *Cardinal* all of a ſudden quite changed his Mind, and commended the Buſineſs himſelf to the *Pope*; and ſo the Society of *Jeſus* was confirmed by the *Popes Bull*, 3. *Octob. A. D.* 1540. to the Joy of *Ignatius*'s Heart; and ſoon after he was made *General* of the *Order*, which he accepted with as many Tears and Proteſtations, and Entreaties (till he plainly ſaw *it was the Will of God it muſt be ſo*) as ever any *Uſurper* took the *Government* into his Hands, which he had moſt eagerly ſought after. And now let the World judge, whether there hath appeared a greater *Enthuſiaſt* or *Pretender* to *Revelations*, than *Ignatius* was, ſince the days of *Mahomet*, and St. *Francis*? Methinks they might be aſhamed to upbraid us with the *Fanaticiſm* of the *Quakers* and ſuch Perſons; the chiefeſt of whom fall very much ſhort of *Ignatius*, in thoſe very things for which they are condemned by us; yet any one who compares them, would imagine, the *Life of Ignatius*, had been their *great Exemplar*. I know not whether any of that *innocent* and *religious Order* of *Jeſuits*, had any hand in forming this *new Society* among us (as hath been frequently ſuggeſted) but if one may gueſs the *Father* by the *Child's* Likeneſs, *Ignatius Loyola* the *Founder* of the *Jeſuits*, was at leaſt the *Grandfather* of the *Quakers*.

§. 14. Thus I have gone through the moſt illuſtrious Orders of the *Church* of *Rome*; and ſhewed, how they have been founded on

Of the Fanatick way of Devotion among them.

Fanaticiſm, and giving encouragement thereby unto it. It remains now, that I conſider the *way* of *Devotion*, in greateſt requeſt among them; and prove, that it doth encourage and promote *Enthuſiaſm*. For this; we are to take notice, that thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, who have ſet themſelves to the Writing Books of Devotion, have with great zeal recommended ſo myſtical and unintelligible a way of Devotion, as though their deſign had been only to amuſe and confound the minds of devout Perſons, and to prepare them for the moſt groſs *Enthuſiaſm* and extravagant illuſions of Fancy. But this is the fruit of leaving the *Scriptures*, and that moſt plain and certain way of *Religion* delivered therein; there can be no end of fantaſtical modes of Devotion, and every ſuperſtitious *Fanatick* will be ſtill inventing more, or reviving old ones. No Laws or Rules publickly allowed can ſerve their turn, they muſt have ſomething peculiar to themſelves, to gain a Reputation of greater Sanctity by; and it is hard, if they do not light upon ſome affected Phraſes unintelligible notions, ridiculous or ſingular poſtures, that they may be ſure to charge thoſe with following carnal reaſon who condemn them. And they triumph in nothing more, than when they can handſomly revenge themſelves on that bitter enemy of theirs, called *Reaſon*; which they never do with greater pleaſure, than when they pretend it to be upon the account of *Religion*. In the *Church* of *Rome*, the caſe hath been thus; among them, as in all *Religions* and Places in the World, there are ſome Perſons of a temper naturally diſpoſed more to R*eligion*, than others are; being melancholy, thoughtful, tender, and eaſily moved by hopes and fears. Theſe do more eaſily receive the impreſſions of R*eligion*, which they being poſſeſſed with, if they be not carefully governed, are more liable to fall into the dotages of *Superſtition*, or to be tranſported by the heats of *Enthuſiaſm*. Againſt both of them, there can be no better cure imaginable, than the true underſtanding the nature and reaſonableneſs of the *Chriſtian* R*eligion*; which fills our minds with a true ſenſe of *God* and *Goodneſs*, and ſo arms us againſt *Superſtition*; and withal acquaints us, that the conduct of the *Spirit* of *God* is in the uſe of the greateſt reaſon and prudence, and ſo prevents the follies of *Enthuſiaſm*. But it being ſo much the deſign of that *Church*, to keep the Members of it from knowing any thing, that is ſo much againſt her intereſt, as the true practice of Chriſtianity is; and therefore keeping the Bible out of the hands of the People, they muſt ſubſtitute ſome other ways in the room of that, to gratifie the earthy dulneſs of a *ſuperſtitious* temper, and the airineſs and warmth of the *Enthuſiaſtical*. For the former; they are abundantly provided, by a tedious and ceremonious way of external Devotion, as dull and as cold as the Earth it ſelf; to the other they commend *abſtractedneſs of life*, *mental prayer*, *paſſive unions*, *a deiform fund of the Soul*, *a ſtate of introverſion*, *divine inſpirations*; which muſt either end in *Enthuſiaſm*, or madneſs. And the perfection of this ſtate lying in *an intime Union with God (as they ſpeak) whereby the Soul is Deified*, is to be attained only *in the way of unknowing* (for nothing ſo dangerous as the *uſe* of *reaſon*) and *ſelf annihilation* and many other things as impoſſible to be underſtood, as practiſed. Which makes it difficult, to give any account of ſuch unintelligible ſtuff; for we muſt only grope in obſcurity and profound darkneſs, and draw a

Night-piece without lights. This way came firſt into requeſt in the *Monaſtick* orders, by the examples of their Founders, as will eaſily appear by our former Diſcourſe; but the Men who moſt ſolemnly preached and divulged it, were *Ruſbrochius*, *Suſo*, *Harpius*, *&c.* and he who, in theſe latter Ages, hath gathered together moſt that had been ſaid before him, and is commended by *Balthaſar Corderius* and others, as a moſt ſublime interpreter of myſtical Divinity, *Ludovicus Bloſius*; from theſe, it were not difficult to put together ſome of their Words and Phraſes, as an account of their Divinity; but I rather chooſe to do it, chiefly from a late Author, publiſhed by Mr. *Creſſy*, not many Years ſince; who, after his many turnings and changes of Opinions, ſits down at laſt (as appears by his publiſhed *Mother Juliana*'s Revelations, and the *Preface* to *Sancta Sophia*) with the deſerved Character of a *Popiſh Fanatick*. Which Book of *Sancta Sophia*, being compiled by Mr. *Creſſy* out of many Writings of *Father Auguſtin Baker*, and ſet forth *A. D.* 1657. with large approbations at the beginning and end of it, I hope no Doctrine contained therein will be thought a ſcandal to their *Church*. The deſign of it is as the title tells us, *To give Directions for the Prayer of Contemplation*, &c. I would they had given Directions for underſtanding it, in the firſt place; for if we have no other help, than what Mr. *Creſſy* gives in his Preface, we may as well hope to underſtand the *Quakers Canting*, as Mr. *Creſſy*'s. Let the Reader judge of it, by theſe few Paſſages in his Preface. *The only proper diſpoſition, towards the receiving ſupernatural irradiations from God's Holy Spirit, is an abſtraction of life, a ſequeſtration from all buſineſs that concerns others* (though it be their Salvation) *and an attendance to God alone, in the depth of the Spirit.* And a little after, *the lights here deſired and prayed for, are ſuch as do expel all Images of Creatures, and do calm all manner of Paſſions; to the end that the Soul being in a vacuity, may be more capable of receiving and entertaining God, in the pure fund of the Spirit.* What this *pure fund of the Spirit* means, I had been ſomewhat to ſeek, had not *Lud. Bloſius* in the Preface to his *ſpiritual Inſtitution* told us, that *the Deiform fund of the Soul*, is the *ſimple eſſence of the Soul ſtamped with a divine impreſs*; or if this be not plain enough, *that from whence ariſeth a ſuper-eſſential life:* But if yet it cannot be underſtood, we may be the leſs troubled at it, ſince the ſame Author ſaith afterward, *that very few do know that hidden fund of their Souls, or believe that they have ſuch a thing within them.* It being, it ſeems, like ſome very cunning Drawer in a *Cabinet*, where the main treaſure lies; which the owner himſelf cannot find out, till it be broken to pieces: For *ſelf-annihilation* is neceſſarily required, in order to it. And this *ſuper-eſſential life*, as he admirably deſcribes it, is a certain new and cunning way of knowing without thoughts, of ſeeing in darkneſs, of underſtanding without reaſon, of unknowing *God* by perceiving him, of being melted and brought to nothing firſt, and then being loſt and ſwallowed up in *God*, by which means all created being is put off, and that which is only divine put on, being changed into God, as iron heated into the nature of fire. This being the *ſtate of perfection*, aimed at here in this World, we muſt now conſider the Directions given in order to it. To this end, in the firſt place, *a contemplative ſtate is commended above an active, as more*

perfect

Corderii Iſagog. in myſtic. Theolog. Dianyſ. c. 7.

Preface to Sancta Sophia. ſ.33.

Lud. Bloſii Inſtit. Spirit. cap. 12.

perfect and more eaſy, more ſimple and more ſecure from all Errors and Illuſions which may be occaſioned by an indiſcreet Uſe of Prayer. Where, by an *active* and *contemplative State* me muſt not underſtand what we commonly do by thoſe Terms; but the *active State* is, *the Uſe of reaſoning and internal Diſcourſe, to fix our Affections upon God, and expreſſing it ſelf in ſenſible Devotion and outward Acts of Obedience to God's Will*; the *contemplative*, in the Authors Language is, *ſeeking God in the Obſcurity of Faith with a more profound Introverſion of Spirit, and with leſs Activity and Motion in ſenſitive Nature, and without the Uſe of groſſer Images; and ſuch Souls are not of themſelves,* he ſaith, *much inclined to external Works; but they ſeek rather to purify themſelves and inflame their Hearts to the Love of God, by internal, quiet and pure Actuations in Spirit; by a total Abſtraction from Creatures, by Solitude both external and eſpecially internal; ſo diſpoſing themſelves to receive the Influxes and Inſpirations of God, whoſe Guidance chiefly they endeavour to follow in all things.* Now, he ſaith, *the Security of ſuch a State, above the other, lies in this; that a contemplative Soul tending to God, and working almoſt only with the Heart and blind Affections of the Will, pouring themſelves upon God, apprehended only in the obſcure Notion of Faith, not enquiring what he is, but believing him to be that incomprehenſible Being which he is, and which can only be comprehended by himſelf, rejecting and ſtriving to forget all Images and Repreſentations of him, or any thing elſe; yea tranſcending all Operations of the Imagination, and all Subtlety and Curioſity of reaſoning; and laſtly, ſeeking an Union with God, only by the moſt pure and moſt intime Affections of the Spirit, what Poſſibility of Illuſion or Error can there be to ſuch a Soul?* None doubtleſs; for this is more, than a meer *Sleep* of the Soul: For all *Reaſoning* and *Images of things* being wholly laid aſide, there is not ſo much as a Poſſibility of *dreaming* left. The next thing he takes notice of, which is very well obſerved, is *that Men given to ſublime Speculations* (or I ſuppoſe any who have the Uſe of Reaſon) *are not ſo capable of it, as unlearned Perſons and Women*; and therefore *Father Leander à Sancto Martino* approves the Book, *as containing very ſound and wholeſome Doctrine for the Direction of devout Souls, and fit and agreeable to our calling and Rule; and eſpecially for the uſe of our Dames*; becauſe they might more eaſily ſwallow it, as they do Pills, without chewing; and ſo find not any Bitterneſs in it: Which is to the ſame purpoſe, with that Reaſon *Baker* himſelf gives, *viz. that the Perfection of Contemplation ſcarcely at all lies in the Operations of the Underſtanding.* A moſt admirable way of contemplating with the Will: But why might it not conſiſt as well in the *Volition* of the *Underſtanding*, as in the *Contemplation* of the *Will?* The proper end of this *contemplative Life*, he adds, *is the attaining to an habitual and almoſt uninterpreted perfect Union with God, in the ſupreme Point of the Spirit* (or rather *fund* as Mr. *Creſſy* more *myſtically* calls it) *and ſuch an Union as gives the Soul a fruitive Poſſeſſion of him, and a real experimental Perception of his divine Preſence in the Depth and center of the Spirit, which is fully poſſeſſed and filled with him alone.* And leſt we ſhould think, this were all to be hoped for in this contemplative State, he ſaid further, *that beſides this active Union, wherein the Soul her ſelf concurs, there are others meerly paſſive, in which God after a wonderful*

Sancta Sophia treat. 1.c.3.ſ.1,2.

Treat. 1. c.1.ſ.4,5.

Sancta Sophia.chap. 3. ſ. 2.

ſ. 3.

The Approbations. pag. 319.

ſ. 6.

ſ. 11.

derful and inconceivable manner affords them interior Illuminations and Touches; yet far more efficacious and divine; in all which, the Soul is a meer Patient and only ſuffers God to work his divine Pleaſure in her, being neither able to further or hinder it. The which Unions, though they laſt but even as it were a Moment of time, yet do more illuminate and purify the Soul, than many Years ſpent in active Exerciſes of ſpiritual Prayer, or Mortification could do.

The Steps he ſets down, in order to this State of Perfection are, Cap.4.ſ.11 1. *The way of external and imaginary Exerciſes of Prayer; in which, without a diſcreet Diligence and Conſtancy in them, the Soul may perhaps may end her days therein.* A ſad Caſe to end our days as *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* did; who uſed this low Diſpenſation of *praying* to the laſt! But alas, they never underſtood theſe *paſſive Unions* with *God*, in the *Fund of the Spirit*; they taught Men a plain and intelligible way of ſerving God, and bid them look for Perfection in another World. 2. *Aſpirations and pure Elevations of the ſuperior Will.* 3. The *divine Inaction.* 4. Then when one would leaſt expect them, follow *woful Obſcurities and Deſolations:* And after them; 5. Comes the *State of Perfection.* Elſewhere he deſcribes the Progreſs towards this *State* of *Perfection* thus, *that he who would come* Treat. 3. Sect. 11. cap.1.ſ.10. *to it muſt practiſe the drawing of his external Senſes inwardly to his internal, there loſing and as it were annihilating them; then he muſt draw his internal Senſes into the ſuperior Powers of the Soul, and there annihilate them likewiſe; and thoſe Powers of the intellectual Soul he muſt draw into that which is called their Unity; and laſtly, that Unity, which alone is capable of perfect Union with God, muſt be applyed and firmly fixed on God; wherein the perfect divine* ſ.15. *Contemplation lies. In which Union,* he ſaith, *all is Vacuity or Emptineſs, as if nothing were exiſtent but God and the Soul; yea ſo far is the Soul from reflecting on her own Exiſtence, that it ſeems to her God and ſhe are not diſtinct, but one only thing.* This is called by ſome myſtick Authors the *State of Nothingneſs*; by others (it being Treat. 3. ſect 4. c.6. ſ. 8. indifferent it ſeems among them) the *State* of *Totality*; but the moſt ſublime Deſcription of it, is that *of the Union of nothing with nothing:* Which being hard terms to be underſtood, he explains them thus, *that the Soul being no where corporally or ſenſibly, is every where ſpiritually and immediately united to God this infinite nothing.* By which, it is juſt as intelligible as it was before. Nay, ſ. 9. which I think is the higheſt ſtate of all, it is *that the Soul comes to a feeling of her not being, and by conſequence of the not being of Creatures; the which is indeed a real Truth:* Or elſe intolerable Nonſenſe; as we cannot think it otherwiſe, who know we have Cauſe to thank *God*, we are yet in our *Wits*, and are not poſſeſſed Treat. 3. ſect. 4. S. 19, 20. with ſuch a *Spiritual Frenzy*, as this *Author* ſaith *Frier* Bernard *one of the Diſciples of St.* Francis *had*; neither was the other free from it, who as *Baker* related, *in the Heat of his interior Affection, could uſually cry out nothing but V. V. V.* Neither can any Perſons who have any Uſe of their Underſtandings left, think ſuch Diſcourſes the Effect of any thing, but of the Height of *Enthuſiaſm* or a *Religious Madneſs*. I do not think ſuch Expreſſions as thoſe I have already produced, can be parallel'd by the moſt frantick *Enthuſiaſts*, that have been ſince the beginning of the *Family of Love*.

Yet theſe Books are *licenſed, approved,* nay *admired* in the *Roman Church*; whereas we have always diſowned, diſproved, and condemned any ſuch Writers among us, and have uſed all Care to ſuppreſs and confute them. The plain Effect of ſuch *Enthuſiaſtic* Fooleries is, to make Religion laughed at by ſome, deſpiſed by others, and neglected by all, who take no other Meaſures of it, than from ſuch confounded Writers. If once an unintelligible way of practical *Religion,* become the Standard of *Devotion,* no Men of Senſe and Reaſon will ever ſet themſelves about it; but leave it to be *underſtood* by *mad Men,* and *practiſed* by *Fools.*

The utmoſt Effect of this Way is groſs Enthuſiaſm.

§. 15. But ſuppoſing this way were intelligible and practicable, which it is not; yet what would the Effect of it be, but the higheſt *Enthuſiaſm?* For the ſame Author lays it down as a fundamental Rule, *that God only, by his holy Inſpirations, is the Guide and Director in an eternal contemplative Life;* Treat. 1. Sect 2.c.1. ſ. 6. *and that all the Light they have therein, is from immediate divine Illumination, as well as our Strength from the divine Operation: And that this Light* ſ. 7. *doth extend further, and to more and other more particular Objects, than the divine Light or Grace, by which good Chriſtians living common Lives in the World are lead, extends to; yea than it does even in thoſe, that ſeek Perfection by the Exerciſes of an active Life.* But which is very extraordinary in this ſupernatural Light, he ſaith, *that generally when there is propoſed the not doing or doing of an* ſ. 12. *external Work, and both of them are lawful, the divine Inſpiration moves to the not doing;* but this is not all, but among the Impediments to *divine Inſpirations* he reckons not only *all external Du-* cap.5.ſ.10. *ties of Religion, but the doing things meerly for Edification.* A moſt excellent and *Apoſtolical* Doctrine! But it is happy for the *Chriſtian* World, the *Apoſtles* had other kind of *Inſpirations* from theſe: Or elſe they had never done much good in the World, or been ſuch eminent Examples of holy Life and Actions. What becomes of all the Precepts they have left us of doing good, of mutual Edification, of conſtant Buſineſs, beſides the Commands for the outward Duties of Worſhip, if theſe be the Hindrances in the Way to Perfection? And although he would not have *his ſpiritual, internal li-* Sect. 2. *ver to pretend to extraordinary Apparitions, Voices, Converſa-* c.1. ſ. 14. *tions with Spirits, Meſſage from Heaven,* &c. Yet in his Diſcourſe of *Paſſive Unions,* he ſaith, *that God reveals himſelf to the* Treat. 3. *Soul, by a ſupernatural Species impreſſed in her;* ſect.4.c.3. *which Revelations* ſ. 2. *are either ſenſible as Apparitions, Words,* &c. *or intellectual, either immediately, or by Angels; the Effects of which ſupernatural Inactions of God are Rapes or Extaſies, internal Viſions* &c. *in which,* ſ. 6. he ſaith, ſ. 36. *that the leſs experienced and imperfect, are to adviſe with their Director about them; but thoſe who were more eminently perfect; have followed their own Light in judging of thoſe things and practiſing accordingly, without conſulting others;* and withal adds, *that ſuch Souls which receive theſe things, muſt carefully obſerve* ſ. 37. *her internal Direction: And that they are not ſo abſolutely obliged to reſign their Judgments and Wills to others, as to neglect their own proper call received from God.* And doth this Doctrine now differ from that of the *Fanatick Sectaries,* which have ſwarmed in *England?* Yes, Mr. *Creſſy,* in his Preface, undertakes at large to ſhew the Difference: by anſwering the Objection taken from thence

againſt

derful and inconceivable manner affords them interior Illuminations and Touches; yet far more efficacious and divine; in all which, the Soul is a meer Patient and only ſuffers God to work his divine Pleaſure in her, being neither able to further or hinder it. The which Unions, though they laſt but even as it were a Moment of time, yet do more illuminate and purify the Soul, than many Years ſpent in active Exerciſes of ſpiritual Prayer, or Mortification could do.

The Steps he ſets down, in order to this State of Perfection are, Cap.4.ſ.11 1. *The way of external and imaginary Exerciſes of Prayer; in which, without a diſcreet Diligence and Conſtancy in them, the Soul may perhaps may end her days therein.* A ſad Caſe to end our days as *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* did; who uſed this low Diſpenſation of *praying* to the laſt! But alas, they never underſtood theſe *paſſive Unions* with *God*, in the *Fund of the Spirit*; they taught Men a plain and intelligible way of ſerving God, and bid them look for Perfection in another World. 2. *Aſpirations and pure Elevations of the ſuperior Will.* 3. The *divine Inaction.* 4. Then when one would leaſt expect them, follow *woful Obſcurities and Deſolations:* And after them; 5. Comes the *State of Perfection.* Elſewhere he deſcribes the Progreſs towards this *State* of *Perfection* thus, *that he who would come* Treat. 3. Sect. 11. cap.1.ſ.10. *to it muſt practiſe the drawing of his external Senſes inwardly to his internal, there loſing and as it were annihilating them; then he muſt draw his internal Senſes into the ſuperior Powers of the Soul, and there annihilate them likewiſe; and thoſe Powers of the intellectual Soul he muſt draw into that which is called their Unity; and laſtly, that Unity, which alone is capable of perfect Union with God, muſt be applyed and firmly fixed on God; wherein the perfect divine* ſ.15. *Contemplation lies. In which Union,* he ſaith, *all is Vacuity or Emptineſs, as if nothing were exiſtent but God and the Soul; yea ſo far is the Soul from reflecting on her own Exiſtence, that it ſeems to her God and ſhe are not diſtinct, but one only thing.* This is called by ſome myſtick Authors the *State of Nothingneſs*; by others (it being indifferent it ſeems among them) the *State* of *Totality*; but the Treat. 3. ſect 4. c.6. ſ. 8. moſt ſublime Deſcription of it, is that *of the Union of nothing with nothing:* Which being hard terms to be underſtood, he explains them thus, *that the Soul being no where corporally or ſenſibly, is every where ſpiritually and immediately united to God this infinite nothing.* By which, it is juſt as intelligible as it was before. Nay, ſ. 9. which I think is the higheſt ſtate of all, it is *that the Soul comes to a feeling of her not being, and by conſequence of the not being of Creatures; the which is indeed a real Truth:* Or elſe intolerable Nonſenſe; as we cannot think it otherwiſe, who know we have Cauſe to thank *God*, we are yet in our *Wits*, and are not poſſeſſed Treat. 3. ſect. 4. S. 19, 20. with ſuch a *Spiritual Frenzy*, as this *Author* ſaith *Frier* Bernard *one of the Diſciples of St.* Francis *had*; neither was the other free from it, who as *Baker* related, *in the Heat of his interior Affection, could uſually cry out nothing but V. V. V.* Neither can any Perſons who have any Uſe of their Underſtandings left, think ſuch Diſcourſes the Effect of any thing, but of the Height of *Enthuſiaſm* or a *Religious Madneſs.* I do not think ſuch Expreſſions as thoſe I have already produced, can be parallel'd by the moſt frantick *Enthuſiaſts*, that have been ſince the beginning of the *Family of Love.*

Yet theſe Books are *licenſed*, *approved*, nay *admired* in the *Roman Church*; whereas we have always diſowned, diſproved, and condemned any ſuch Writers among us, and have uſed all Care to ſuppreſs and confute them. The plain Effect of ſuch *Enthuſiaſtic* Fooleries is, to make Religion laughed at by ſome, deſpiſed by others, and neglected by all, who take no other Meaſures of it, than from ſuch confounded Writers. If once an unintelligible way of practical *Religion*, become the Standard of *Devotion*, no Men of Senſe and Reaſon will ever ſet themſelves about it; but leave it to be *underſtood* by *mad Men*, and *practiſed* by *Fools*.

The utmoſt Effect of this Way is groſs Enthuſiaſm.

§. 15. But ſuppoſing this way were intelligible and practicable, which it is not; yet what would the Effect of it be, but the higheſt *Enthuſiaſm?* For the ſame Author lays it down as a fundamental Rule, *that God only, by his holy Inſpirations, is the Guide and Director in an eternal contemplative Life; and that all the Light they have therein, is from immediate divine Illumination, as well as our Strength from the divine Operation: And that this Light doth extend further, and to more and other more particular Objects, than the divine Light or Grace, by which good Chriſtians living common Lives in the World are lead, extends to; yea than it does even in thoſe, that ſeek Perfection by the Exerciſes of an active Life.* But which is very extraordinary in this ſupernatural Light, he ſaith, *that generally when there is propoſed the not doing or doing of an external Work, and both of them are lawful, the divine Inſpiration moves to the not doing*; but this is not all, but among the Impediments to *divine Inſpirations* he reckons not only *all external Duties of Religion, but the doing things meerly for Edification.* A moſt excellent and *Apoſtolical* Doctrine! But it is happy for the *Chriſtian* World, the *Apoſtles* had other kind of *Inſpirations* from theſe: Or elſe they had never done much good in the World, or been ſuch eminent Examples of holy Life and Actions. What becomes of all the Precepts they have left us of doing good, of mutual Edification, of conſtant Buſineſs, beſides the Commands for the outward Duties of Worſhip, if theſe be the Hindrances in the Way to Perfection? And although he would not have *his ſpiritual, internal liver to pretend to extraordinary Apparitions, Voices, Converſations with Spirits, Meſſage from Heaven,* &c. Yet in his Diſcourſe of *Paſſive Unions*, he ſaith, *that God reveals himſelf to the Soul, by a ſupernatural Species impreſſed in her; which Revelations are either ſenſible as Apparitions, Words,* &c. *or intellectual, either immediately, or by Angels; the Effects of which ſupernatural Inactions of God are Rapes or Extaſies, internal Viſions* &c. *in which,* he ſaith, *that the leſs experienced and imperfect, are to adviſe with their Director about them; but thoſe who were more eminently perfect; have followed their own Light in judging of thoſe things and practiſing accordingly, without conſulting others*; and withal adds, *that ſuch Souls which receive theſe things, muſt carefully obſerve her internal Direction: And that they are not ſo abſolutely obliged to reſign their Judgments and Wills to others, as to neglect their own proper call received from God.* And doth this Doctrine now differ from that of the *Fanatick Sectaries*, which have ſwarmed in *England?* Yes, Mr. *Creſſy*, in his Preface, undertakes at large to ſhew the Difference: by anſwering the Objection taken from thence againſt

Treat. 1. Sect 2.c.1. ſ. 6.
ſ. 7.
ſ. 12.
cap.5.ſ.10.
Sect. 2. c.1. ſ. 14.
Treat. 3. ſect.4.c.3. ſ. 2.
ſ. 6.
ſ. 36.
ſ. 37.

againſt the publiſhing this Doctrine; becauſe it would juſtify them, in all their frenzies and diſorders: and in order to this; 1. He very foolishly goes about to prove *the neceſſity of Divine Inſpirations*, from the *neceſſity of Divine Grace, for the doing good actions*; which is not denied by the greateſt Enemies to *Enthuſiaſm*. 2. He ſaith, *we ought to correſpond to thoſe Divine Inſpirations, which ſtir us up to good actions*; if he means by them nothing but the aſſiſtance of Divine Grace, no one queſtions it. 3. *That there may be falſe ſuggeſtions of the Devil, which may appear like the motions of* God's *Spirit*. 4. That, *it being neceſſary theſe ſhould be diſtinguiſhed from each other, the only means imaginable, that can be proper, natural and efficacious to obtain ſuch a ſupernatural light to diſcern* God's *will in all things, is pure ſpiritual* Prayer *exerciſed by a Soul living an abſtracted, internal, recollected life, ſpent in a continual attendance on* God, *&c. i. e.* in ſhort, the direction of F. *Auguſtine Baker*. And is not this, think we, a very cunning way of vindicating his Doctrine from *Fanaticiſm*, to make *Enthuſiaſm* neceſſary to *diſtinguiſh the motions* of the *good* and *bad Spirit* in our minds? I have already ſhewed, that he teaches the higheſt *Enthuſiaſm*; and it ſeems, thoſe who made the objection were ſenſible of it. But how doth Mr. *Creſſy* anſwer it? by ſhewing what they condemn, to be neceſſary; and in effect, that no Man can know the difference between the motions of the *Holy Ghoſt* and the Devil, but by *Enthuſiaſm*; nay, that is the plain meaning of his words, for this *contemplative* Prayer, he ſaith, is the only means to gain ſuch a *ſupernatural light*, whereby we can diſtinguiſh one from the other. An admirable way! to tell Men they muſt firſt be mad, before they can know whether they be in their wits or no. But ſince this *contemplative ſtate*, hath beſides the common, though *immediate illuminations*, many *paſſive unions*, or *extraordinary revelations* attending it; ſuppoſe the Queſtion were put, how one ſhould know whether theſe came from God or the Devil, what Anſwer will Mr. *Creſſy* then give? will he return back again to try *illuminations* by *inſpirations* (as he calls them) and ſo *inſpirations* by *illuminations*, which is juſt like the *Scripture* by the *Church*, and *Church* by *Scripture*?

Creſſy's *Preface to* Sancta Sophia. S. 23.

S. 24.

S. 25.

S. 27.

S. 29. *But here*, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, *is no pretending to new or ſtrange Revelations, no walking in mirabilibus ſuper ſe:* Yes I think he doth ſo, when he utters theſe things; for what are *paſſive unions*, but *new Revelations*, and as great, as ever any *Fanatick Sectary* pretended to? Did not they deliver this for their Doctrine, that Men ought to hearken to the immediate impulſes of the *Spirit of God* within them; and that now, God doth acquaint his own People with his mind and will, in a way peculiar to themſelves? And what have they done, of the *myſtical way*, but only changed a few terms, and aſſerted the thing it ſelf higher, than our *Enthuſiaſts* did; who did not boaſt of ſo many *raptures*, *viſions*, and *revelations*, as thoſe of the *Church* of R*ome* have done. *Lud. Bloſius* in his Works, hath one Book called *Monile Spirituale*; which conſiſts of nothing, but the new and ſtrange revelations which were made to four Women Saints, St. *Gertrude*, St. *Mathildis*, St. *Brigitt*, and St. *Catharine*; and in his Preface ſaith, *it is a ſign of a carnal mind, to deſpiſe ſuch revelations as theſe are: For the Church of* God *is wonderfully enlightned by them. What*, ſaith he, *did not the* Prophets *and Apoſtles* receive

Lud. Bloſii Monile Spirit. p. 78.

receive Truth from Heaven by Revelations? As though the caſe were the very ſame in theſe melancholy Women, and in the holy *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*; and we had juſt as much reaſon to believe the effects of *hiſtorical Vapours*, as of the *Divine Spirit.* And leſt we ſhould imagine, theſe were only the Fancies of ſome Women, which their Church would not be concerned for the credit of, he concludes with ſaying, *that theſe Revelations were known to the World and approved.* For thoſe of St. *Brigitt*, we have before ſhewed how much they were approved; for St. *Gertrudes*, he ſaith the ſame; and *that one very learned and illuminate Man did ſay, after the accurate reading of them, that Man could not have the Spirit of* God, *who queſtioned whether thoſe Revelations came from it or no.* And therefore *Bloſius* is ſo far from denying any new or ſtrange Revelations among them, that being a devout Man, *he prays God to pardon thoſe, who queſtioned the Authority of theſe Revelations.* But if no *new Revelations* are allowed among them, what means that ſaying in the *ſpiritual Exerciſes* of the *Jeſuits, p.* 31, 32. of the Impreſſion, *A. D.* 1574. *it is the great perfection of a Chriſtian, to keep himſelf indifferent, to do what* God *ſhall reveal to him; and not to determine himſelf to do, what he hath already revealed and taught in the* Goſpel. This is ſpeaking to the purpoſe; and leſt I ſhould ſeem to charge any unjuſtly, (this Paſſage not appearing in the latter Impreſſions) it may be found in the *moral Practice* of the *Jeſuits*, from the *Biſhop* of *Malaga*. But the *Jeſuits* are not ſo much Mr. *Creſſy*'s Friends, that he ſhould be concerned in their *Vindication:* I can tell him therefore of a Friend of his, whom I am ſure he is concerned for, that is for *new and ſtrange Revelations* too; and that is the *worthy Publiſher* of the *ſixteen Revelations of Mother Juliana:* And if thoſe be not *new* and *ſtrange*, I think none ever ought to be accounted ſo.

Moral Practice of the Jeſuits. p. 379.

S. 33.

But ſuppoſing they have *new* and *ſtrange Revelations* among them, yet Mr. *Creſſy* ſaith, *they are not ſeditious and troubleſome to the World; no diſſolving Unity, or croſſing lawful Authority by them; becauſe theſe are enjoyed in Solitude and Retirements, and ſuppoſing they be miſtaken, no harm would acrew to others by it.* As though Perſons were ever the leſs mad for being chained, and having a *Keeper* aſſigned them: Such in effect do they make the Office of a *Confeſſor* to theſe *Contemplatives.* The miſchief to the World is not ſo great while they are kept up, but that to *Religion* is unſufferable; while they lead devout Perſons in ſuch an unintelligible way, that the higheſt degree of their Perfection is *Madneſs.* But I have already proved at large, that they have not been able in ſome Caſes, or willing in others, to keep up theſe *Enthuſiaſtical* Perſons among them; but they have done as much to the diſturbance of the Peace, and been as unreclaimable among them, as ever any *Fanatick Sectaries* have done or been in *England.* And we are not to think, that the Principles of their *Church* are ſuch quiet, meek and obedient things, that not a Man among them would ever lift up his Finger to give any diſturbance to the peace of a Nation: For,

Of their Fanaticiſm in reſiſting Authority under a pretence of Religion.

§. 16. I now come to prove, that they are as much guilty of the ſecond ſort of *Fanaticiſm* as any *Sectaries* among us have been; which is the reſiſting Authority, under a pretence of *Religion.* This I ſhall prove by two things. 1. That the Principles and Practices of the *Jeſuitical Party* in the *Roman Church*, are as deſtructive to Go-

vernment, as of the moſt *Fanatick Sectaries*, which ever have been among us. 2. That this Party is the moſt countenanced, and encouraged by the *Court* of *Rome*.

1. That the Principles and Practices of the *Jeſuitical Party* in the *Roman Church* are as deſtructive to *Government*, as of the moſt *Fanatick Sectaries* which ever have been among us. What effects of *Fanaticiſm* have we ſeen in *England* ſo dreadful, which may not be parallel'd with *Examples*, or juſtified by the *Principles* of that Party? Is it, that ſo many Mens Lives have been deſtroyed, under a pretence of *Religion?* And do they think the *Maſſacre* at *Paris*, and the *Rebellion* in *Ireland*, can ever be forgotten by us? Is it, that *Government* was ſuppoſed by them to be ſo originally in the People, that they by their *Repreſentatives* may call their *Soveraign* to an account, and alter the *Form* of *Government?* This is the expreſs Doctrine of the *Jeſuits:* For, ſaith *Bellarmin*, *Civil Power is immediately in the People, as the immediate Subject of it: And is indifferently transferred by them, either to one or many; and if they ſee cauſe they may change it as they ſee good, from a Monarchy to an Ariſtocracy or a Democracy.* But becauſe after the writing that Book, ſome Perſons had publiſhed a Doctrine contrary to his; therefore, in the *recognition* and *of* his *Works*, he endeavours to ſtrengthen what he had delivered, and produces a ſaying of *Navarre*, *that the People never do transfer their Power ſo far to the King, but they retain it habitually in themſelves; and may in certain Caſes, reſume it into their own Hands. John Mariana*, whoſe Name will never be forgotten in theſe matters, determines the Caſe plainly, *That if there be no hope of a Princes amendment, the Common-wealth may take away his Kingdom; and becauſe that cannot be done without War, they may raiſe Armies againſt him; and having proclaimed the King their publick Enemy, may take away his Life. Reynolds* in his Book of the juſt *Abdication* of *Henry* III. of *France*, ſaith, *that all the Majeſty of the Kingdom is in the Aſſembly of the States, to whom it belongs to bridle the Kingly Power, and to ſettle all things that belong to the publick Government.* This is a Doctrine fitted for ſuch a ſeaſon, wherein there is hopes to prevail upon a conſiderable Party (as in the *League* in *France*) to do their Buſineſs; but in caſe the *States* of the *Kingdom* be faithful to their Prince, they have eaſier ways of Diſpatch. And to this end, they declare it lawful for any Perſon to take away the Life of a *Prince* excommunicated by the *Pope*. But here their juggling and ſhuffling ſhew their meaning is not good; for they who mean honeſtly, are not afraid to ſpeak plainly. If any one ask them, *whether it be lawful to kill their Soveraign?* They will tell you *by no means*, and that none of them ever ſaid ſo; but he being excommunicated they do not account him their *Soveraign*, and ſo they may lawfully do it. Nay it is avowed by ſome of them, *that it is a point of Faith, to believe it is in the Popes power to depoſe heretical Princes; and that Subjects are, upon their being declared heretical, thereby abſolved from all duty of* Obedience *to them. Nay, that there needs no ſentence of the Pope to be pronounced againſt him:* And *Mariana* makes *an intention of publick good, or, the advice of grave* Men *ſufficient;* ſuch as the Jeſuits in *France* were to *Clement*, *Chaſtel*, and *Ravaillac*, the firſt and laſt the actual Murtherers of *Henry* III. and *Henry* IV. and the ſecond ſhewed

his

Bellar. de Levitis, l. 3. c. 6.

Recognit. p. 56.

Marian. de Regis Inſtitut. l. 1. c. 6.

De juſtâ abdicatione. H. n. 3. l. 3. c. 8.

Philipater c. edictum. Elizab. p. 159.

his good Intentions when he ſtabbed *Henry* IV. in the Mouth. If any *Prieſt* or *Frier* ſhould attempt it, they have an excellent *ſalvo* for him, that *being a ſpiritual Perſon* (according to their Doctrine of *Exemption*) *he is no Subject to the King*. *If the Authority of the Council of Conſtance* be objected by them, as the *Doctrine of their Church*, againſt theſe Principles, they have withal given us an Anſwer, that it meddles not with the Caſe of *Soveraign Heretical Princes excommunicated by the Pope*. I need not produce the particular Teſtimonies in this matter, of *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, *Valentia*, *Vaſquez*, with the herd of the *Jeſuitical* Order who followed theſe; having been produced by ſo many already, and particularly by the two worthy Authors of the *Anſwer* to *Philanax*, and the *Papiſts Apology*; from the latter of whom, we ſhortly expect a more accurate examination of theſe Things: and by the former may appear, what Influence the *Jeſuitical Party* had upon the moſt barbarous effects of *Fanaticiſm* here, in the Murther of a moſt excellent Prince. To whoſe Obſervations I ſhall only add this, that A.D. 1648. a Book was printed with this Title, *Several Speeches delivered at a Conference, concerning the power of Parliament to proceed againſt their King for miſgovernment*, licenſed by *Gilb.* M*abbot*; which is, word for word, taken out of *Parſons* the *Jeſuits* Book of Succeſſion to the *Crown of* England (purpoſely deſigned againſt our *Kings* Title) as will appear to any one, who will take the pains to compare them. By which we may ſee to whom our *Fanaticks* owed their Principles, and their Precedents; and how much *Father Parſons* (though at that diſtance) contributed to the cutting off the *Kings* Head. But it may be now they have changed their Principles, and renounced all theſe Doctrines; we ſhould like them ſo much the better, if once they did this freely and ſincerely; and not with ſly Tricks and Equivocations, which they uſe in theſe matters, when ever they are pinched with them. Let them without *mental Reſervations*, declare but theſe two Points; that *the Pope cannot abſolve the Kings Subjects, from the Oath of Allegiance they make to him*; and that *though the Pope ſhould excommunicate the King as a Heretick, and raiſe War againſt him, they are bound to defend the King againſt the Pope*; and by the owning theſe two Propoſitions, they will gain more upon our belief of their Fidelity, than the large Volumn in Vindication of the *Iriſh* R*emonſtrance* hath done; for there they falter, in the very entrance; for being charged from Rome, *that by their* R*emonſtrance they had fallen under the Condemnation of the Bull of* Paul V. *againſt the Oath of Allegiance*, they give theſe three Anſwers which ought to be conſidered by us. 1. *That in the Oath of Allegiance they ſwear and teſtifie in their Conſciences before God, and the World, that King* Charles *is their lawful King, and that the Pope hath no power to depoſe, &c. Whereas they only acknowledge it.* 2. *That in the Oath of Allegiance the contrary Opinion is condemned, which is not in theirs.* 3. *That in the Oath of Allegiance, they declare that they believe that the Pope cannot diſpenſe with that Oath, or any part of it; but this is omitted by them:* And ſurely not without reaſon on their Parts, but with little ſatisfaction on ours: And it is eaſy to obſerve, that this *Remonſtrance* was grounded upon this, *that the Pope owned our King to be lawful King of* England (a great Kindneſs) and this being ſuppoſed, all the reſt follows naturally, as they well prove againſt the *Divines* of *Lovain*; but ſuppoſe it

Anſw. to Philan. *chap. 5. p.* 111.

Anſw. to Apology. p. 6.

Anſw. to P*hilan. p.* 53. *to* 65.

Remonſt. Hiber. nor. p. 1. c. 4. S. 2.

Remonſt. Hib. p. 1 c. 2. art. 2. 5.

ſhould come into his *Holineſs*'s Head, to be of another Opinion, we ſee no aſſurance but they will be ſo too. And it may make the *Pope* more cautious for the Future, how he declares himſelf, when ſuch ill uſe is made of it; and others, how they rely upon ſuch *Remonſtrances*, which have ſtill a tacit Reſervation of the *Popes power* to declare and diſpenſe. But will they declare it unlawful to reſiſt Authority, when the Cauſe of their *Church* is concerned; and ſuppoſing that thereby they can ſettle the *Pope* in the full Exerciſe of his ſpiritual *Authority* among us? No, this is their *Good Old Cauſe*, that undermines *Parliaments*, that *ſanctifies* Rebellion, and turns *Nuptials* into *Maſſacres*. This is that which changes *Blood* into *Holy Water*, and *dying* for Treaſon into *Martyrdom*; this is that which gives the Glory at Rome to *Regicides*, and makes the Pictures of *Gueret*, *Guiguard* and *Garnet*, ſo much valued there; of which we have a ſufficient Teſtimony, from *Monſ. S. Amour*; who tells us, that among the ſeveral Pourtraicts of Jeſuits, publickly ſold there with permiſſion of the Superiour, heſaw one of *Garnet*, with this Inſcription, *Pater Henricus Garnetus Anglus, Londini pro fide Catholicâ ſuſpenſus & ſectus Maii* 1606. Father Henry Garnet, hanged and quartered at *London*, for the Catholick Faith: by which we ſee, that Treaſon and the Catholick Faith are all one at Rome; for nothing can be more notorious, than that *Garnet* ſuffered only on the account of the *Gunpowder-Treaſon*, of which as *M. S. Amour* obſerves, he acknowledged himſelf guilty before he dyed. The moſt dangerous Sect among us, is of thoſe who under pretence of ſetting up the *Kingdom of Chriſt*, think it lawful to overturn the *Kingdoms* of the World. But herein they have mightily the Advantage of thoſe of the *Church* of Rome, that what they do for *Chriſt*, the other do it only for his *Vicar:* and ſurely if either were lawful, it is much fitter to do it for one, than for the other. We are of opinion, that it is ſomewhat better being under *Chriſts* own Government, than the *Popes*, whatever they think, but we condemn any *Oppoſition* to *Government*, under any pretence whatſoever, and though *Venner* and his Company acted to the height of *Fanaticiſm*, among our Sectaries; yet Guido *Faux* with his Companions in their Church, went beyond them.

Canon. p. 1. c. 5. S. 24. p. 25.

S Amour's Journal. part. 2. *ch.* 11. p 58.

2. That Party which hath been moſt deſtructive to *Civil Government*, hath had the moſt Countenance and Encouragement from Rome. Of which I ſhall give but two *Inſtances*, but ſufficient to prove the thing, *A. D.* 1594. 27. of *December*, *John Caſtel* a Citizens Son of *Paris:* and Diſciple of the *Jeſuits*, having been three Years in the School, watched his opportunity to ſtab *Henry* IV. But by his ſtooping, juſt at the time of the Blow, he ſtruck him only into the mouth; upon which the *Jeſuits* were baniſhed *France*, and a *Pyramid* erected in the place of his *Fathers* Houſe; in the Front whereof towards the *Palace-gate*, the *Arreſt* of the *Court of Parliament* againſt the *Traytor* was engraven, containing his Examination and Confeſſion, of being a *Scholar* of the *Jeſuits*, a Diſciple of *Guerets*; and the Sentence paſſed upon him becauſe he believed it lawful to *kill Kings*, that *Henry* IV. was not in the *Church*, till he was approved by the *Pope*, &c. This *Arreſt* continued without notice taken of it at Rome, till *October* 9. *A. D.* 1609. and on that Day, it was condemned by the order of the *Inquiſition*, and put into the *Index expurgatorius*, as it is at this Day to be ſeen. Which was a time wherein many Reports were ſled abroad

Index expugat. Alex. 7. p. 705.

in many Parts of the Murther of *Henry* IV. and Letters came to *Paris* from ſeveral Places, to know the Truth of it; and the Conſequence of this was, that it being found how careful the *Court* of *Rome* was to preſerve the Honour of *Regicides*, it was but ſeven Months and twenty four days, before *Ravaillac* perfected that Work which the other had begun. This Obſervation I owe to an ingenuous and learned *Doctor* of the *Sorbon*, yet living; who deteſts theſe Practices and Doctrines, and himſelf lies under the ſame *Cenſure* there. And the more to abuſe the World on the ſame day, a Book of *Mariana*'s was ſuſpended; which thoſe, who look no farther than the Name, might imagine was the dangerous Book, ſo much complained of; but upon ſearch it appears, to be a Book quite of another Nature, concerning *Coyns*.

Joh. Launoy Epiſt. par. 6. pag. 358.

The latter Inſtance concerns the *Iriſh Remonſtrance*, the account of which I take from *Caron* the publiſher of it. The *Popiſh Clergy* of *Ireland* (a very few excepted) were accuſed of *Rebellion*, for oppoſing themſelves to the *Kings* Authority, by the Inſtigation of the *Popes Nuncio*; after which followed a meeting of the *Popiſh Biſhops*, where they baniſhed the *Kings Lieutenant*, and took the Royal Authority upon themſelves; almoſt all the *Clergy*, and a great Part of the People joyned with them: And therefore it was neceſſary, ſince the *Kings* Return to give him better Satisfaction concerning their *Allegiance*; and to decline the *Oath* of *Allegiance*, which they muſt otherwiſe have taken, ſome of them agree upon this *Remonſtrance* to preſent to the *King*, the News of which was no ſooner come to *Rome*, but *Cardinal Barbarin* ſends a Letter to the *Iriſh Nobility* 8 July *A. D.* 1662. *to bid them take heed of being drawn into the Ditch by thoſe blind Guides, who had ſubſcribed to ſome Propoſitions teſtifying their Loyalty to the King which had been before condemned by the Apoſtolick See.* After this the *Popes Nuncio at* Bruſſels, July 21. 1662, ſends them word, *how diſpleaſing their* Remonſtrance *was at* Rome; *and that after diligent Examination by the Cardinals and Divines, they found it contained Propoſitions already condemned by* Paul *V. and* Innocent *X. and therefore the Pope gave him Order to publiſh this among them; that he was ſo far from approving their Remonſtrances, that he did not ſo much as permit it, or connive at it, and was extremely grieved that the Iriſh Nobility were drawn into it, and therefore condemned it in this Form, that it could not be kept without Breach of Faith, according to the Decree of* Paul V. *and that it denied the Popes Authority in Matters of Faith, according to that of* Innocent *X.* By this very late Inſtance, we ſee what little Countenance they receive from *Rome*, who offer to give any reaſonable Security to the *King* of their *Loyalty*; and by the *Popes* own Declaration, the giving of it is an Injury to the *Faith*, and a denying of his *Supremacy*. For which we are to underſtand that *A. D.* 1648. when the *Papiſts* were willing to make as good terms for themſelves as they could, and it was objected to them, that they held Principles inconſiſtent with civil Government, *viz. That the Pope can abſolve them from their Obedience; that he can depoſe and deſtroy heretical Magiſtrates, that he can diſpenſe with all Oaths and Contracts they make with thoſe whom they call Hereticks*; upon this they met together, and to ſave themſelves from Baniſhment reſolved them in the *Negative*; but no ſooner

Remonſtr. Hib. p. 1 c. 5. p. 27.

cap. 3. p. 6.

was this heard at *Rome*, but the *ſacred Congregation* condemned *this Reſolution as heretical, and the Subſcribers, as liable to the Penalties againſt thoſe who deny the Popes Authority in Matters of Faith; upon which they are cited to appear at* Rome, *and Cenſures and Priſons are there prepared for them.* The Sum of it then is, that they can give no Security of their Loyalty to the *King*, againſt the *Popes* Power to depoſe him, and abſolve his *Subjects* from whatever *Oaths* they make to him; or they muſt be accounted *Hereticks* at *Rome* for ſo doing. For this *good old Cauſe* is as much ſtill in requeſt at *Rome* as ever; and it is in their Power to be accounted *Hereticks* at Rome, or *bad Subjects* in their own Country; but one of them they cannot avoid. So much may ſuffice to ſhew that the moſt dangerous Principles of *Fanaticiſm*, either as to *Enthuſiaſm* or *Civil Government*, are owned and allowed in the *Church* of R*ome*: And therefore the Number of *Fanaticks* among us is very unjuſtly charged upon the reading the *Scriptures* in our own Language. For I hope I have made it evident by this Diſcourſe, that thoſe who read not the *Scriptures* may be as *fanatical* and *diſloyal*, as thoſe that do: And to ſay that *Sects and Fanaticiſms are the dire Effects of the promiſcuous reading of the Scriptures*, is in effect to ſay that the Scripture is a peſtilent Book, which God had better have kept to himſelf, and good for nothing but to confound the World; and that the only way to hinder the Miſchiefs which it is apt to produce, is (follow his own Compariſon) to keep it out of the Peoples Way, as Men do Knives and Swords from their Children.

H. 9

CHAP. V.

84.2:K

Of the Diviſions of the Roman *Church.*

The great pretence of Unity in the Church *of* Rome *conſidered. The* Pope's *Authority the Fountain of that Unity; what that Authority is, which is challenged by the* Popes *over the* Chriſtian *World; the diſturbances which have happened therein, on the account of it. The firſt Revolt of* Rome *from the Empire, cauſed by the* Popes; Baronius *his Arguments anſwered. Rebellion the Foundation of the Greatneſs of that* Church. *The cauſe of the ſtrict League between the* Popes *and the Poſterity of* Charles Martel. *The Diſturbances made by* Popes, *in the new Empire: Of the Quarrels of* Greg. *VII. with the Emperor and other Chriſtian* Princes, *upon the Pretence of the* Popes *Authority. More diſturbances on that account in Chriſtendom, than any other matter of Religion. Of the Schiſms which have happened in the* Roman *Church; particularly thoſe after the time of* Formoſus, *wherein his Ordinations were nulled by his Succeſſors; the Popes Oppoſition to each other in that Age: The miſerable State of that Church then deſcribed. Of the* Schiſms *of latter times, by the* Italick *and* Gallick *Factions; the long Continuance of them. The Miſchief of thoſe* Schiſms *on their own Principles. Of the Diviſions in that Church about Matters of Order and Government. The Differences between the Biſhops and the Monaſtick Orders, about exemptions and*

and Privileges; the Hiſtory of that Controverſy, and the bad Succeſs the Popes *had in attempting to compoſe it. Of the Quarrel between the* Regulars *and* Seculars *in* England. *The Continuance of that Controverſy here, and in* France. *The* Jeſuits *Enmity to the Epiſcopal Order and Juriſdiction: the hard Caſe of the* Biſhop *of* Angelopolis *in* America. *The Popes ſtill favour the* Regulars *as much as they dare. The* Jeſuits *way of converting the* Chineſe, *diſcovered by that* Biſhop. *Of the Differences in Matters of Doctrines in that* Church. *They have no better way to compoſe than we. The* Popes *Authority never truly ended one Controverſy among them. Their Ways to evade the Deciſions of Popes and Councils. Their Diſſentions are about Matters of Faith. The Ways taken to excuſe their own Differences will take away the Differences between them and us, manifeſted by* Sancta Clara's *Expoſition of the thirty nine Articles. Their Diſputes not confined to their* Schools, *proved by a particular Inſtance, about the immaculate Conception; the infinite Scandals, confeſſed by their own Authors, to have been in their Church about it. From all which it appears, that the* Church *of* Rome *can have no advantage in point of Unity, above ours.*

Of the great pretence of Unity, in the Church of Rome.

2. §. 1. THE other thing objected, as flowing from the promiſcuous reading the Scriptures is, *the number of our Sects*, and *the Diſturbances which have been among us upon their account:* Whereas among them, the Government of the Church is ſo ordered, as to keep all *in Peace and Unity.* This makes it neceſſary, to examine that admirable *Unity* they boaſt ſo much of, and either they mean by it, that there hath been leſs *Diſturbance* in the World before the *Reformation* or no *Schiſms* among themſelves, or no *Differences* in the Matters of *Religion.* But I ſhall now prove: 1. That there have never been greater Diſturbances in the World, than upon the account of that *Authority* of the *Pope*, which they look on as the *Foundation* of that *Unity.* 2. That there have happened great and ſcandalous *Schiſms* among themſelves, on the ſame account. 3. That their Differences in *Religion*, both as to Matter of Order and Doctrine have been as great, and managed with as much Animoſity, as any among us.

Hiſtory of Romiſh Uſurpations by Hen. Foulis.

1. The *Diſturbances* in the World upon the account of the *Popes Authority:* I meddle not barely with his *Uſurpations* (which Work is lately and largely done) but the Effects of them in theſe *Weſtern Churches*. For which we are to conſider, what *Authority* that is which the *Pope* challenges; and what Diſturbances have been given to the Peace of *Chriſtendom* by it. The *Authority* claimed by the *Pope*, is that of being *Univerſal Paſtor* over the *Catholick Church*, by Virtue of which not only ſpiritual Direction in Matters of Faith, but an actual Juriſdiction over all the Members of it doth belong unto him. "For otherwiſe, they ſay the Government of the *Church* " is imperfect, and inſufficient for its end; becauſe Princes may ea-" ſily overthrow the Unity of the Church, by favouring Hereticks, " if they be not in Subjection to the *Pope*, as to their temporal Con-" cernments; becauſe it may happen that they have a regard to " no other but theſe; if it were not therefore in the *Popes* Power, " to depoſe *Princes*, and abſolve Subjects from their Allegiance, when

“ they oppoſe the *Unity* of the *Church*, his *Power*, ſay they, is an inſignificant Title, and cannot reach the end it was deſigned for. Beſides they urge, that all Princes coming into the Church are to be ſuppoſed to ſubmit their Scepters to Chriſt, ſo as to loſe them in caſe they act contrary to the *Catholick Church*, of which they are made Members; for *whoſoever doth not hate Father and Mother*, &c. *cannot be my Diſciple.* And what Officer is there ſo fit to take all *Eſcheats* and *Forfeiture* of *Powers*, as Chriſt's own Vicar upon Earth? But to add more Strength, *Bellarmin* very prettily proves it out of *Paſce oves*, “ for every Paſtor muſt have a threefold Power to defend his Flock; a Power over Wolves, to keep them from deſtroying the Sheep; a Power over the Rams, that they do not hurt them; and a Power over the Sheep, to give them convenient Food: Now, ſaith he, *very ſubtilly*, if a Prince of a Sheep ſhould turn a Ram or a Wolf, muſt not he have Power to drive him away, and to keep the People from following him? This is then the only current Doctrine concerning the *Popes* Authority, in the *Court* of *Rome*, and although ſome mince the Matter more than others do, and talk only of an *indirect* Power; yet they all mean the ſame thing, and aſcribe ſuch Power to the *Pope*, whereby he may depoſe Princes, and abſolve Subjects from the Duty they owe to them. And how much in requeſt this Doctrine continues at *Rome*, appears by the Counſel given by *Michael Lonigo*, *Maſter* of the *Palace*, to *Pope Gregory* XV. Printed *A. D.* 1623. about perſwading the Duke of *Bavaria*, then newly made *Elector*, to receive a Confirmation of his Title from the Pope; “ to which end, he ſaith, ſome ſkilful Perſon ought to be employed to acquaint him, that the Power of the Empire was the meer Iſſue of the *Church*, and did ſpring from it as a Child from the Mother; and that it was a great Sin for any *Chriſtian* to call this into Queſtion; and conſequently the *Popes* Power and Authority to determine concerning the State and Affairs of the *Empire*; and this he attempts to prove by no fewer than nineteen Arguments, all of them drawn from the former Uſurpations of the *Popes*, and Encroachments upon the Empire: From whence he concludes, that the *Electorſhip* could not be lawfully taken away from one, and given to another, without the *Popes* Conſent and Authority; and that ſuch a Diſpoſal of it was in it ſelf *null*; and of no Force. The ſame Year, came forth a Book of *Aphoriſms* concerning the reſtoring the State of the Church, by the Decree and Approbation of the *Colledge* of *Cardinals*, collected by the ſame Perſon, and by him preſented to the *Pope*; wherein the ſame Power of the Pope is aſſerted, and that it belongs to him to transfer the Electoral Dignity from one to another; and that it ought to be taken away from the *Electors* of *Saxony*, and *Brandenburg*, for oppoſing his Authority; and that to allow the *Emperor* Authority in theſe things, was to rob the *Apoſtolick* See of its due rights. By which we may underſtand what that Authority over the Church is, which is challenged by the *Pope* as ſupream Paſtor, in order to the preſerving the Unity of it.

Bell. de Pontif. R. l. 5. c. 7.

Conſilium Greg. XV. exhibitum per Mich. Lonigum. A.D. 1623.

Aphoriſmi de ſtatu Eccleſiæ reſtaurando per Mich. Lonigum.

Of the Diſturbances of the Chriſtian World, under the pretence of the Popes Authority.

§. 2. We now conſider what the bleſſed Effects of this pretended Power hath been in the Chriſtian World: And I doubt not to make it appear, that this very thing hath cauſed more Wars and Bloodſhed, more Confuſions and Diſorders, more Revolts and Rebellions in *Chriſtendom*, than all other Cauſes put together have done, ſince the time it was firſt challenged; and this I ſhall prove from their own Authors; and ſuch, whoſe Credit is the greateſt among them. The Revolt of *Rome* and the adjacent Parts, from the Subjection due to the *Roman Emperor*, then reſident at *Conſtantinople*, was wholly cauſed by the *Pope*. The firſt *Pope*, ſaith *Onuphrius*, that ever durſt openly reſiſt the *Emperor* was *Conſtantine* I. who oppoſed *Philippicus* in the Matter of *Images*, which the Emperor commanded to be pulled down, becauſe they were abuſed to *Idolatry*, and the *Pope* utterly refuſed to obey; and not only ſo, but ſet up more in Oppoſition to him, in the *Pertico* of St. *Peter*; and forbad the Uſe of the *Emperors* Name and Title, in any publick Writings or Coyns. The ſame Command was not long after renewed by *Leo* III. upon which, ſaith *Onuphrius*, *Gregory* II. then *Pope*, took away the ſmall Remainder of the *Roman Empire* from him in *Italy*; and *Sigonius* more expreſly, *that he not only excommunicated the Emperor, but abſolved all the People of* Italy *from their Allegiance, and forbad the Payment of any Tribute to him; whereupon the Inhabitants of* Rome, Campania, Ravenna *and* Pentapolis, *i. e. the Region about* Ancona, *immediately rebelled, and roſe up in Oppoſition to their Magiſtrates, whom they deſtroyed. At* Ravenna, Paulus *the Emperors Lieutenant or Exarch was killed; at* Rome, Peter *the Governor had his Eyes put out; in* Campania, Exhilaratus *and his Son* Hadrian *were both murdered by the People of* Rome; *and not content with this, he writ a Letter to the Emperor, full of the greateſt Reproaches imaginable.* *Baronius* is very hard put to it, to vindicate the Pope; for he confeſſes, the Rebellion of the People was occaſioned by the *Popes* oppoſing the *Emperor*, and commends their Zeal for *Religion* in it, and acknowledgeth that the *Emperor* laid all the blame on the *Pope*, and that the *Greek* Hiſtorians, *Theophanes* and *Zonaras* do ſo too; but all this, he ſaith, proceedeth only from *their ſpight againſt the Roman Church, and their Ignorance of Affairs in it*; but if we believe him, *the Pope rather endeavoured to keep them in Obedience to the Emperor; and when they would have choſen another, he oppoſed it: Which he proves from* Paulus Diaconus, *and* Anaſtaſius. But what is that to the Buſineſs? The Queſtion is not, whether the *Pope* did not hinder the chuſing another *Emperor*, but whether he did not draw the People off from their Obedience to the Emperor that then was? And this is not only affirmed by the *Greek Hiſtorians*, but by thoſe of the Roman Church. *Sigebert* ſaith, *that* Gregory *II. finding the Emperor incorrigible, he made* Rome, Italy, *and all the Weſt to revolt from him, and forbad his Tributes:* The ſame is affirmed by *Otto Friſingenſis*, *Conradas Urſpergenſis*, *Hieronimus Reubeus*, and others, who cannot be ſuſpected of any Enmity to the *Roman Church*. As for the making a *new Emperor*, therein the Pope had another game to play, he was not willing the Souldiery ſhould make another *Emperor*: For as *Hadrianus Valeſius* well obſerves, the *Pope* durſt not ſo affront the *Emperor*, if he had not held a private Correſpondency with *Charles Martel* at that time, whoſe Honour and Arms were the greateſt in theſe Weſtern Parts. Having thereby ſtrengthned his Intereſt againſt both the Emperor his known Enemy, and the *Lombards* that were at beſt but unfaithful Friends, he makes what

Onuphr. Annot. in Platin. vi. Conſtant.

Sigonius de regno Italiæ. l. 3. A. D. 726. Naucler. Chronon. Gen. 25.

Baron. Annales Eccl. A. 726. Tom 9.

Chronicon. Sigeberti ad A. 728.

Otto Friſin. l. 5. *c.* 18.

Urſpergenſ. Chron. ad A. 718.

Hier. Rubei hiſtor. Raven. l. 4. *p* 190.

Hadr. Valeſ. Rerum Francic. lib. 25. *tom.* 3. *p.* 520.

Advantage he can of the Places that owed Subjection to the *Emperor*, to make up the *Patrimony* of the *Church :* as *Valeſius* obſerves particularly of *Sutrium* ; but *Sigonius* ſaith, *the People not only caſt off the Emperor, but did ſwear to be faithful to the Pope,* (no wonder then he was not willing to have a new *Emperor* choſen) *ſo that at this time* Rome, *and the* Roman *Dutchy came into the hands of the Pope,* the Cities of which are enumerated by *Sigonius* ; and therefore *Papirius Maſſonus* deſervedly makes this *Pope, the Founder of the greatneſs of the* Roman *Church :* Which we ſee was laid in downright *Rebellion:* and can be no otherwiſe juſtified, than by making the *Pope* abſolute *Governor* of the World. Not long after the *Pope* begins, ſaith *Valeſius*, a War with the *Lombards*, who watched any occaſion to take away ſome part of his newly gotten *Patrimony* ; he therefore ſends away *Anaſtaſius* and *Sergius* into *France* to *Charles Martel* with the *Keys of St. Peters Sepulchre*, in token of their owning him as their *Protector*. Which Embaſſie being acceptable to *Charles*, he procures a Peace to be concluded between the *Lombards*, and the *Romans :* which was contrary to the Popes deſire, who ſent ſeveral Letters and Meſſengers to him to come into *Italy*, to revenge St. *Peters* quarrel againſt the *Lombards* with *Fire* and *Sword* ; and as he loved St. *Peter*, he would come with all ſpeed into *Italy* ; as appears by the Letters ſtill extant and publiſhed by *Sirmondus*. But he ſoon after dying, his Son *Pepin* ſucceeding in all his Power ; and growing weary of having ſo much as the Name of a *King* above him, ſends to *Pope Zachary* to know whether it were not fitter for him to bear the name, who did all the Buſineſs of a *King* ; he very well underſtood his meaning, and readily aſſented to it ; upon which *Chilperick* was depoſed and put into a *Monaſtery*, and *Pepin* was afterwards abſolved by the *Pope* from his Oath of Fidelity, with all the Nobles and People. There being now ſo cloſe a League between the *Popes* and the *Pepins*, the ones Title to his Crown depending on the *Popes* Authority, the others ſecurity upon his Protection, no wonder to ſee them endeavour the promoting each others Advantage. The *Popes* Territories being not long after moleſted by *Aiſtulphus* King of the *Lombards*, *Stephen* writes a very pitiful Letter of complaint to *Pepin*, and *Charles* and *Charlemagne* his Sons ; wherein he ſaith, that *Aiſtulphus* had almoſt broke his heart with grief, becauſe he would not leave one foot of Land to St. *Peter* and the *holy Church* ; and therefore he conjures them by St. *Peter*, who had anointed them *Kings*, that they would recover the Lands again out of the *Lombards* hands ; or otherwiſe they may think what a ſad account they will give to St. *Peter* in the day of Judgment : Theſe are the words of the *Popes* Letter, lately publiſhed by *Delaland Sirmondus* his Nephew, in his *Supplement* of the *Gallican Councils*. Upon this, *Pepin* comes to his aſſiſtance, and every peace adds ſtill more to the *Churches* Revenue ; by which it was now grown very conſiderable by the ſpoils of the *Empire*, the *Exarchat* of Ravenna in *Pope Stephens* time being deſtroyed, which was the only *Remainder* then left of the *Empire* in *Italy :* And the Revenews of it were given by *Pepin* to the Church of Rome : As appears by an ancient Inſcription in Ravenna, mentioned by *Papirius Maſſonus :* Which the *Pope* ſolicited hard for, when he went himſelf into *France* on purpoſe to ſtir up *Pepin* againſt the *Lombards*, and was much afraid leſt the

Exarchat

Sigon. de regno Ital. l. 3. ad A. D. 727.

Papir. Maſſonus de Epiſcop. Urbis l. 3. p. 126.

Valeſ. tom. 3. p. 525.

Platina in Gregc. 3.

Sirmondi Concil. Gallic. Tom. 1. p. 526.

Otto Friſing. Chron. l. 5 c. 22. Papir. Maſſon. Annal. Franc. l. 2. p. 86. ...bellic. Enead. 8. l. 8. Blond. decad. l. lib. 10.

Concilior. Antiq. Galliæ ſupplement. p. 78. A. D. 756. papir. Maſſon. Annales Franc. l. 2. p. 87. Sigon. de reg. Ital. l. 3. A. 754. Sirmond. Concil. Tom. 2. p. 12.

Exarchat ſhould have been reſtored again to the *Emperor*; but Pepin promiſing to give the Region of P*entapolis*, and R*avenna*, to the R*oman See*, (aſſoon as he had taken them from the *Lombards*) the P*ope* went away well ſatisfied: And drew after him a mighty Army, whereby a great part of *Italy* was laid waſte, and the People miſerably harraſſed; for no other end, but to ſecure that to the P*ope*, which did by all right belong to the *Emperor:* Who ſent *Ambaſſadors*, firſt to the P*ope*, and then to P*epin* to deſire the reſtitution of thoſe Places to their true Owner; but the P*ope* denied, and P*epin* urged the promiſe he had already made to the P*ope*, and that he could not go back from it; becauſe he undertook that quarrel meerly for his Souls, and the P*opes* ſake, without expecting any advantage to himſelf by it. *Aiſtulphus* being dead, *Deſiderius* takes upon him the *Kingdom* of *Lombardy*, but he fearing *Rachis* the right Heir, makes a League preſently with the *Pope*; and by ſurrendring up ſome *more Cities*, makes him wholly of his Party, and *Rachis* is fain to retire again to a *Monaſtery:* But after a while, *Deſiderius* finds an occaſion to quarrel with the *Pope*, and takes ſeveral *Cities* into his Hands, which the *Pope* had got poſſeſſion of, and threatens ſuddenly to beſiege *Rome*; *Pope Adrian*, finding himſelf in theſe Straights, diſpatches away Meſſengers with all ſpeed to *Charles* the Son of *Pepin*, that he would imitate his *Father* and *Grandfather*, in relieving the *Church* of R*ome* in this Diſtreſs. *Charles*, not willing to omit ſuch an opportunity of enlarging his Dominions, enters *Italy* with a great Army; and in a little time puts a period to the *Kingdom* of *Lombardy*, which had then laſted in *Italy* 206 Years; and was magnificently receiv'd at *Rome*, by *Hadrian* and the People; by whom he was choſen *Protector* of the *Roman Church* and State, under the name of *Patritius*; and he being deſired by *Hadrian*, to confirm his Fathers Promiſes to the *Church*, not only doth that, but adds a conſiderable Acceſſion, the more firmly to oblige the *Romans*, and eſpecially the Pope to him. *Italy* being thus reduced, nothing was now wanting to *Charles* but the Title of *Emperour*; having already ſo great a Dominion in *Italy*, beſides what he had in G*ermany* and *France*. This had been often treated on between the P*ope* and him, but the *Seditions* of R*ome* by the *Emperors Party* frequently happening by the preſence of ſome of his Officers there, as P*latina* confeſſeth, and his Party being not inconſiderable in other parts, though not daring publickly to appear, and *Charles* by his Wars being elſewhere employed, this was put off till Pope *Leo* III. by the Conſpiracy of ſome of the chief Citizens of R*ome*, was ſeized on and impriſoned; from whence making a difficult eſcape, he goes in haſte to *Charles*, who coming into *Italy* and puniſhing the Conſpirators, the P*ope* then, (ſome ſay, *by his own Authority*, of which number *Bellarmin* reckons thirty three Authors, *by the conſent of the Senate and* People) declares *Charles* to be *Emperor of* Rome, and ſolemnly performs the office of his *Inauguration.* Thus we have ſeen the *Foundation* laid, of the greatneſs of the R*oman Church*; which being begun in Rebellion, was carried on by continual Wars, and ſo great devaſtations of the Country, that P*latina* and *Blondus* both ſay, *that the Country about* Rome, *ſuffered more in that time, than in all the Invaſions of the barbarous Nations for* 344 *Years before.* And was not the

Blond. de. cad. 2. l. 1. Platin. in Stephen 2.

Adelmus in Franc. Annal. ad A. 755. Blondus ib. Platina in Steph. 2.

Platina in Stephan. 3

De tranſlat. Im. Ro. l. 1. c. 4.

plat. in Steph. 2. Biond. decad. l. 1.

Church like to enjoy much Happineſs and Peace, under a *Government* founded in *Rebellion*, and maintained by *Blood?* For we ſee the *Popes* were the great Inſtruments of caſting off their lawful *Prince*, and taking his Territories to themſelves; and to maintain what they had unjuſtly gotten, they never ſcrupled beginning Quarrels, making Wars, calling in any foreign aſſiſtance that might the moſt ſerve to promote their Deſigns.

The diſturbances made by Popes, in the new Empire.

§. 3. It might now be imagined that the *Popes*, having been ſo highly obliged by *Charlemagne*, ſhould in meer gratitude have done their utmoſt to preſerve the *Empire* in peace, under his Poſterity; but they are great Strangers to the *Court* of *Rome*, who look for any thing there, but what tends to their own Advantage. For in the time of *Ludovicus Pius*, Son of *Charles* the *Great*, his Sons combining together againſt him in *France*, the *Pope Gregory* IV. going thither, under a pretence of reconciling them, joyns with the Sons in their Rebellion againſt the Father. This *Baronius* would have to be a meer Calumny; and endeavours to vindicate the *Pope*, *becauſe* Paulus Æmilius *ſaith*, *that the Pope abrogated the Decree, whereby* Ludovicus *was deprived of the Empire:* But *Baronius* underſtood his buſineſs too well, to make uſe of the Teſtimony of ſo late an Author, if he could have had any Aſſiſtance from thoſe who lived near the time. *Nithardus*, who lived in the ſame Age, and was nearly related to the *Imperial Family*, wrote a Book on purpoſe, of the Differences among the Sons of *Ludov. Pius*; and he expreſly ſaith, *that they drew the Pope into their Party*; which is likewiſe affirmed by the Author of the Life of the ſaid Emperor, who lived at the ſame time: *The Pope*, he ſaith, *indeed pretended to reconcile them, but the event ſhewed it to be otherwiſe; and the Emperor ſent to him to know if he came to him, what made him ſtay ſo long before he came at him? and underſtanding that he came with a deſign to excommunicate all that would not yet joyn with the Sons againſt the Father*, he ſaid, *that if he came to excommunicate others, he ſhould go away excommunicated himſelf, becauſe he acted againſt the Canons.* *Papirius Maſſonus*, upon the Teſtimony of *Nithardus* (whom he calls *Vitaldus*) makes *Gregory* guilty of the conſpiracy of the Sons againſt their Father: and the reaſon he gives of it is, that *Lotharius*, having the command of *Italy*, might diſpoſſeſs him of his Seat if he oppoſed him; and *more*, he ſaith, *are ready to worſhip the riſing than the ſetting Sun.* A very worthy excuſe for the Head of the Church to encourage the Rebellion of Sons againſt their *Father*; and him too, who had all his life ſhewed as much kindneſs to the *Roman See*, as his Anceſtors had done! *Sigebertus Gemblacenſis* ſaith, *that* Pope Gregory *went into* France *being of the Party of the Emperors Sons againſt himſelf.* And *Hincmarus* the famous *Biſhop* of *Rhemes*, who lived in the time of *Ludovicus* his Sons, in his Letter to *Pope Hadrian* II. ſaith, *that* Gregory *came into* France *with* Lotharius, *againſt the Emperors will; and there was no peace in* France *after, as had been before; and that he returnd with Infamy to* Rome. It would be too large a task to reckon up particularly all the quarrels which the Popes, after this, did either begin or foment among *Chriſtian Princes*; I ſhall only at preſent ſingle out ſome of the moſt remarkable of them, not managed by

Annales Eccleſ. ad *A. D.* 833. P. Æmilius hiſtor. Franc. p. 54.

Nithard. hiſt. l. 1. à Petr. Pithæ ed. in Annal. Franc. Vita Ludovici Pii à Pithæo ib. p. 245.

Papir. Maſſon. in vit. Greg. 4.

Sigeberti. Chron. *A. D.* 832. Hinmar. Rhemenſ. Epiſtol p. 577. ed. Cord.;

Beaſts and *Monſters*, as their own Writers call ſome of their *Popes*, but Perſons applauded for their *Wiſdom* and *Courage*, in maintaining the Dignity of their *See.*

Of the quarrels of Greg *VII. with the Emperor and other Chriſtian Princes.*

§. 4. Among theſe, *Gregory* VII. deſerves the firſt place; I meddle not with other things in his life, which *Cardinal Benno* hath writ, (and is very weakly ſuſpected by *Bellarmine* to have been made by ſome *Lutheran*; it being firſt publiſhed by a *zealous Papiſt*) but that which I deſign, is to ſhew, that under a pretence of advancing his *Authority* he was the great *Boutefeu* of *Chriſtendom.* It is obſerved by ſome Hiſtorians that *Henry* IV. then *Emperor*, fought Sixty two pitched Battels (Ten more than ever *Julius Cæſar* fought) and he may thank the Pope for ſo many opportunities to ſhew his Courage. For he was no ſooner well ſettled in his Chair, but he finds a pretence of quarrelling with the *Emperor*; and he had ſuch a ſpirit of contradiction in him, *that it was enough for any thing to diſpleaſe him, to hear it was liked by the Emperor and the Biſhops*, as Otto *Friſingenſis* reports of him. While he was yet but Archdeacon of *Rome*, *Petrus Damiani*, who was a *Brother Cardinal* with him deſcribes him as a Perſon of the greateſt Pride and Inſolency imaginable, in a Letter to Pope *Alexander* II. and *Hildebrand* his *Archdeacon*, wherein he calls him *Sanctum Satanam*, a *holy Devil*; and ſaith, *that his venerable pride had plowed his back with ſuch ſevere ſtripes, that he was able to endure them no longer:* And in another Letter to himſelf alone, he ſaith, *that he could not get ſo much as a good word from him, though he wiſhes he had ſerved God and St.* Peter *as heartily, as he had ſerved him: And that he followed no other Canons, but his Will: And his judgment did not follow his own thoughts, but his.* This had been very fair, towards another Man; but none of his *fellow Biſhops* are matches for him, being Pope he cares for medling with nothing under *Crowns* and *Scepters*; and thoſe he takes upon him to diſpoſe as freely as his Predeceſſor did, when he ſaid, *All theſe things will I give thee, only fall down and worſhip me:* For this was the indiſpenſable condition with him. I ſhall give a brief account of the Affairs of the *Empire*, in his time; chiefly from *Sigonius*, who cannot be ſuſpected for an *Henrician Heretick*, (as ſome of the *German* Hiſtorians are called; only for aſſerting the juſt Authority of their Prince againſt the Popes Uſurpations) the firſt thing Pope *Hildebrand* began with, was the buſineſs of *inveſtitures*; and at a *Council* in the *Lateran*, he *Decreed*, that *in caſe any one received inveſtiture from a Lay Perſon, both he that gave, and he that received it, ſhould be excommunicated*; to which he adjoyned a Decree againſt the *Marriage* of *Clergy-men*, which was no ſooner publiſhed by his *Legats* in *Germany*, but all the *Clergy* were in an uproar, and charged the Pope with contradicting St. *Paul*, and that by this means he made way for all manner of uncleanneſs; and that they would rather part with their places, than ſubmit to it; and when the *Archbiſhop* of *Mentz* was prevailed with to publiſh this Decree at *Erford*, the Biſhops were ſo enraged, that the *Archbiſhop* fearing his life, diſmiſſed the *Aſſembly:* The like oppoſition was made at *Milan*, againſt *Erlembaldus*; who was there killed, with *Luitprandus*, the only Perſon who ſubmitted to him: The Pope highly incenſed, excommunicates all the *Biſhops*, who ſided with the *Emperor*, and forbids the Peo-

Urſpergen. Chronic. p. 216. marg.

Otto Friſing. l. 6. c. 32.

Petr. Damiani Epiſtol. l. 1. ep. 19.

L. 1. Epiſt. ad Card. Ep. 8.

Sigonius de regno Italico. l. 9. in Hen. 3. A. D. 1074.

Lambert Schaſnaburg. hiſt. German. A. D. 1074. p. 201.

Sigebert. Gembloc. Chron. A. 1074.

Mat. Paris in Gul. 1.

Aventin. Annal. Boior. l. 5. p. 564.

ple to communicate with any *Clergy-men* who had *Wives*, but not ſatisfied with this, he ſummons the *Emperor*, very magiſterially, to appear before him; and in caſe of neglect, that he ſhould be excommunicated. *Henry* inſtead of appearing calls a *Council* of *Biſhops*, who pronounce him an *unlawful* Pope, to which they all ſubſcribed; which Meſſage was ſent to the Pope, before his *Council* could meet; but *Hildebrand* encouraged himſelf, by the examples of his *Predeceſſors*, *Gregory* II. *and* III. (who took away the remainder of the Empire from *Leo*) and publiſhed a *Bull*, wherein *he deprived the Emperor of his Authority, and abſolved all his Subjects from their Allegiance, and forbad any to own him for their* Prince; upon which, a *Rebellion* in the *Empire* followed; only they allowed him time to make his Peace with the Pope within the Year, before they would chooſe a new *Emperor*. The poor *Emperor* finding ſo general a *revolt*, is fain to go into *Italy* without Money or Retinue, till the Biſhops of *Milan* and *Ravenna* and *Lombardy*, who held faithful to him, furniſhed him with both. The Pope hearing that, ſtops his Journey into *Germany*, and returns to *Canuſium*, a ſtrong place belonging to his dear *Mathildis*, who out of great kindneſs never parted from him; thither came the German Biſhops firſt, and beg their pardon barefoot; the Pope puts them ſeverally into Cells, and there feeds them with Bread and Water; but at laſt upon promiſe never to diſcourſe with the *Emperor*, before he had given him ſatisfaction, (unleſs it were to perſwade him to it) they are diſmiſſed. The *Emperor* now draws near to *Canuſium*, and gets *Mathildis* and two more of greateſt intereſt with the Pope, to intercede for him; but all they could prevail with him for, was, that this *ſervant of ſervants*, this *follower* of St. *Peter*, even the humble minded Pope *Hildebrand*, admits him within the ſecond Wall of the *Town*; where caſting off his Royal Habit, he was, barefooted in the midſt of Winter, to wait for the Pope's Anſwer, in which poſture he continued three days together; on the fourth, the Pope very graciouſly ſends him word, he might come into his preſence. If *Lucifer* himſelf had ſate in the Chair, he would not have denied him ſo much courteſie as his *Vicar* ſhewed him; who after ſubmiſſion to his own terms, and at his Feet having begged Abſolution, abſolved him. But the mean carriage of the *Emperor* herein, extremely diſobliged the *Italians*: His Friends who began to ſlight and contemn him for it, and to ſay he was unworthy the *Empire*, and therefore would chooſe his *Son* in his room: *Henry* finding himſelf in this condition, returns to his old Friends, who declared the terms null which the Pope had forced upon him; the Pope finding the *Emperor* reſolved to defend his power, ſends away two *Legats* into *Germany*, who met the *Princes* at the *Diet* in *Forcheim*; in which, by the approbation of the *Legats*, *Henry* is depoſed, and *Rodolphus* of *Suevia* choſen *Emperor*. *Baronius* charges *Helmuldus*, and *Albertus Stadenſis*, with falſhood in ſaying that *Greg.* VII. *transferred the Crown to* Rodolphus, *and ſent it with the known verſe upon it*; but whatever becomes of the *verſe*, it ſeems ſtrange, from *Baronius* his own ſtory, that any one ſhould queſtion the thing. For was not his excommunicating *Henry*, the cauſe of the firſt defection from him? Did not he abſolve the People from their *Allegiance*? And after his abſolution, when he found *Henry* reſolved to maintain his Power, did not he ſend his *Legats* on purpoſe

Conſtit. Imperial. Tom. 1. p. 238.
Baron. Annales Eccleſ. A. D. 1077 *n* 40.

purpoſe into *Germany*, with inſtructions to the *Princes* to take care of the *Empire*? Were not his *Legats* preſent at all the proceedings, and approved them? How could then the *Pope* have no hand in it? unleſs it were, that he did not put the *Crown* upon his Head himſelf. But ſaith *Baronius*, *Gregory, in an Epiſtle of his, calls* Peter *and* Paul *to witneſs that he did not know of their chooſing* Rodolphus: but he doth not deny, that they proceeded to a new choice, *becauſe* Henry *did not keep his Terms with him*: He had intimations enough given him, who was likeſt to be the Man; and therefore he need not care any more, than to have a new Election: And in the inſtructions given to his *Legats*, wherein he pretended to umpire the buſineſs between them (after *Rodolphus* had ſent his Son as Hoſtage for his Fidelity to the *Pope*) he gave them expreſs commands, *that which ſoever of them ſhould not obey his will, that they ſhould reſiſt him to the death and excommunicate all that adhered to him; becauſe,* forſooth, *it was the Sin of Idolatry to contemn the Apoſtolick See*: And concludes his Letter with that abominable hypocriſy, *that herein he did not ſeek his own things, but the things of Jeſus Chriſt.* A way of abuſing *Scripture* he had taught his Friend *Mathildis*, when ſhe uſed St. *Paul's* Words, in a Leter to the *Pope*, to expreſs her *Love* to him, that *neither tribulation, nor diſtreſs, nor perſecution, nor famine, nor nakedneſs, nor ſword, nor death, nor life, nor principalities,* &c. *Should be able to ſeparate her from the Love of* St. Peter *in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord*; whom ſhe meant by St. *Peter*, is very eaſie to underſtand, according to the conſtant dialect of this *Pope*, whoſe *Bulls* and *Anathema's* againſt *Princes* ran in St. *Peters* name. But we leave *Baronius* admiring the Providence of *God*, that when *Princes* and *Biſhops* forſook the *Church* of *Rome*, he raiſed up *Agnes* the *Emperor's Mother*, againſt her own Son, and *Beatrix* and *Matilda*, of near kindred to the *Emperour*, to ſupport the *Pope* againſt him; and not long after, we find him acknowledging that *Rodolphus* was confirmed by the *Pope*, and *Henry* again excommunicated by him; in the form of which Excommunication, extant in *Baronius*, *he deſires all the World to take notice, that it is in the* Popes *power to take away Empires, Kingdoms, Principalities, Dutchies, Marquiſates, Earldoms, and the poſſeſſions of all Men from them, and give them to whom he ſhall think fit.* But doth *Baronius* in the leaſt go about to explain, or mitigate this? no, but inſtead of it, *he complains of the proſperity of the wicked: Becauſe* Henry *obtained after this a ſignal victory over* Rodolphus, *in his fourth Battel,* wherein he was wounded in his right hand, and (ſay the *German Hiſtorians*) acknowledged therein the juſt judgment of God being near his Death; that being the hand, wherewith he had ſworn fidelity to the Emperor; and then told his Friends (whatever the Pope did ſwear by *St.* Peter *and St.* Paul) *that the* Popes *command made him break his* Oath: *And take that Honour upon him which did not belong to him; and he wiſhed they who had put him upon it would conſider, how they led Men to their eternal damnation by ſuch courſes;* which having ſaid, with *great Grief of Mind*, ſaith *Helmoldus*, he dyed. And the *Pope* himſelf, did not eſcape much better; for the *Emperor* marches into *Italy*, with a great Army; takes in all the Towns, which oppoſed him; depoſes *Hildebrand* by the *Biſhops* of his Party, as the Cauſe of all the War and Bloodſhed, and ſets up

Baron. ad A. 1074. *n.* 10.

Ad A. D. 1080. *n. S.* 14.

N. 12.

Helmoldi Chron. Slavorum l. 1. cap. 29. Abbas Urſperc. ad A.D. 1080

Gibert of *Ravenna* under the Name of *Clement* III. beſieges *Rome*; and the *Pope*, not truſting the Citizens who ſoon left him, ſecures himſelf in a Caſtle; from whence eſcaping to *Salerno*, he not long after there dyes. The only good thing we read of him, is that which *Sigebert* and *Florentius Wigornienſis*, and *Matthew Paris* report of him from the Teſtimony of the *Biſhop* of *Mentz*, that he called, when he was dying, one of his Friends to him, and confeſſeth, *that it was through the Inſtigation of the Devil, that he had made ſo great a Diſturbance in the Chriſtian World*, whether they who applaud and admire him in the *Roman Church*, as particularly *Baronius*, (who recommended him as a Pattern to *Paul* V. and rejoyced, to ſee *a Man of his Spirit to ſucceed him*) will believe this or no, we matter not, ſince there is ſo apparent Evidence for the truth of the thing. But we not only ſee the whole *Empire* put into a Flame, under pretence of this *Authority* of the *Pope*, and *Italy* laid waſte by it to ſo great a degree, ſaith *Sigonius*, *that Mothers devoured their Children for meer Hunger*; but we may find him as buſy, though not with equal Succeſs with other *Princes* of *Chriſtendom*. He threatens the *King* of *France* to deprive him (if he did not ſubmit to him) and *that his Subjects ſhould certainly revolt from him, unleſs they would renounce their Chriſtianity*; which are the Words of his *Bull* in *Baronius*: But finding no Amendment, the next Year he ſends another; wherein he tells him, *that if according to his hard and impenitent Heart, he did treaſure up the Wrath of God, and St.* Peter, *by the Help of God he would excommunicate him, and all that ſhould obey him*: The ſame Year he excommunicates in *Italy*, *Robert Duke* of *Apulia*, *Prince* of the *Normans*, and *Gilulphus Prince* of *Salerno*, and ſends an Army againſt them. He threatens *Alphonſus* King of *Spain*, with *the Sword of St.* Peter; he excommunicates *Nicephorus Emperor of Conſtantinople*; he not only deprives *Boleſlaus King* of *Poland* of his *Kingdom*, and puts the whole *Kingdom* under an Interdict, and *forbids the Biſhops anointing any for King, but whom he ſhould appoint.* Of all the Princes of *Chriſtendom*, I find none ſo much in his Favour as our *William*, the firſt of the *Roman Race*; for he coming into a Kingdom, where he found no Intereſt, but what his Sword made him, keeps a fair Correſpondency with the *Pope*, receives his Decrees, refuſes to enter into an Alliance againſt him; which ſo pleaſed him, whom all other Princes hated, that he ſends to him in his Diſtreſs, to come to his Aſſiſtance, to divert the *Emperor*; and calls him *the Jewel of* Princes, and ſaith, that *he ought to be the* Rule *of Obedience to all other* Princes; but yet *William* himſelf could not eſcape his Threatnings, when he forbad the *Biſhops* of his *Kingdom* to go to *Rome*, and utterly denyed taking any Oath of Fidelity to the *Pope*, which he preſſed upon him by his *Legate*; although *Baronius* make him to ſubmit to the *Pope*, upon the receipt of his Letter; whereas the Letters of *Lanfranc* and the *King*, produced by himſelf, expreſly contradict it. This we are ſure of, that *William* all his time practiſed that *Right of Inveſtiture* of *Biſhops* by *a Staff and a Ring*, which had been the firſt *Cauſe* of the Quarrel between the *Emperor* and the *Pope*; and which he had ſo ſeverely forbidden in ſeveral *Councils* at *Rome*, thereby to maintain his own Authority, by taking of the *Biſhops* of ſeveral *Kingdoms* from any Acknowledgement

of

Sigebert. Chron. ad A.D. 1085. Florent. Wigorn. ad A. 1084. Matt. Paris Hiſtor. Anglic. A. 1087. Aventin. Annal. Boior. l. 5. p. 581. Sentent. Cardin. Baronii ſuper excommun. Venet.

Sigon. de regno Ital. l. 9. ad An. 1084.

Baron. Annal. ad A.D. 1073. n. 65.

Id. ad A. 1074. n. 53. Id. ib. n. 32.

Id. ad A. 1080. n. 48. Id. A. 1078 n. 15.

Matt. Cron. er de geſtis Polon. l. 4. ad fin.

Baron. ad A.D. 1074 n. 5.

Id. ad A.D 1080. n. 45.

Id. A. 1079. n. 20.

Eadmer. præfat. ad hiſt. Novorum.

of Dependence on their own *Sovereign Princes*; which was the trueſt Cauſe of all the Quarrels of *Chriſtendom* raiſed and fomented by this *Hell-brand*, as the *Centuriators* according to their *Dialect* call him.

And although *Onuphrius* in his Life confeſs that this *Popes* Deſigns if they had taken effect, would have quite overthrown the *Majeſty* of the *Empire*; and that he was the firſt *Pope*, who ever attempted ſuch things: yet he having now ſtarted ſo fair a Game, though he died in the Purſuit of it, his Succeſſors retrieved it and followed it with all their Might and Skill; thence we read that *Urban* being made *Pope* by *Hildebrand*'s Faction in Oppoſition to the *Emperor*, renews the Sentence of Excommunication againſt him; and in the *Council* at *Piacenza*, not content barely to excommunicate him (in the Preſence of *Agnes* or *Adelais* the *Emperors* Wife) he uttereth, ſaith *Urſpergenſis*, *very reproachful Speeches againſt him*: But he had not been no fit Succeſſor for *Hildebrand*, who could content himſelf with bare Words; eſpecially, having declared his Reſolution to follow the Steps of ſo worthy a Predeceſſor: And ſo he did to purpoſe, when he ſet up *Conradus* the *Emperor's* Son in Rebellion againſt his *Father*. This *Baronius* would fain ſhift off, as not ariſing from the *Popes* Inſtigation, but ſome *private Diſcontents*, for which he quotes *Dodechindus*; but *Sigonius*, who follows the ſame Author, ſaith expreſly, *that he took upon him the Kingdom of* Lombardy *againſt his Father*; *by the Authority of* Urban *himſelf*: And *Bertholdus*, whoſe Teſtimony is afterwards produced by *Baronius*, *mentions not only their meeting at* Cremona, *but that* Conradus *there took an Oath of Fidelity to the Pope, and the Pope in requital ſolemnly promiſed him to give him all the Advice and Aſſiſtance he could for the obtaining the Kingdom and the Empire of his Father.* What is fomenting and encouraging Rebellion in the higheſt degree, if this be not? And the Sentence of Depoſition of *Conrade* in the *Diet* at *Aken*, *A. D.* 1096. expreſly mentions, as the Cauſe of it, his adhering to *Pope Urban* againſt the *Emperor* his *Father*, and there his Son *Henry* was declared his Succeſſor, and ſolemnly ſwears never to rebel againſt his *Father*. But notwithſtanding this Oath, *Conrad* being dead, this *Son* is likewiſe prevailed upon by the *Popes* Inſtruments, to rebel againſt his *Father*: For *Paſcal* II. ſucceeding *Urban*, had again excommunicated *Henry* IV. and at a *Council* called by him in *Rome*, he made all the *Biſhops* preſent by particular Subſcription to Anathematize the *Emperors Hereſy* (as they were pleaſed to call it) and to promiſe Obedience to *Paſchal* and his Succeſſors, and *to affirm what the Church affirmed and condemn what ſhe condemns.* Having by this means ſecured the *Biſhops* from adhering to the *Emperors* Party, their wanted not *Agents* to ſolicite his *Son*, to take away his *Crown* from him. And the firſt thing he did upon his *Rebellion* was to Anathematize his *Fathers Hereſy* (which was keeping the *Empire* inſpight of the *Popes*) and to promiſe Obedience to the *Pope* as the *Biſhops* had done at *Rome*: and in the *Diet* at *Northauſen*, A. D. 1105. *he calls God to witneſs, that it was no deſire of the Empire which made him take his Fathers Government from him*; *but if he would obey the Pope, he would preſently yield himſelf to him, and become his Slave.* And when the *Son* had in a perfidious manner ſeized

Of the Quarrels of his Succeſſors.

Onuphrius in vit. Greg. VII.

Sigebert. Gemblac. ad A. D. 1088. *Helmond. Chron. Slav. l.* 1. *c.* 30. *Urſpergenſ. Chron. p.* 235. *Baron. Annales ad A. D.* 1088. *n.* 3. *Aventin. Annal. Boior. l* 5. *p.* 590 *Baron. A. D.* 1093. *n.* 3. *Sigon. de regno Ital. l.* 9. *A.* 1093. Bar. ad A. D. 1095. n. 8.

Conſtit. Imper. Tom. 1. p. 247. Abbas Urſperg. Chron. p. 241.

Urſperg. ib. Baron. ad A. D. 1105. n. 4.

Avent. Annales. Boior. l 5. p. 597.

Conſtitut. Imper. Tom. 3. p 318. Baron. ad A. 1106. n. 2. &c.

Id. ad A.D 1105. n. 6. Id. ad A.D 1106 n. 14.

Aventin. Annal. Boior. l 5. p. 562. Sigeberti Chronic. ad A. D. 1074.

zed on the Perſon of his *Father*, and he addreſſed himſelf to the *Popes Legate* for his ſafety, he plainly told him, *he muſt look for none, unleſs he would publickly declare the Juſtice of* Hildebrand, *and his own unjuſt Perſecutions of the Roman See.* But, which is the moſt evident Teſtimony of all others, in this caſe, *Henry* IV. a little before his Death, *A. D.* 1106. at *Liege* (whither he was forced to retire by his Sons Rebellion) ſends an account of the whole Quarrel to *Philip* of *France*; wherein he declares *that he had offered all reaſonable ſatisfaction to the Pope, only preſerving the Authority of the Empire; but this not being accepted, in a moſt unnatural manner they had armed his moſt beloved Son, his* Abſolom *againſt him; who, by their Inſtigation and Counſel, had moſt perfidiouſly dealt with him:* But we need not ſo much Proof of this, ſince *Baronius* confeſſed, *that the Son had no greater Cauſe of rebelling againſt his Father, than that he was excommunicated by the Pope*; and afterwards very freely delivers his Mind, *that in caſe the Son did it ſincerely, as he pretended,* i. e. out of Obedience to the *See of* Rome, *it was*, ſaith he, *an Act of great* Piety *in him, to be thus cruel to his Father: And that his only Offence was, that he did not bind him faſter till he was brought to himſelf,* i. e. *to the* Popes beck. O the admirable Doctrine of Obedience at *Rome!* What an excellent Commentary is this upon the fifth Commandment, and the thirteenth of the *Romans!* What mighty Care hath the *Church* of *Rome* always taken, to preſerve *Peace* and *Unity* in the *Chriſtian Church!* The Hiſtorians who report the Paſſages of this time, tell us, *there was never known ſo diſmal an Age as that was, for Wars and Bloodſhed, for Murthers and* Parricides, *for* Rapines *and Sacriledge, for Seditions and Conſpiracies, for horrible Schiſms and Scandals to Religion, the* Prieſt *oppoſing the Biſhops, the* People *the* Prieſts, *and in ſome* Places *not only robbing the Churches, burning the Tythes, but trampling under foot the holy Euchariſt that was conſecrated by ſuch whom* Pope Hildebrand *had excommunicated.* And muſt we after all this believe, that the *Roman See* is the *Fountain of Unity* in the *Catholick Church*; that all Wars and Rebellions ariſe from caſting off ſuch Subjection to the *Popes*, who have been the great Fomenters of Rebellions ever ſince *Hildebrands* time, and the Diſturbers of the Peace of *Chriſtendom?* For we are not to imagine that this Quarrel ended with *Henry* IV. for it was revived again in *Henry* Vth's time between *Pope Paſchal* and him; and the *Pope* grants him the Priviledges, which his *Father* contended for; but afterwards revoked his own Grant (Perjury being no Sin at *Rome*, in ſo holy a Cauſe) and raiſed a Rebellion in the Empire againſt him; and notwithſtanding ſeveral Agreements, made berween him and the ſucceſſive *Popes* could enjoy no laſting Peace in his time, upon their account; and dyed at laſt without Iſſue, going to ſuppreſs a new Rebellion. After his Death, *Conradus* being to ſucceed a Siſters Son to *Henry* V. *Lotharius* by the Arts of the *Court of Rome*, was ſet up in Oppoſition to him: He was fain to part with the Rights of the *Empire* to ſatisfy the Pope; who made him receive the *Imperial Crown*, at his Feet. In the time of *Conradus*, who ſucceeded *Lotharius*, the *Pope* encouraged *Guelſo* the *Duke* of *Bavaria* in a Rebellion againſt him (from whom the two loving Factions of *Guelphs* and *Gibellines* had their beginning.) It would be endleſs to relate the *Diſturbances*

ces of the Chriſtian World, which aroſe from the Contentions of ſeveral *Popes*, about their Authority, with *Frederic Barbaroſſa*, *Philippus Suevus*, *Otho* IV. *Frederic* II. *Ludovicus Bavarus*, and other Emperors, till ſuch time as the Majeſty of the Empire was loſt in *Carolus* IV. or if we ſhould give an account of all the *Wars* and *Rebellions*, and *Seditions*, and *Quarrels*, which happened meerly upon *pretence* of the *Papal Authority*, in our own *Nation*, or in *France*, or elſewhere. But theſe may at preſent ſuffice to give Teſtimony, what an excellent *Inſtrument* of Peace to the *Chriſtian* World, the *Authority* challenged by the *Biſhop* of Rome hath been: And the ſame *Authority* is ſtill vindicated and aſſerted in the *Court* of Rome.

Of the Schiſms in the Roman Church.

§. 6. 2. But although ſuch civil Diſturbances have happened, by the Contentions about the P*apal Authority*; yet they may ſay, *the Church had its Unity ſtill, as long as they were united in the ſame Head:* For this they look on, *as the great Foundation of Unity*; for ſay they, *the Unity of the Body conſiſts in the Conjunction of the Members with the Head, and then with one another: And although there may be many other ſorts of Unity in the Church, yet the eſſential Unity of the Church*, they tell us, *lies in Conjunction of the Members under one Head.* But what becomes then of the Unity of the Roman *Church* in the great number of *Schiſms*, and ſome of long continuance among them? Were they all Members united under *one Head*, when there were ſometimes two, ſometimes three ſeveral *Heads? Bellarmine* in his *Chronology*, confeſſeth twenty ſix ſeveral *Schiſms* in the Church of Rome; but *Onuphrius*, a more diligent ſearcher into theſe things, reckons up thirty; whereof ſome laſted ten Years, ſome twenty, one fifty Years. And it ſeems very ſtrange to any one, that hears ſo many boaſts of Unity in the *Church* of Rome above others, to find more *Schiſms* in that *Church*, than in any Patriarchal *Church* in the World. We ſhould think, if the *Biſhop* of Rome had been deſigned *Head* of the *Church* and the *Fountain of Unity*, that it was as neceſſary that *Church* ſhould be freed from inteſtine Diviſions on that account, as to be ſecured from *Errors* in Faith, if it had the Promiſe of *Infallibility*; for *Errors* are not more contrary to *Infallibility*, than *Diviſions* are to *Unity*; and the ſame *Spirit* can as eaſily prevent *Schiſms*, as *Hereſies*. But as the *Errors* of that *Church* are the cleareſt Evidence againſt the Pretence of *Infallibility*; ſo are the *Schiſms* of it againſt its being the Fountain of *Unity:* For how can that give it to the whole *Church*, which ſo notoriouſly wanted it in it ſelf? I ſhall not need to inſiſt on the more ancient *Schiſms*, between *Cornelius* and *Novotianus* and their Parties, between *Liberius* and *Felix*, between *Damaſus* and *Urſicinus*, between *Bonifacius* and *Eulalius*, between *Symachus* and *Laurentius*, between *Bonifacius* and *Dioſcorus*, between *Sylverius* and *Vigilius*, and many others. I ſhall only mention thoſe, which were of the longeſt continuance in that Church, and do moſt apparently diſcover the *Diviſions of it*. I begin with that which firſt brake forth in the time of *Formoſus*, who was ſet up *A. D.* 821. againſt *Sergius*, whom the Faction of the *Marqueſs* of *Tuſcany* would have made *Pope*; but the popular Faction then prevailing, *Sergius* was forced to withdraw, and *Formoſus* with continual Oppoſition from the other Party, enjoyed the Papacy Four Years and Six Months; not without the Blood of many of the chief Citizens of *Rome*, ſlain by *Arnulphus* in the Quarrel of *Formoſus*. After his Death *Boniface* VI. intruded,

Bellarm. de notis Eccleſ. l. 4. c. 10. De Eccl. milit. l. 3. c. 5.

truded, ſaith *Baronius*, into the *Papal See*, but was after fifteen days diſpoſſeſſed by *Stephanus* VII. who in a Council called for that purpoſe, nulled all the Acts of *Formoſus*, deprived all thoſe of their Orders, who had been ordained by him, and made them be *re-ordained*; and not content with this, he cauſed his Body to be taken out of the Grave, and placed it in the Popes Chair with the Pontifical Habits on; where after he had ſufficiently reviled him, *that could not revile again*, he cauſed the three Fingers to be cut off, with which he uſed to give Benediction and Orders, and the Body to be thrown into *Tiber*. This laſt Part *Onuphrius* would have to be a Fable, and *Andreas Victorellus* from him; but *Baronius* ſaith, *they are miſtaken who ſay ſo*; for not only *Luitprandus*, who lived in that Age, expreſly affirms it, (although he attributes it to *Sergius*, upon whoſe account the Schiſm begun:) But the Acts of the *Roman Council* under *John* IX. extant in *Baronius* make it evident: And *Papirius Maſſonus* cites other ancient Hiſtorians for it. Upon this nulling the Ordinations of *Formoſus*, a great Diſpute was raiſed in the Church; for many of the *Biſhops* would not ſubmit to Re-ordination, and particularly *Leo Biſhop* of *Nola*, to whom *Auxilius* writ his Book in Defence of the Ordinations of *Formoſus*, a ſhort account whereof is publiſhed by *Baronius* from *Papirius Maſſo*; but the whole Book is now ſet forth from an ancient Manuſcript by *Morinus*; by which we underſtand the Controverſy of that time much better than we could before. Two Things were chiefly objected againſt *Formoſus*'s Ordinations. 1. That againſt the Canons of the Church he was tranſlated from one See to another, being *Biſhop* of *Porto*, before he was made *Biſhop* of *Rome*. 2. That having been degraded by *John* VIII. (although reſtored by his Succeſſor *Marinus*, and abſolved from his Oath) he was not capable of conferring Orders. Againſt the firſt of theſe *Auxilius* ſhews, that Tranſlation from one See to another cannot null Ordination from the Teſtimony of Pope *Anterus*, the Example of *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Perigenes*, *Doſitheus*, *Reverentius*, *Palladius*, *Alexander*, *Meletius*, and many others. That the *Nicene Canon* againſt *Tranſlations*, was interpreted by the *Council* of *Chalcedon* ſo as not to extend to all Caſes, and it was ſo underſtood by *Pope Leo* and *Gelaſius*; and however, that only nulls the *Tranſlation*, and not the *Ordination*. Againſt the ſecond he pleads, that ſuppoſing it not to be lawful to remove from one *Epiſcopal See* to another, yet the Ordination may be valid; for *Formoſus* was not conſecrated again himſelf, but only reconciled by *Marinus*; that the *Popes*, *Gregory* and *Leo*, had declared againſt *Re-ordination*, as much as againſt *re-baptizing*; that the *Canons* of the *Apoſtles* had forbidden it; that the Ordinations by *Acacius* were allowed by *Anaſtaſius*; that the *Bonoſiaci*, though Hereticks had their Orders allowed them; that the *Cathari* were admitted to the Churches Communion by the *Council* of *Nice*, only with Impoſition of hands; that though *Liberius* fell to the *Arrian* Hereſy, yet his Ordinations afterwards were not nulled; neither thoſe of *Vigilius*, although he ſtood excommunicated by *Silverius*, and added Homicide to it: That the nulling theſe Ordinations was to ſay in effect, that for twenty Years together they had been without the Chriſtian Religion in *Italy*: That none bnt Hereticks could aſſert theſe things; that if any *Popes* themſelves *ſpeak* or *act* againſt the *Catholick Faith or Religion*, they

Onuphr. Annot. in Plat. vit. Formoſi. Victorel add. ad Ciaccon. de vit. Pontif. Baron. Annal. ad A.D. 897. *n.* 2, 3. *Papir. Maſſon de Epiſcop. Ub. l* 3. *p.* 151.

Morinus de Sacris Ecleſ. ordinat. par. 2. *p* 348.

they are not to be follow'd in ſo doing. This is the ſubſtance of the firſt Book of *Auxilius*, which things are more largely inſiſted upon in the ſecond. But by that Book it appears moſt evidently, that the barbarous uſage of the body of F*ormoſus* was moſt true; it being expreſly mentioned therein, and juſtified by him, in the Dialogue that pleads for *Reordination.* And now ſaith Baronius, *began thoſe moſt unhappy times of the* Roman *Church, which exceeded the Perſecutions of Heathens or Hereticks:* But he, out of his conſtant good will to civil Authority, lays the fault altogether upon the Power of the *Marqueſſes* of *Tuſcany*, who had then too great Power in R*ome*; but he ſtrangely admires the Providence of *God*, in keeping the *Heads* of the *Church* from *Hereſie*, all that time. Alas for them! They did not trouble themſelves about any *matters* of *faith* at all, but were wholly given over to all manner of Wickedneſs, as himſelf confeſſeth of them; when *Theodora*, that *Mother* of the *Church* of R*ome*, rul'd in chief, and her Daughter *Marocia*'s Son by P*ope Sergius* came to be P*ope* himſelf; when as Platina ſaith, *it grew to be the Cuſtom of* Popes, *to null all that their* P*redeceſſors had done.* Were not theſe goodly Heads of the *Church* the mean time? and did not they keep the *Church* in great *Unity*, under their agreeable conduct? Methinks the Providence of *God*, is as much concerned to preſerve *holineſs* and *peace*, as *faith* in the World, and were not theſe excellent inſtruments for doing it! *Baronius* grants *the acts of* Stephanus *to be ſuch, as the moſt barbarous Nations could not endure to hear of, and are too bad to be believed*: and all the following Age he calls *Iron* for its ruſt and barrenneſs, and *leaden* for its ſadneſs and dulneſs; and confeſſeth *that monſters of impurity then reign'd in the Apoſtolical See, that infinite evils ſprung from thence, and horrible Tragedies, and Miſchiefs not to be ſpoken of.* And yet a very *Catholick faith*, and the *Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace* muſt be ſuppoſed to be there infallibly all this while; but if all their faith and unity be of ſuch a kind as was in the Tenth *Century* in the R*oman Church*, I ſhould think *Baronius* might have ſaid more in admiration of the providence of *God*, in preſerving the *Catholick faith* and *unity* among the *Devils* in Hell! For the *Scripture* tells us, *they believe and tremble*; and our Saviour ſaith, *that the Devils Kingdom cannot ſtand, if it be divided againſt it ſelf*; and theſe are clearer and ſtronger teſtimonies, than can be brought of the *faith* and *unity* of the *Roman Church*; when ſuch horrid wickedneſs is acknowledged to have had Dominion in it, and that Church had this diſadvantage of the *Devils Kingdom*, that it was *divided againſt it ſelf.* In the very beginning of this *Century*, Pope *Stephen* is caſt into Priſon, and there ſtrangled, as *Baronius* proves from his *Epitaph*; and now the *Roman faction* prevailing, they make one *Romanus* Pope, the firſt and only thing he did, was to condemn all that *Stephen* had done, as *Platina*, *Onuphrius*, and *Ciacconius* all agree; but he continued not much above four Months; after him *Theodorus*, who held out about Twenty days, and followed the ſteps of R*omanus*; to him ſucceeded *John* X. (as P*latina* calls him) of the ſame faction, who ſet all F*ormoſus* his *Acts* to rights again, condemning all that *Stephen* had done in a *Council* at R*avenna*, whither he was driven by the prevalency of the faction at R*ome* againſt him; where in the preſence of Seventy four Biſhops, the Acts of the *Council* under *Stephen* were burnt, in which the Ordinations of F*ormoſus* were nulled; and

Baron. Annal. ad A.D. 897. n. 8 9.

Platina in vit. Steph. 6.

Ad. A. D. 900. n. 1.

N. 6.

Sergius, *Benedictus*, and *Marinus* were *anathematized*, for being inſtruments in the Acts againſt F*ormoſus*. The next Pope B*enedict* eſcapes without any thing, but a dull Epitaph; but *Leo* his Succeſſor had not been above Forty days in the place, but he is caſt into Priſon, by one of his Servants, who is made P*ope* in his place, and Seven Months after he is ſerv'd the ſame way by *Sergius*, who now at laſt recovered the P*opedom*; and the greateſt thing he did was to condemn F*ormoſus* again, and all who had appeared for him: So that now, as *Sigebert* ſaith, nothing was talked of ſo much as *ordinations*, and *exordinations*, and *ſuperordinations*, by the contrary *Acts* of theſe P*opes* to one another. B*aronius* confeſſeth *this* Sergius *to have been a Man of a moſt infamous and diſſolute life:* after his Death, *Theodora* was not at reſt till ſhe had gotten her *Gallant* to be P*ope* under the name of *John* XI. *and what manner of Cardinals*, ſaith B*aronius*, *way we imagine ſuch a* Pope *would make?* But *Marozia* her Daughter was not ſo well pleaſed with him; for by her order, his B*rother* was killed in his preſence, and he put into Priſon, and there ſmothered. After him, ſaith *Luitprandus*, *her own Son by* Pope Sergius, *is made* P*ope*; who was caſt into Priſon, by his Brother *Albericus*; who being not pleaſed with *Stephen*, who followed him, he was ſet upon and ſo wounded and deformed thereby, that he durſt not let his Face be ſeen, and the ſeditions, ſaith P*latina*, continued ſo high in his time, that he could do no great thing. At laſt, *Alberic's* Son, called *Octavianus*, got poſſeſſion of the See, under the name of *John* XIII. (or XII. as others beſide P*latina* call him) who was ſuch a Monſter for all Wickedneſs, that *Otho* the *Emperor* was called into *Italy*, to diſplace him; who called a *Council*, wherein he was accuſed *for ordaining a Deacon in a Stable, and making a Biſhop of Ten years of age*; but theſe were ſmall faults *to his Adulteries, Sacrilege, Cruelties, drinking Healths to the Devil; and at Dice calling upon the Devils for help.* When theſe Accuſations were ſent to him from the *Council*, he only threatned to excommunicate them all, if they choſe another *Pope* againſt him: But they not regarding his threatning depoſe him, and chooſe *Leo* VIII. in his place. Here B*aronius* ſtorms unreaſonably, *that a Council ſhould take upon it to depoſe a Pope, though ſo abominably bad*, as he confeſſeth this Man to have been; and *makes them guilty of an intolerable Error and Hereſie in ſo doing, becauſe it implies their believing that the Power of the Keys did depend on the worth of the Perſon! And therefore he deteſts* Leo *as a Schiſmatical Pope.* And to make ſure of a *Schiſm*, after the infamous Death of *John* XIII. being killed in the act of Adultery, the oppoſite faction in R*ome* choſe B*endict*. V. to ſucceed him, who was carried away Priſoner by *Otho* into *Germany*; but before his Death *John* XIII. called a *Council*, wherein he nulled all the *Acts* of the other *Council*, and pronounced them *Schiſmaticks*, *and decreed that all that were ordained by them muſt be reordained.* Is not here now a moſt admirable *unity* in the Roman Church? After *Leo*, another *John* is choſen by the *Emperor's* Party; but, as P*latina* ſaith, *it being now grown cuſtomary to depoſe Popes, they drive him away by ſeditions againſt him, being firſt impriſoned by* Rotfredus *and then expelled the City.* But they ſuffered ſufficiently for it, by the ſeverity of O*tho* againſt them.—— The next Pope, *Benedict* VI. was caſt into Priſon by the other *faction*, and there ſtrangled, or famiſhed.

* *Baron. A.* 908. *n.* 3.

A D 912. *n* 14.

A. D. 928. *n.* 2. *Luitprand. hiſt. l.* 3. *c* 12. *Baron ad A* 933 *n.* 1.

Baron. A D. 903. *n.* 15.

N. 27. 28. *&c.* . . 33.

A. 964. *n* 7.

John XIV. came to his end after the ſame manner, dying in Priſon, by the faction of *Ferrucius* the *Father* of *Boniface* VII. who was driven away from *Rome* after his being made *Pope*; after whom, *Benedict* VII. was ſet up; and *John* ſucceeding him, *Boniface's* faction recovering again, he was for a few Months reſtored to the *Popedom*. Againſt *Greg.* V. the faction of *Creſcentius* ſet up one *John* XVII. who by the Power of the *Emperor* was deprived of his Eyes and the Popedom together, and a little after of his Life. Methinks it is very pleaſant, in the midſt of all the villanies and deviliſh enmities which thoſe Popes practiſed towards one another, to ſee Baronius ſo gravely admiring their Orthodoxneſs.

But theſe *factions* in Rome, did not end with this *Century*; for in the next, *A. D.* 1044. We find a new *Schiſm*, breaking out on the account of them. We are contented to take the ſtory, as *Baronius* relates it in that year. Benedict. IX. was made Pope, by the faction of the *Counts* of *Tuſculum* (*Fraſcati*) out of oppoſition to which, and diſlike of Benedict, the People of Rome depoſed him, and ſet up *Sylveſter* III. who got the *Popedom* by *Simony*, and enjoyed it but three Months; when (the *Tuſculan faction* again prevailing) *Sylveſter* was depoſed, and Benedict reſtored; but finding himſelf hateful to the People, he *reſigns* to *John* (called *Greg.* 6.) or as Platina ſaith ſome affirm, *ſold it to him.* *Otto* Friſingenſis ſaith, *theſe three ſat together in the City of* Rome, *and all of them led very bad Lives, as he heard himſelf at* Rome. But Baronius will not have *Greg.* VI. to be the ſame with *John*, one of the *Schiſmatical Popes*, but *Gratian*, who, by fair offers (not to be called *Simony*) perſwading the other three to part with their places, got the poſſeſſion of the *Popedom* alone. *Alphonſ. Ciacconius* follows *Onuphrius*, in ſaying that his Name was *Joh. Gratianus*, but not one of the three *Anti-popes* ſitting together; wherein neither *Baronius*, nor he, can ſufficiently clear themſelves. If he were diſtinct, there muſt be five *Popes* at the ſame time; for this *Greg.* VI. was deprived with the reſt by a *Council*, call'd by the *Emperor* *Hen.* III. at *Sutrium*. For Baronius is very much miſtaken in ſaying, that the other three *Popes* were all deprived two years before; for his own Author *Hermanus* aſſerts, *that the cauſe of the falſe Popes was there diligently diſcuſſed*, and *Greg.* 6. deprived for *Simony*, and *Ciacconius* expreſly ſaith, after other Authors; however Baronius ſtrives to vindicate him, out of kindneſs to his name ſake and Diſciple *Greg.* VII. and *Clement* II. is there made *Pope*, who enjoyed it but a little time *being poyſoned*, ſaith Platina, *by* Damaſus II. *who ſucceeded him*; but after the Death of both theſe, *Benedict* IX. got into poſſeſſion of the Papacy again, and the fifth time after the Death of *Leo IX.* in whoſe time a great Controverſy aroſe again about *Reordination*, *viz.* of ſuch who had been ordained by *Simoniacal Perſons:* and although *Leo* had determined in Council, *that upon forty Days pennance, they might perform the duties of their Function*; yet it appears by an Epiſtle of *Petrus Damiani*, extant in *Baronius*, that this Controverſy remained ſtill, and *they thought all Actions done by ſuch Perſons, no other than if they had been done by Lay-men*; but we find nothing done in it to ſuppreſs this *Hereſie*, as he calls it, although he earneſtly deſires the *Pope* to condemn it. We are now fallen into the times of *Hildebrand*, who cauſed *Benedict X.* to be deprived of the *Papacy*, before he came to it himſelf; for he called

Baron. An. ad A. D. 1052. *n.* 6.

called together the diſcontented Cardinals at *Siena*, where they diſcarded *Benedict*, and choſe *Nicolaus* II. The *Schiſm* that happened in his own time, I have already ſpoken to, which I ſhall therefore paſs by; as likewiſe the others, that followed upon the oppoſition between the *Popes* and *Emperors*; although it is not to be imagined, that there could be greater diviſions among Men, than were upon the account of thoſe two *Factions*; eſpecially, after they came to be diſtinguiſhed by the names of *Guelphs* and *Gibellines*; it being ordinary for them to murder each other where ever they met, for a mighty demonſtration of the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *Roman Church*.

I ſhall only now enquire, whether all theſe *Schiſms* and *Factions* happened among them, only on the account of the differences between the *Popes* and *Emperors*, and we ſhall find, that the agreement among themſelves was only from that external oppoſition; and when that ceaſed, new *Factions* and *Schiſms* brake forth among them. Of which *Italy* was ſo full, that the election of *Popes* became the work of Years, by reaſon of the Heats which were among them: But I meddle not with theſe Factions in the elections although they are no indications of the preſence of the *Holy Ghoſt* among them. But I ſhall only touch at the greateſt *Schiſm*, for continuance, they ever had among them (as their *Hiſtorians* reckon it,) which laſted with great Animoſities, for fifty Years together; in which all the Princes of *Chriſtendom* were concerned, and one Party was always condemning the other with the greateſt bitterneſs, and condemning all the Acts done by the other, and pronouncing them *null* and void. This was begun upon the election of *Urban* VI. at which the *Cardinals* declaring a force by the Souldiers and People of *Rome*, when they were withdrawn from thence to a place of ſafety, choſe another *Pope*, *viz. Clem.* VII. who ſate in in *France*, as *Urban* VI. and his Succeſſors did in *Rome*; he made Twenty ſeven *Cardinals*, and *Petrus de Luna*, or *Benedict* XIII. ſucceeded him; and notwithſtanding all the Endeavours could be uſed to ſuppreſs this *Schiſm*, it ſtill continued; and the means for that end, did rather increaſe it; as the *Council* of *Piſa*, which inſtead of two *Popes* made three, ſetting up *Alexander* V. Beſides *Greg.* XII. and *Benedict* XIII. and after him *John* XXIII. was choſen at *Bononia*: and although afterwards the *Council* of *Conſtantine* deprived *John* XXIII. and *Benedict* XIII. and choſe *Martin* V. yet *Benedict* never yielded; and after his Death, the Cardinals that were with him choſe *Clem.* VIII. againſt *Martin* V. who were ſo far from yielding him to be true Pope, that they rather choſe to rot in Priſon, as they did; and ſo ſaith *Ciacconius*, *this Schiſm was ended after fifty two Years, which had given ſo great diſturbance to the whole Chriſtian World*. One might have imagined now, when *Councils* were called for that purpoſe, that an end ſhould thereby be put to theſe *Schiſms* among them; but it was ſo far otherwiſe, that we find another *Schiſm* begun in that Church not long after, by the *Authority* of the *Council* of *Baſil* which choſe *Felix* V. in oppoſition to *Eugenius* IV. where there was not only *Pope* againſt *Pope*, but *Council* againſt *Council* too; *Eugenius ſitting* at that time with the *Council* of *Florence*. In the time of *Julius* II. we find *Council* againſt *Council* again, that at *Piſa*, and the *Lateran* at *Rome*, both

Alphonſ. Ciaccon. vit. Pontif. in Clem. 7.

both called *General Councils*, and condemning each other. By which we ſee, how far the *Church* of *Rome* is from being free from dangerous *Schiſms* in it ſelf; and therefore hath no cauſe to object them to others. The only thing pleaded, in anſwer to this charge of their numerous *Schiſms*, *is*, that theſe were moſt of them Controverſies concerning elections of *Popes* (which is all the *ſalvo Molanus* hath for it, at the end of *Onuphrius* his *Chronology*) but what is that to the purpoſe? Since the Queſtion was, which of them was the *Head* of the *Church*, *with whom the Members were to be united?* and all thoſe who were not united with him whom they account *the true Head*, muſt be as much in *Schiſm*, as they who renounce all Subjection to the *Pope*. For are not thoſe as much in Rebellion, who ſet up an *Uſurper* againſt their *lawful* P*rince*, as they who deny him to be their P*rince*, and to have any Authority over them, becauſe they look on themſelves as a *Free-State?* There can be but *one* lawful *Head* of the *Church*, by their own Principles; and only they are truly united to the *Church*, who are in conjunction with the *lawful Head*; and therefore it follows upon their own Principles, that they muſt be in a *ſtate* of *Schiſm*, who are united with any other than the *true Head*. What then ſignify the boaſts of *Unity* in the *Roman Church*, if they cannot prevent the falling of their Members into ſuch dangerous *Schiſms?* To what purpoſe is it, to tell us of *one Head of the Church, to whom all muſt ſubmit*, if there have been ſeveral Pretenders to that *Headſhip*, and the *Church* hath been a long time divided, which of them was the true? Unleſs all their *Unity* comes to this at laſt, that they have an excellent *Unity* among them if they could all agree: And ſuch an *Unity* may be had any where. But if all were agreed, what need any means of agreement by *one Univerſal Head?* or what can that *Univerſal Head* ſignify to making *Unity*, when his Title to his *Headſhip* becomes a cauſe of greater Diviſions? May not we ſay upon better grounds, that taking away the Popes Authority would tend much more to the Peace of the *Church*; ſince that hath been the cauſe of ſo great Diſturbances in the World, and is to this day one of the greateſt differences between the ſeveral parts of the *Catholick Church?* For as things now ſtand in the *Chriſtian World*, *the* B*iſhop of Rome* is ſo far from being the *Fountain* of *Unity*, that he is much rather the *Head* of *Contention*, and the great cauſe of the *Diviſions* of the *Chriſtian Church*.

Of the differences in the Roman Church, about matters of Government.

§. 7. 3. The Differences have been as great in the Roman Church, as out of it; both as to *matters* of *Order* and *Doctrine*.

(1.) *For matters of Order and Government*; have not the Controverſies between the *Regulars* and *Seculars*, among them even here in *England*, been managed with as much heat and warmth, as to matter of *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction*, as between thoſe of the *Church* of *England*, and the Diſſenters from it? Neither is this any lately ſtarted Controverſy among them, but hath continued ever ſince the prevalency of the *Mendicant* F*riers*, and their pretences of Exemptions from *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction*, and encroaching upon the Office of the P*arochial Clergy*. For no ſooner did the F*riers* begin publickly under pretence of Priviledges, to take upon them to preach, *without licence from the* B*iſhops*, where they pleaſed, and to take other Offices of the P*arochial Clergy*, out of their hands, but great oppoſition was made againſt them, by all the learned Men who were Friends to the *Epiſcopal Power*, and the Peace of the *Church*. Which being a matter of concernment for us to underſtand, I ſhall give a faithful account of it, from the beſt Writers of their own Church. Aſſoon as the *Monaſtick Orders* were found to be very ſerviceable to the *Intereſt* of the *Court* of *Rome*, it was thought convenient to keep them in an immediate Dependance upon the *Pope*, in whatever Country they were. From hence came the great Favour of *Popes* to them, and their willingneſs to grant them almoſt what Privileges they deſired; becauſe receiving them only from the *Plenitude* of the *Popes Power*, they were obliged to maintain and defend that from whence they derived them. At firſt, when they led a more properly *Monaſtick Life*, the *Privileges* granted them ſeem to be nothing elſe, but exempting them from ſome Troubles which were inconſiſtent with it; either relating to their Perſons, or the Eſtates they enjoyed. After this, they began to complain of the Numbers of People flocking to their Churches, as inconſiſtent with their private and retired Life; from hence we firſt read that publick *Maſſes* by the *Biſhop* were forbid in *Monaſteries*, to prevent a Concourſe of People, and eſpecially of Women to them. But a long time after this they lived in Subjection to the *Biſhops*, and meddled no more in *Eccleſiaſtical* than in *Secular Matters*. So *Charles M.* in his *Capitular commands them to keep within their Monaſteries, to be ſubject to their Biſhops, and to meddle in no Eccleſiaſtical Matters, without the expreſs Command of the Biſhop.* But as the *Popes* encreaſed their Authority, the *Monks* inlarged their Privileges, and procured Exemptions from *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction*; which yet was not pleaſing to thoſe, who valued the *Churches* Peace above the Privileges of the *Monaſtick* Orders. Theſe Exemptions are therefore highly condemned by St. *Bernard*, though a *Monk* himſelf, *as tending to the Diſſolution of the Eccleſiaſtical Government*; and by *Ivo Carnotenſis*, who ſaith, *he grew weary of his Epiſcopal Government, by reaſon of them.* *Petrus Bleſenſis* hath an Epiſtle written to Pope *Alexander* III. in the Name of *Richard Archbiſhop of Canterbury*, againſt the *Abbot of Malmſbury*, who refuſed Subjection to the *Biſhop* of *Saliſbury*, and being cited by the *Archbiſhop* to appear before him for his contempt, he declared he would be ſubject to none but the Pope; and ſaid, *they were pitiful Abbots, who did not wholly exempt themſelves from the* Biſhops *Power, when they might for an annual Penſion to the* Pope *obtain an abſolute Exemption.* Therefore the *Archbiſhop* ſaith, *it was time for them to complain, becauſe this Contagion did ſpread it ſelf far, and the Abbots ſet themſelves againſt their* Biſhops *and Metropolitans: And the* Popes *by indulging theſe things, did command Diſobedience and Rebellion, and arm the Children againſt their Fathers*; but theſe and many other Complaints ſignified nothing in the *Court* of *Rome*, as long as their Profit and Intereſt were advanced by it. And although we read of many Affronts which the *Monks* put upon the *Biſhops*, before the time of the *Mendicant Fryers*, yet their Inſolency grew the higheſt, when they took upon them to *preach* in *Parochial Churches*, and hear Confeſſions without the *Biſhops* leave. Thence the *Univerſity* of *Paris*, publiſhed the Book *de Periculis noviſſimorum temporum*; which although written by St. *Amour*, went abroad in the Name of all the *Divines* there, as appears by the beginning of it: Wherein

Gregor. l. 4 Epiſt 43. Carol. M. Capitul. l. 5. n. 25.

Bernard. Epiſt. 42. ad Hen. Senon. de Conſider. l. 3. c. 4. Ivo Carnot. ep. 29. & 276. Petri Bleſenſ. ep. c. 8.

Wherein a Character is given of thoſe Perſons, who ſhould make *the*
laſt times ſo troubleſome, “ they *ſhould be lovers of themſelves,* not
“ enduring Reproof, *covetous* both of Riches and Applauſe, *high-minded,* De periculis no-
“ becauſe they would not be in Subjection to the *Biſhops,* but viſſimo-
“ be ſet before them: And therefore *diſobedient* to their ſpiritual rum tem-
“ Fathers. And ſuch as theſe are ſaid to *creep into Houſes,* which porum. p. 18.
“ the ordinary *Gloſs* expounds of thoſe who enter into the Houſes cap. 2.
“ of thoſe who are under anothers Charge: Theſe enter not *by the*
“ *Door,* as the *Rectors* of Churches do; but ſteal into them like
“ *Thieves* and *Robbers;* and *leading captive ſilly Women,* is their ſetting
“ them againſt the *Biſhops,* and perſwading them to a Monaſtick
“ Life. Theſe are likewiſe *falſe Teachers,* who though never ſo learned
“ and holy, teach without being ſent; and none are duly ſent,
“ but ſuch as are choſen and authorized by the *Church,* ſuch as *Biſhops*
“ and *Preſbyters* are; the one ſucceeding the *Apoſtles,* the other
“ the 72 *Diſciples:* And afterwards they deny, that the *Pope* himſelf
“ can give any Power to others, to meddle in the Charge of a
“ *Pariſh,* or in *preaching* among them, but where they are invited
“ to it; becauſe *Biſhops* themſelves cannot otherwiſe act out of their
“ own *Dioceſes;* and that the *Pope* in this caſe doth Injury, by
“ violating the Rights of others: And if he ſhould go about to deſtroy
“ what the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* have taught, he would err in ſo doing.
“ Beſides, ſay they, if theſe *Prædicant Fryers* have a Liberty to preach
“ where they pleaſe, they are all *Univerſal Biſhops;* and becauſe
“ Maintenance is due to all who preach, the People will be bound
“ to pay *Procurations* to them, which will be an unreaſonable Burthen
“ upon them. Many other Arguments they uſe againſt this
“ new ſort of *Itinerant Preachers,* and repreſent the Dangers that
“ came to the *Church* by them at large: Wherein they deſcribe them, cap. 3.
“ as a kind of *hypocritical Sectaries,* that abuſed the People under a
“ fair ſhew and pretence of *Religion;* having, as they ſay, *a Form*
“ *of Godlineſs, but denying the Power of it:* And that the Perſecution
“ of the *Church* by them, would be equal to what it was by
“ *Tyrants* and open *Hereticks;* becauſe they are familiar Enemies,
“ and do Miſchief under a ſhew of Kindneſs. And that one of
“ the great Dangers of the Church by them would be their *poſſeſſing*
“ *Princes and People with Prejudices againſt the Government of the* Cap. 4.
“ *ly Church by the Biſhops;* which having done, they can more eaſi-
“ lead them into Errors, both againſt Faith and a good Life. That
“ their way of dealing is firſt with the *Women,* and by them ſeducing Cap. 5.
“ the Men, *as the Devil firſt tempted* Eve, *and by her* Adam; and
“ when they have once ſeduced them, they tie them by Oaths and Vows,
“ not to hearken to the Council of their Biſhops, or thoſe who have
“ the Care of their Souls. That the *Biſhops* ought to ſuppreſs theſe,
“ and call in the publick help to do it, and to purge their *Dioceſes* cap. 9.
“ of them: And that if they do it not, *the Blood of the People*
“ *will be required of them,* and Deſtruction will come upon them cap. 10.
“ for it: And though *Princes* and People had taken their Part, that cap. 11.
“ ought not to diſcourage them; but their Folly ought to be made
“ manifeſt to all Men. After this, they lay down the means to be
“ uſed for ſuppreſſing them, and the Signs for their Diſcovery; cap. 12.
“ ſaying, that *they are idle Perſons, buſy Bodies, wandring* Beggars,
“ againſt the *Apoſtles* expreſs Command, who would have all ſuch cap. 13. cap. 14.

“ excluded the *Church* as *diſorderly Livers :* And therefore conclude, “ with an earneſt Exhortation to all who have a Care of the *Church*, “ to riſe up againſt them, as the pernicious Enemies of its Peace “ and Welfare. All theſe things, which are only ſummarily comprehended in that Book, are very largely inſiſted upon by *Gul. de Sancto Amore*, in another Book entituled, *Collections of Holy Scripture*, which is wholly upon this Subject. The *Mendicant Fryers* being thus aſſaulted, endeavoured to defend themſelves as well as they could, and made choice of the beſt Wits among them, for their Champions; ſuch as *Bonaventure*, and *Aquinas* then were, who undertook their Cauſe, and were fain to ſhelter themſelves under the *Plenitude of the Popes Power*; by which means, they were ſure to have the *Pope* on their ſide; but his *Authority* was here no means of *Unity*; for the Controverſy continued long after, and was managed with great heat on both ſides.

Of the Inſufficiency of the Popes Authority for ending this Controverſy.

§. 8. Upon the great Complaint of the *Privileges* and *Exemptions* which the *Monaſtick Orders* had obtained from the *Popes*, *Clement* V. promiſed to have this Buſineſs diſcuſſed, in the *Council* of *Vienna*; and to that end, gave order to ſeveral learned Men to write about it; among whom particularly *Durandus Mimatenſis* writ a large Diſcourſe (not mentioned by *Poſſevin*) but printed *A. D.* 1545. “ wherein he perſwades the *Pope*, to revoke all ſuch Exemptions, “ becauſe they were contrary to the ancient *Canons* of the *Church*; “ whereby from the Apoſtles times, all Places and Perſons what- “ ſoever were immediately under the Juriſdiction of the *Biſhops*; and “ that the *Pope* neither ought, nor could change this Order of the “ *Church*. Becauſe the Order of *Biſhops*, being appointed to prevent “ *Schiſms* in the *Church*, it could not attain its end, if any Perſons “ were exempted from their Juriſdiction. And if it were in the *Popes* “ Power to grant ſuch Exemptions, it were by no means expedient “ to do it, becauſe the Order of the *Church* would be deſtroyed “ by it, the *Biſhops* contemned, and the Church divided; and if the “ *Monaſtick* Orders paid no Obedience to the *Biſhops*, the People “ would ſoon learn by their Example to diſobey them too. And “ ſuppoſing it had been expedient before, it could not be ſo “ then; becauſe, though the *Monaſtick* Orders were founded in “ a *State* of *Poverty*, yet now thoſe who were in them were arrived at ſuch a height of intolerable Pride and Arrogance, “ that not only their *Abbots* and *Priors*, but the *Fryers* thought “ themſelves equal to *Biſhops*, and fit to be preferred before other “ *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons*. Thus far *Durandus*; and *Ægidius Romanus* at the ſame time writ a Book againſt the *Exemptions* of *Fryers*; againſt both of them, *Jacobus* the *Abbot* of the *Ciſtercians* writ a Defence of *Exemptions*; which was publiſhed in *Vienna*, in the time of the *Council*. This Matter was hotly debated in that *Council*, but the *Pope* would not yield to the *Revocation* of them: But renews a *Bull* of *Boniface* VIII. for qualifying and compoſing the Differences, that had happened to the great Scandal of the *Church* about them: “ Wherein he takes notice of ſeveral Bulls before which had “ taken no Effect (ſo excellent an Inſtrument of Peace is the *Popes* “ *Authority*) and that of a long time, a *moſt grievous and dangerous* “ *Diſcord* had been between the *Biſhops* and *Parochial Clergy*, on “ one Part; and the *preaching Friers*, on the other. Therefore the

Clementin. l. 3. c. 2.

“ the Pope very wiſely conſidering, *how full of Danger, how prejudicial to the Church*, how *diſpleaſing to God ſo great a diſcord was*; and reſolving, wholly to remove it for the future, by his Apoſtolical Authority doth appoint and command, that the *Friers* ſhould have Liberty to preach in all *Churches*, Places, and publick Streets at any other hour, but that wherein the *Biſhops* did preach, or did command others to preach, without a particular licenſe to preach then: A greater Inſtance of the diſcords which have been in the *Roman Church*, nor of the Inſufficiency of the *Popes* Authority for the cure of them, can hardly be produced, than this is. The *Popes* were forced to ſay and unſay, and retract their own grants, to mitigate and qualifie them and all to no purpoſe; for the differences continued as great, notwithſtanding them. The firſt *Pope*, who interpoſed in this quarrel was *Greg.* IX. who upon complaint made by the *Friers*, of the *Biſhops* exerciſing their *Juriſdiction* over them in ſeveral things, mentioned as *grievances* by them; he publiſhes two *Bulls* or *decretal Epiſtles*, to forbid the *Biſhops* doing it for the future: Upon this the *Friers* openly contemn the *Biſhops*, and preach where they pleaſe, and hear Confeſſions, and bury the dead in ſpight of them, and the *Parochial Clergy*. *Innocent* IV. finding how neceſſary their help was to him, in the Controverſies between him and the *Emperor*, confirms the ſame *Privileges* to them: By which they grew ſo inſolent, that they called the *Pariſh Prieſts*, as *Matthew Paris* relates, *Ideots*, *Dunces*, *Drunkards*, *blind Guides*, and would make the People believe, that all *Knowledge* and *Sanctity* was only among them: inſomuch that in *Petrus de Vineis*, who lived in that *Age* and was *Chancellor* to the *Emperor*, we read a miſerable Complaint of the Parochial *Clergy* againſt the Friers, *viz.* that *by their means they were brought under the greateſt contempt, to the general Scandal of Religion, they expreſſing the moſt bitter Hatred againſt them imaginable, reproaching their Lives, and leſſening their dues ſo, as they were brought to nothing by it; and they were made a laughing ſtock to all People, that they took away the main of their Employment from them, and drew away the People from the Churches to the Convents, telling them the Word of God was to be heard only among them. That they had nothing now left to do, but to pull down their Churches; in which they had ſcarce any thing left, beſides a Bell and an old ruſty Image; but theſe holy Friers, while they had nothing, poſſeſſed all things, and profeſſing Poverty were extreamly Rich.* But *Innocent* IV. a little before his Death, being wearied by the Complaints of the *Biſhops* and *Clergy*, revoked the Privileges which he had ſo largely granted to the *Friers*, and confined them within certain Limits; *forbidding them to draw away the people from their Pariſh Churches, upon Sundays and Holy days; or to admit any to Pennance, who had not firſt confeſſed to their Pariſh Prieſt*: but the *Friers* were as far from being pacified by this, as the *Clergy* were by the former; for therein the *Pope* upbraids them, *with violating the Rights of others, with blaſpheming Religion by ſuch Actions, diſpleaſing God, and drawing the Souls of the faithful to perdition*: but he dying, aſſoon as they had notice of this *Bull*, they ſaid, it was a juſt Judgment of God upon him, for revoking their Privileges. And *Alexander* IV. was no ſooner ſetled in his Chair, but they procured another *Bull* from him, to call in that of *Innocent* IV. and immediately to ſuſpend all Execution of it; but this

Gregor. decret. Epiſtol. l. 5. n. 31. c. 16. 17.

Matth. Paris A. D. 1235. p. 419.

Petrus de Vineis epiſtol. lib. 1. ep. 37.

Seculum quintum Univerſit. Pariſ. p. 371.

this did not ſatisfie them, for they boaſted they had killed *Pope Innocent* by their *Prayers*, and that the *V. Mary, every time they invocated her Name, turned to her Son and ſaid, Son hear them :* Upon which *Innocent* was preſently ſtruck with a *Palſie* and dyed ; from whence aroſe a ſaying in the *Court* of *Rome, from the* Friers *Litanies good Lord deliver us.* This is related as true by *Bzovius, ad A. D.* 1254. but is looked on as a Fable of the *Friers*, by *D'atticby, Raynaldus*, du *Boulay* and others of any Judgment among them. But neither this *Bull* of *Alexander*, nor all the reſt he made for their ſakes, could make the *Biſhops* and the *Clergy* give up their *rights* ; for in the time of *Martin* IV. the *Friers* procured another *Bull*, for *hearing Confeſſions without Licence from the Biſhops* ; upon which, the contention increaſed between the *Biſhops* and the *Friers* ; inſomuch, that not waiting the *Popes* revocation of his grant, which he was inclined to by the perſwaſions of the *Biſhop* of *Amiens*, they called a *Synod* of the *Gallican Church* at *Paris, A. D.* 1284. wherein the *Archbiſhop* of *Bourges* being Preſident, declared to them, “ that being “ *Paſtors* of the Flock, they ought to lay down their Lives for their “ Sheep, and not to ſuffer the encroachments were made upon them “ by the *Friers* ; by whom all things were brought to *confuſion* in the “ *Church :* that they had uſed all fair ways of prevailing with them, “ by the Intreaties of the *King* and *Nobles*, to forbear ſuch Intruſions “ into their Offices, as they were continually guilty of ; but all to “ no purpoſe, they ſtill defending themſelves by *papal Privileges*, “ whereas there had been contrary *Bulls* to one another granted at “ *Rome*. And it was then agreed among them, that they ſhould maintain their *own Office* againſt the *Friers* Incroachments ; by which the *contention* increaſed to ſo great a height, that many *Invectives, Apologies*, and *Libels* were publiſhed one againſt another, *to the great Diſgrace* (ſaith *Meyerus*) *of the whole Eccleſiaſtical Order.* Upon which, Pope *Martin* endeavour'd an accommodation by another *Bull*, wherein he required, *that all Pariſhioners ſhould confeſs to their own* Pariſh *Prieſt, at leaſt once a year.* But this was as far from making peace, as any before ; therefore from *Boniface* VIII. the *Friers* procured a new *Bull* of *Privileges*, “ which abſolutely nulls all the former “ *Bulls* of reſtriction and limitation ; and by the fulneſs of his Apoſtolical Power, doth exempt them from all manner of Power or “ Juriſdiction of the *Biſhops*, or any other *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons* ; and “ decrees, that they were immediately ſubject to the *Pope*, and to “ none elſe. And yet this *Pope* himſelf, not many years after, retracted this *Bull* ; and ſet forth that, which *Clement* V. renewed in order to the compoſing this difference ; which had now, to the great demonſtration of their *Unity* and the *Popes Authority*, continued with great violence above fifty years: And was far from being ended by this *Bull* ; for *Benedict* XI. in another publiſhed on the ſame occaſion, ſaith, *that inſtead of peace, troubles aroſe by it ; inſtead of unity and concord, greater diviſions and diſturbances : And by cutting off one head of the* Hydra, *ſeven more came up in its room.* Are not the Popes great *Peace-makers*, the mean while ! Therefore he reſolves, to try what the other way would do ; and again inlarges the Privileges of the *Friers* ; which being found as unſucceſsful as ever, *Clement* V. reſumes the *Conſtitution* of *Boniface*, which this *Pope* con-

demned

D'atticby hiſt. Cardinal. Tom. 1. *vit. Sinibaldi. Rainald. ad A. D.* 1254 *n.* 73. *Boulay. hiſtor. Univerſit. Pariſ. tom.* 3. *p.* 176. *Id. p* 462

Meyer. Annales Flandr. l. 10. *ad A. D.* 1285

Extravagant. commun. l. 5. *tit.* 7. *c.* 1.

demned; and to as little purpoſe, as the other had done before. And now let us ſoberly conſider, whether there hath not always been an *admirable Unity* in the *Roman Church*; or if diviſions have aroſe, a ready means to ſuppreſs them? Here we have the *Popes* interpoſing, by *Bull* after *Bull*; and ſo far from ending the differences that occaſioned them, that they begot more, which made the *Popes* contradict one another, nay the ſame *Pope to contradict* himſelf; and ſo the differences became greater than they were at firſt. And after all theſe *Bulls*, we find the very ſame Controverſie at as great a height in *England*, and *Ireland* as ever it had been in *France* or *Germany*; *Wadding* ſaith, *it went ſo high, that the Biſhops and Clergy here would not ſuffer the* Friers *to enjoy any of the Privileges granted them by the Popes*; which cauſed an appeal to the *Pope*, made by the Friers; to whom, in behalf of the Clergy, was ſent *Richard Fitz Ralph*, the learned *Biſhop* of *Armagh*, beſt known by the name of *Armachanus*; who there, with great ſmartneſs, oppoſed the Friers to the *Popes* face, in a long and ſet diſcourſe ſtill extant, wherein he gives an account, “ that coming to *London*, about ſome buſineſs of his *See*, he “ found great diſputes about the *Privileges* of the Friers; and being “ deſired to preach, he made ſeven or eight Sermons, wherein he “ declared his Mind againſt them both as to their order, and privileges; in which he followed the Doctrine of the *Divines* at *Paris*, “ above an hundred years before delivered by them, upon the like occaſion; aſſerting it not to be in the Popes power, to grant ſuch “ Privileges which deſtroy the Rights of the *Parochial Clergy*, or the “ *Juriſdiction* of the *Biſhops*. The Friers charge him with *Hereſie*, *as they are wont to do thoſe who are wiſer than themſelves*, ſaith *Boulay*: *Armachanus* dyed at *Avignon*, but ſo did not the Controverſie with him; although the Friers ſeem to have had the better there, they being the *Popes Janizaries*, and ready in all places to ſerve his turn: yet *Walſingham* ſaith, *it was not without corrupting the Popes Court, by great bribes given by the* Friers, *that they obtained the confirmation of their Privileges*; yet ſeven years after, *Harpsfield ſaith, this Controverſie was referred to the Parliament to be determined.* Very ſtrange! that a *Parliament* in *England* ſhould be thought a more likely means for *Unity* in the *Church* than the *Authority* of ſo many *Popes*, who had interpoſed in it, for putting an iſſue to this difference. After *Armachanus Wickliffe* undertook this quarrel againſt the *Friers*; and made uſe of the ſame arguments againſt them, which thoſe who defended the *Clergy* had done before. For in his book againſt the *Orders* of Friers, he particularly inſiſts upon this, *that they for pride and covetiſe had drawn from Curats their Office and Sacraments, in which lyen winning or worſhip; and ſo making diſſention, betwixt Curats and their Ghoſtly Children.* Which are his own Words. But *Wickliff* and his Diſciples carrying the Controverſies much farther, to points of doctrine and other practices in the *Roman Church* made the other Parties more quiet, out of oppoſition to theſe whom they looked on as their common Enemies. It may be therefore they will ſay, *that although the* Popes Paſtoral Power *may not always cure their diviſions, yet the Oppoſition of Hereticks makes them run together like a flock of ſheep*; if this were true, it ſeems they are more beholding to *Hereticks* for their *Unity*, than to the *Popes Authority*: But we ſhall find that neither one nor the other of theſe, nor both

Wadding. Annal. Minorum ad A. D. 1357.

Rich. Armach. Defenſio Curat.

Bulæ. hiſt. Univerſit. Pariſ. tom. 4. p. 337.

Walſingham hiſt. Angel. in Ed. 3. p. 173

Joh. Wickliff *againſt the Orders of Friers* c. 10. p. 28.

both together, can keep them from diviſions; and thoſe managed with as great Animoſity, as we have ever found in the moſt differing Sects.

Of the differences between the regulars and ſeculars in England. **Watſon's** *Reply to* **Parſons** *his Libel.* p. 2.

§. 9. Witneſs the Proceedings between the *Jeſuits* and the *Secular Prieſts*, begun in *Wiſbich Caſtle*, in the latter end of *Queen Elizabeth's Reign*; when it came to a ſeparation from each other about the Authority of the *Arch-prieſts*. And they mutually charged each other, with being guilty *of a horrible Schiſm*, maintained, ſaith *Watſon*, *by the Jeſuits* and *Arch-prieſts*, *with infinite violence, much infamy for the time, and innumerable particular Wrongs thereupon, not unknown to the meaneſt Catholick in* England. The *ſecular* Prieſts finding themſelves unjuſtly accuſed, as they ſaid, to the Pope, publiſhed a Book in *Latin* which they dedicated to his *Holineſs*, called *declaratio motuum & turbarum*; which ſaith P*arſons* in his anſwer, called, *A Manifeſtation of the great folly and bad ſpirit of certain in* England *calling themſelves ſecular* Prieſts, “is made up only of invectives, and paſſionate words, injurious, and manifeſt falſe ſlanders; they in their Reply charge P*arſons* with *folly and madneſs*, and the higheſt *degree of Impudency*. If any one hath a mind to furniſh himſelf with all the terms and phraſes of ſcolding reproach and infamy, he may find them in the Books they then writ againſt each other; or if he thinks that too great a Trouble, he may meet with a goodly parcel of them put together, out of F*ath.* P*arſons* his own Writings, by *Watſon* at the end of the *Reply to Parſon's Libel.* The ſhort account of the breach among them was this; all the loud talk they made abroad concerning their cruel Perſecution, could not hinder Ambition, and Envy from having its effects among them, from theſe, firſt aroſe Miſunderſtandings, and then Quarrels, between the *ſecular Prieſts* and the *Jeſuits*: From thence, the Prieſts proceed to the framing a *Sodality*, (as they called it) among themſelves, the better to ſtrengthen themſelves againſt the *Jeſuits*; which they underſtanding prevail with one of the number of the *aſſociated* P*rieſts* to betray their Counſels; him they ſend to *Rome*, who in the name of all the P*rieſts* in *England* deſired, for the preventing differences for the future, and the curing thoſe that were already, that there might be a *Government* and *Subordination* ſetled among them. F*a. Parſons*, being then at Rome, follows the matter cloſe; and repreſents to the *Pope* the neceſſity of it, becauſe of the great diſcords which were among them in *England.* Whereupon, the P*ope*, according to F*a.* P*arſons* deſire, refers the whole buſineſs to C*ardinal Cajetan*, their P*rotector*. Who being governed by the *Jeſuits* pitched upon a Perſon wholly at their devotion (as the *ſeculars* thought) which was *Blackwell*, a Man ſwayed altogether by *Garnet*, Provincial of the *Jeſuits*; (well known for his Zeal in the *Catholic Cauſe*, by ſuffering as one of their *Martyrs* in the *Gunpowder Treaſon*,) and one of the *Arch-prieſts* inſtructions was, *in all matters of Moment, to be adviſed by the* P*rovincial of the Jeſuits.* The *ſecular* P*rieſts*, finding themſelves thus over-reached by the cunning of the *Jeſuits*, and that they deſigned hereby, wholly to govern their affairs, make many demurrs to his Authority; both concerning the manner, and the ſubſtance of it: And deſire a B*reve* from the P*ope*, and then promiſe to ſubmit. P*arſons* procures one to their purpoſe, and an appearance of Peace was for a little time among them; and they mutually promiſed not to charge the *Schiſm* upon each other; but within a month or ſix weeks, the flame brake out with greater Fury than ever, the *Arch-Prieſt* ſending his Directions into all parts, *that none of the Seculars ſhould be admitted to the Sacraments without acknowledging themſelves Schiſmaticks.* So that the *Popes Breve* was ſo far from ending the difference, that it encreaſed it; *Fa. Parſons* charging them (and the *Seculars* not denying it) that after it, they were farther from obeying the *Arch-Prieſt*, than they were before. So unhappy have the *Popes* been, when they have gone about to uſe their *Authority* for compoſing Differences, among thoſe who are in their own *Church*?

But we leave this, and come to a later Controverſy among them, about the ſame matters of Order and Government. *Richard Smith*, titular B*iſhop* of *Chalcedon*, was inveſted with the Authority of *Ordinary*, over the *Engliſh Clergy* by *Urban* VIII. *Feb.* 4. *A. D.* 1625. not long after he comes into *England*; and was received with ſo great kindneſs by their Party here, as made the *Jeſuits* (who are Friends to none but themſelves) ſoon to become his Enemies, eſpecially when he began to exerciſe his E*piſcopal Juriſdiction* here, in laying *reſtraints* upon the *Regulars*; which the *Jeſuits* with other *Regulars* grew ſo impatient of, that they ſoon revived the old Quarrel, concerning the *Authority* and *Juriſdiction* of B*iſhops*; and managed it with ſo great heat and fierceneſs, that the Titular B*iſhop* was fain to leave the Field, and withdraw into *France*. The bottom of the Quarrel was, they found the kindneſs of their Party to them abated, ſince the *Biſhops* coming; who before had ſwayed all, and lived in great Plenty and Bravery; when *the poor Seculars got ſcarce Bread to eat*, as *Watſon* very ſadly laments, in his anſwer to *Parſons*; but now the neceſſary ſupport of the dignity of a *Biſhop*, made the charity of their Party run in another channel; which the P*rovincial* of the *Jeſuits* complains of, in a Letter to the *Biſhop* of *Chalcedon*. Therefore they endeavour all they can to make a Party againſt him, among the People too; which they did ſo effectually, as amounted to his *withdrawing*, a more civil word for Exile. And now, both Parties being ſufficiently heated, the Battel begins, in which not only *England* and *Ireland*, but *France* and *Flanders*, were deeply engaged. The firſt who appeared was Dr. *Kelliſon*, Profeſſour of *Doway*, in a Book in *Vindication of the Biſhops Authority*; to whom *Knot*, then *Vice-principal* of the *Jeſuits*, returned his *modeſt and brief Diſcuſſion*, &c. under the Name of *Nicholas Smith*, a *Jeſuit* then dead. Soon after came out another, written to the ſame purpoſe, under the Name of *Daniel* of *Jeſu*, whoſe true Name was *John Fluide* (which the other writing *Joannes* for *John*, was the *Anagram* of,) he was a *Jeſuit too*, and P*rofeſſour* at St. *Omars*: which Books were firſt cenſured by the *Archbiſhop* of P*aris*, then by the *Sorbonne*, and at laſt by the Bi*ſhops* of *France*, in an *Aſſembly* of them at *Paris*: But the *Jeſuits* were ſo far from giving over by this, that they ſet forth their Books again in *Latin*, with large Approbations of them; and publiſh a *Remonſtrance* againſt the *Biſhop* of *Chalcedon*, in the Name of the *Catholick* P*arty in England*; which was diſowned by the greateſt number of them, and caſt wholly upon the *Jeſuits*: The ſame Year, 1631. three Books were publiſhed by the *ſecular Clergy* here, in oppoſition to the *Jeſuits*. Who were ſo far from quitting the Field by reaſon of the number of their Enemies, that they begin afreſh charge againſt both the *Sorbonne Doctors* and the *French Clergy*, under the feigned Name of *Hermannus Loemelius*, whoſe chief Author was therefore named *Jeſuit Lloyd*, with the aſſiſtance of his Brethren, as the diverſity of the Style ſhews: and another Book came out againſt the *Faculty* of *Paris*, in *Vindication* of *Knot* or *Nicholas Smith*, with many approbations of *Biſhops*, *Univerſities* and *private Doctors:* and in Vindication of the *Propoſitions* of *Ireland* (likewiſe cenſured at *Paris*) another Book came forth, under the name of *Edmundus Urſulanus*, whoſe true Name was *Mac-mhaone*, *Prior* of the *Franciſcan Convent* in *Lovain*. About the ſame time, the *Jeſuits* publiſhed their *Cenſure* of the *Apoſtolical Creed*, in imitation of the *Cenſures* at *Paris*, againſt their Doctrine (as though their *Doctrines* were as certain as that, and themſelves as *infallible* as the *Apoſtles*:) wherein they charge the *Biſhops* their Enemies, with reviving old Hereſies, and broaching new ones. The *Jeſuits* having now done ſuch great things, triumph unreaſonably in all Places, as having utterly overthrown their Enemies, and beaten them out of the Field: when, in a little time after, *Hallier* and *le Maiſtre* two Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, undertake the quarrel againſt them; but none was ſo highly magnified and infinitely applauded by the *French Clergy*, as a Perſon under the diſguiſed Name of *Petrus Aurelius*; whoſe Atchievements in this kind they celebrate, next to thoſe of the *Pucelle d'Orleans*, and Printed all theſe Works together at their own Charge: and writ a high *Elogium* of him, which is prefixed before them. And the *ſecular Clergy* of *England* ſent him a Letter of Congratulation for his Triumphs, ſubſcribed by *John Colleton Dean* of the *Chapter*, and *Edmond Dutton Secretary*; wherein, they ſadly lament the Diſcords that have been among them here, and the *Hereſies* broached by their Adverſaries, by occaſion of them. The main of this Controverſy did concern the *Dignity*, *Neceſſity*, and *Juriſdiction* of the *Epiſcopal Order*; as appears by the Cenſures of the *Biſhops* of *France*, and by *Aurelius*, who ſaith, “ that “ although the Diſpute began upon occaſion of the *Biſhop* of *Chalcedon*, and the Engliſh Clergy, yet it was now carried farther, “ whether the *Epiſcopal* Order was neceſſary to the *Being* of a “ particular *Church?* Whether it was by *Divine Right*, or no? “ Whether Confirmation might be given, without *Biſhops?* Whether “ the *Epiſcopal* Order was more perfect, than the *Monaſtical?* Whe- “ ther the *Regulars* were under the Juriſdiction of *Biſhops?* And therefore the *Jeſuits* are charged by their *Adverſaries*, with a deſign to extirpate and ruine the whole *Order* of *Epiſcopacy*. Have not theſe Men now great reaſon to inſult over us, that ſome of theſe Queſtions have cauſed great Differencs among us; when the *Jeſuits* in *England* had laid the Foundation of them, by their *quarrels* of the ſame kind, but a little before; and furniſhed the Enemies to *Epiſcopacy* and the *Church* of *England*, with ſo many Arguments to their hands, to manage their bad Cauſe with? But what becomes of the *Court* of *Rome* all this while? do the *Pope* and *Cardinals* only ſtand ſtill, to ſee what the Iſſue of the Battel will be, without ever offering to compoſe the Differences, between the two Parties? No. The *Jeſuits*, finding how hard they were put to it, make their *Addreſs* to *Rome*, as their greateſt *Sanctuary*,

Petri Aurelii opera tom. 1. p. 26.

ſtuary, A. D. and 1633. obtained a *Decree* of the *Sacred Congregation*, for ſuppreſſing the Books on both ſides, without judging any thing at all of the merits of the Cauſe, or giving any *Cenſure* of the *Authority* on either ſide. And is not now the *Popes* Authority an excellent Remedy, for all *Diviſions* in the *Church*? When in ſo great a heat as this was, the *Pope* durſt not interpoſe at all in the main Buſineſs, for fear of loſing either ſide; which is a plain Argument, that they themſelves look on this Authority as ſo precarious a thing, that they muſt by no means expoſe it, where it is like to be called in *Queſtion*. Were not her *Controverſies* fit to be determined? To what purpoſe is that Authority, that dare not be exerciſed when there is moſt need of it? and when could there be greater need, than in ſuch a Time, when the *Church* was in a Flame by theſe Contentions? And yet ſo timerous a *Decree* as this was, could find no Acceptance. For at *Paris* immediately comes out a *Diſquiſition* upon it, “ ſhewing the unreaſonableneſs of it, in ſuppreſſing Books without enquiring into the merits of the Cauſe, in a matter of ſo great Conſequence as that was; that this would give great occaſion of Triumph to the Hereticks, when ſuch ſcandalous and ſeditious Books, as thoſe of the *Jeſuits* are, meet with the ſame Favour at *Rome*, with the Cenſure of the *Biſhops* of *France*: that their *profane* and *atheiſtical Cenſure* of the *Apoſtles Creed* muſt have no mark of Diſgrace put upon it; nor ſuch ſayings of theirs, wherein they call the Biſhops and *Divines* of *France* by moſt contumelious Names, and ſay they are the Enemies of the Truth and Piety. The *Jeſuits*, inſtead of defending themſelves againſt *Aurelius*, write a pitiful defence of this Decree, of ſuppreſſing the Books on both ſides; and ſo all the Means, which the *Court* of *Rome* durſt uſe to extinguiſh this Flame, proved but an occaſion of adding to it. And whether this Controverſy be yet at an end among them, let all the Heats in *France* and *England* of late Years concerning the *Jeſuits* give Teſtimony.

Of the Jeſuits particular oppoſition to Biſhops and their Authority.

§. 10. I ſhall not now inſiſt any longer upon them, but only produce ſome late Paſſages of things (which though they happened at a greater diſtance, are yet ſufficiently atteſted) to ſhew what ſpight the *Jeſuitical Order* bears, to the *Authority* of *Biſhops*; what Arts they have uſed to enervate it, what Power to affront their Perſons, and to expoſe them to all the Contempt that may be, when they go about to ſtop their Proceedings, or exerciſe any Juriſdiction over them. The great occaſion of the Controverſy between the *Biſhops* and them was, that the *Jeſuits* took upon them to Preach, and hear Confeſſion, *&c.* without any permiſſion from the *Biſhop* of the *Dioceſe*. So they did in the *Philippine Iſlands*, whereupon the *Archbiſhop* of *Manille*, *Don Aernando Guerrero* called a Synod; wherein it was reſoved, that the Archbiſhop ought to bring the *Jeſuits* to account for what they did; which he did, and all the ſatisfaction he could get from them was, *that they had privileges*; the *Archbiſhop*, not ſatisfied with this, proceeds againſt them; they name a *Conſervator* an Enemy of the *Archbiſhops*, (for the Popes to keep the *Biſhops* in awe, have allowed them, by a *Bull* for that purpoſe, Liberty in caſe of Difference between the *Biſhops* and them, to chuſe a *Conſervator*, to defend their Privileges againſt them) this *Conſervator* proceeds againſt the *Archbiſhop*, and the *Jeſuits*

Moral Practice of the Jeſuits. p. 328.

Bull. Rom. Tom. 2. **p.** 361. **Bull.** 1. **Greg.** 13.

Jeſuits procure the *Governor* to joyn with him; who, without giving leave to him to make his defence reſolve to baniſh him. The *Archbiſhop* underſtanding their Reſolution to ſend him away, goes with the *Clergy* about him into his *Chappel*; and there, to ſecure himſelf from the inſolence of the *Soldiers*, in his *Pontifical Habit*, holds the *Euchariſt* in his Hand: notwithſtanding which, they came and dragged out all the *Friers*, who took the *Archbiſhops* part; and afterwards, the old *Archbiſhop* himſelf, who fell down in the crowd with the *Pix* in his Hand, and wounded himſelf in the Face. Such Exorbitances made that Impreſſion on one of the Soldiers, that he drew his Sword, and falling upon it ſaid, *he had rather die by his own Hands, than ſee ſuch Enormities among Chriſtians.* At laſt, the Archbiſhop was forced to let go his *Pix*, and was preſently carried away out of the City; and put into a little pitiful Barque, unprovided of all things, without permitting any Food to be given him, or any of his Servants to accompany him; and was conveyed by five Soldiers into a Deſart *Iſland*, where he had not ſo much as a *Cabin* for Shelter; and there he was kept, till he yielded to their Terms. O the admirable Unity, Peace, and Submiſſion to *Biſhops* in the *Roman Church*! But we have yet a more remarkable Inſtance of this kind, in the notorious caſe of the difference between the *Biſhop* of *Angelopolis* in *America*, and the *Jeſuits*; which was heard at *Rome*, and ſeveral *Bulls* publiſhed by *Innocent* X. in it. I ſhall give an account of it, from the *Popes Bulls*, and from the Letter which the *Biſhop* himſelf ſent to the *Pope* about it, *A. D.* 1649. which is extant in the *Collection* at the end of Mr. *S. Amours Journal*; which he had from *Coſimo Ricciardi* Sub-library-keeper of the *Vatican*, who received it immediately from the *Biſhops Agent*. The Controverſy began there upon the very ſame grounds, which it had done in the *Philippine Iſlands*; for the *Jeſuits* would acknowledge no Subjection at all to the *Biſhop*, but would Preach and hear Confeſſions, without any licenſe from the *Biſhop*; which difference grew ſo high, that the *Jeſuits* choſe *Conſervators* againſt the *Biſhops* Authority; as the *Popes Bull* granted, *May* 14. *A. D.* 1648. doth declare; and not only ſo, but theſe *Conſervators* very fairly excommunicated the *Biſhop* and his *Vicar General*: upon this, the *Biſhop* ſends an *Agent* to *Rome*, and the *Jeſuits* appear in behalf of their *Society*; the *Pope* commits the Cauſe to a particular Congregation of *Cardinals* and *Biſhops*; who, upon the hearing of both ſides, give Sentence in favour of the *Biſhop*, *Ap.* 16. *A. D.* 1648. But the *Jeſuits*, (as appears by the *Biſhops* Letter, bearing date, *Jan.* 8. *A. D.* 1649.) were reſolved not to wait for the *Popes* reſolution; but finding that the People contemned their Cenſures, and adhered to the *Biſhop* were ſo enraged at it, that they reſolved to impriſon him: to that end, they bribe the *King* of *Spains Viceroy*, the *Biſhops* particular Enemy, with a great ſum of Money; and by that means clapt up moſt of his Friends, and threatned them with worſe, if they would not obey the *Conſervators*, the *Biſhop* himſelf they had appointed Soldiers to ſeize upon, on *Corpus Chriſti* day, (the better Day, the better Deed) who underſtanding their Minds, ſent Commiſſioners to treat with them, to prevent the *Tumults* and *Diſorders* were like to follow on theſe Differences; but they uſed them with Contempt, and would hear of no Terms, unleſs the

Collection of Tract. p. 11.

Biſhop would ſubmit himſelf, and his Juriſdiction, to them and their *Conſervators*; but inſtead of Peace they proceed to more open Acts of Hoſtility, by impriſoning his *Vicar General*, and uſing all manner of Inſolencies among the *People*, who joyned with the *Biſhop* to defend him againſt them. The good *Biſhop*, ſeeing things in ſo bad a Poſture, thought it his greateſt Prudence to withdraw to the Mountains, thinking himſelf ſafer among the *Serpents* and *Scorpions* there, than in the City among the *Jeſuits*. There he continues for Twenty days, almoſt famiſhed; and afterwards, for four Months lay hid in a pitiful Cottage; the *Jeſuits* in the mean time, offering great Sums of Mony to thoſe who ſhould bring him alive or dead. But not finding him, they bring the excommunicated *Conſervators* with great Pomp into the *City*; and erect a Tribunal, or in the Language of the late times, a *High Court* of *Juſtice* among them; where according to their Pleaſure, they fine, baniſh and impriſon as many as they thought their Enemies; and their ſolemnly declare, what mighty Injury the *Biſhop* had done the *Jeſuits*, in forbidding them to preach without *Licenſes* from him, or till ſuch time as they produced thoſe, which they had from his Predeceſſors: Then they declare the *Biſhops See* to be vacant; and cauſed it to be publiſhed in the *Churches*, that the *Jeſuits* did not need any Licenſe from the *Biſhop*; they null all Cenſures againſt them, recal all Orders publiſhed by the *Biſhops* for the good *Government* of his *Dioceſe*. The *Biſhop* in the mean time privately ſends monitory *Letters* to the People; to bear the preſent Perſecution with Patience, but by no means to aſſociate with, or to hear thoſe excommunicated Perſons, who had offered ſuch Affronts to his Authority and Juriſdiction; by which means, the People not being prevailed upon, they with a great Sum of Mony procure ſome Secular *Judges* to form a Judicial Proceſs againſt the *Biſhop* for *Sedition*; to which end, they ſuborn Witneſſes againſt him, but could make Evidence of nothing tending to Sedition, but forbidding the *Jeſuits* to preach. This not taking, they attempt another way to expoſe him to contempt; upon the ſacred Day of their holy *Father Ignatius*, they put their Scholars in *Maſquerade*, and ſo perſonating the *Biſhop* and his *Clergy*, they make a Proceſſion through the *Town*, in the *middle* of the *day*, and ſung the *Pater noſter* and *Ave Maria* as they went, with horrible Blaſphemies, perverting both of them to the abuſe of the *Biſhop* and his *Party*; inſtead of ſaying, *Libera nos à malo*, they ſaid *libera nos à Palafox*, which was the Name of the *Biſhop*: And others had the *Epiſcopal Staff*, hanging at a Horſe Tail, and the *Miter* on their Stirrups, to let them ſee how much they had it under their *Feet*: Others ſung *Lampoons* againſt the *Biſhop*, others did ſuch things which are not fit to be repeated: Which were Parts of this glorious Triumph of the *Jeſuits* over the *Biſhop* and his *Authority*. But in the midſt of this exceſſive Jollity, the *King* of *Spains Navy* arrived, wherein the *Kings* Commands were brought for removing the *Vice-Roy*, who was the great Friend of the *Jeſuits*: The news of this abated their Heat, and the *Biſhop* ſecretly conveys himſelf into his *Palace*, which the People hearing of ran with incredible Numbers to embrace him for ſeveral days together; upon which the *Jeſuits* complain to the old *Vice-Roy* of a Sedition, and obtained from him a Command to the *Chapter*, not to yield to the *Biſhops* Juriſdiction; which cauſed a great Diviſion among them, one Part adhering to the *Biſhop*, and another to the *Jeſuits*; the

Biſhop therefore, ſeeing the Differences to riſe higher, and the *Schiſm* to be greater, and the miſerable Condition the *Church* was in among them, was fain to ſubmit, and promiſe to innovate nothing, but to wait the *Popes* Deciſion. Not long after, another Ship arrived from *Spain*, with an *Expreſs* from the *King*, wherein the *Vice-Roy* was commanded immediately to ſurrender his *Government*; and was ſeverely rebuked for aſſiſting the *Jeſuits* againſt the *Biſhop*; and all the Acts in that Matter were nulled by the *Kings* Authority; but the *Jeſuits*, according to their uſual Integrity, gave out juſt the contrary to the Orders received, and framed Letters on purpoſe, which they diſperſed among the People. But theſe Arts never holding long, when the *Vice-Roy's* Succeſſor was eſtabliſhed, the truth brake forth, and the *Biſhop* returned to the Exerciſe of his former *Authority*.

But notwithſtanding the *King's* Declaration, and the *Popes Breve* was now publiſhed among them, the *Jeſuits* perſiſted ſtill in their obſtinate Diſobedience, and, altho' excommunicated by the *Biſhop*, yet continued to preach and act as before. And hereby we have a plain Diſcovery, what a mighty regard the *Jeſuits* have to the *Papal See*, if it once oppoſe their *Deſigns*; and what an effectual Inſtrument of *Peace* and *Unity* the *Popes* Authority is; for they preſently found Ways enough to decline the Force of the *Popes Bull*. For, (1.) They ſaid, it could have no force there, becauſe it was not received by the *Council* of the *Indies*, it ſeems *paſce oves*, and *dabo tibi Claves*, &c. ſignify nothing in the *Indies*, unleſs the *Kings Council* pleaſes, or rather unleſs the *Jeſuits* pleaſe to let it do ſo. (2.) They pleaded bravely for themſelves, that the *Privileges* granted them by the *Popes* were in Conſideration of their Merits, and ſo were of the Nature of *Contracts* and *Covenants*; and therefore could not be revoked by the *Pope*. (3.) That the *Popes Conſtitutions* in this matter were not received by the *Church*, and *Laws* which are not received are no *Laws*: But as the Biſhop well urges againſt them, if theſe ways of interpreting the *Popes Bulls* be allowed, his Authority will ſignify nothing, and all his *Conſtitutions* ſhall have no more Force, than thoſe againſt whom they are directed be pleaſed to yield to them; and it will be impoſſible to preſerve peace in the *Church*, if it ſhall be in the power of offenders to declare, whether the *Laws* againſt them are to be received for *Laws* or no. But *this*, ſaith he, *is the Inſpiration and the Illumination of the Jeſuits, and their Method of interpreting the Papal Conſtitutions*; which he heard very often from their own Mouths in the frequent Conferences he had with them about theſe Matters; but they had another way to decline the *King's Authority*; for the *King* and his *Council* being all *Lay-men*, they had nothing to do in *Eccleſiaſtical Matters*. By which means (as the *Biſhop* ſaith) they make themſelves ſuperior both to *King* and *Pope*, and free from all Juriſdiction, either *ſpiritual* or *temporal*. And I dare appeal to the moſt indifferent Perſon, whether any Doctrine broached by the greateſt *Fanaticks* among us, ever tended more to the Diſſolution of *Government*, the countenancing Sedition, the perpetuating *Schiſms* in the *Church*, than theſe of the *Jeſuits* do? And therefore the *Biſhop* ſaith, *that he had rather lay down his Life, than by yielding up his Juriſdiction expoſe his Authority to Contempt, and the Church to the continual Danger of Schiſms*; and by many weighty Arguments perſwades the *Pope*, if he truly deſigned the Peace and flouriſhing of the *Church*, ſpeedily and effectually to reform the whole *Order* of the *Jeſuits*; *without which*, he ſaith, *it is impoſſible, eſpecially in thoſe remoter Parts, for the Biſhops to preſerve any Authority.* And beſides other Corruptions among them, he tells ſtrange Stories of their ways of propagating *Chriſtian Religion* in *China*, and other neighbour Nations; which they boaſt ſo much of at this diſtance; but, he ſaith, they who are ſo much nearer and underſtand thoſe things better, have cauſe to lament the infinite Scandals which they give to the *Chriſtian Religion* in doing it. The account which he gives of theſe things, this *Biſhop* proteſts he ſends to the *Pope*, only to clear his own Conſcience; that he might not be condemned at the day of Judgment, for concealing that which he ſo certainly knew to be true, from thoſe who were eye-witneſſes of it. Their firſt Work is, to hinder all Perſons, of any other *Order* whatſoever, from coming among them; and if they do come, by one means or other, they are ſure to procure their Baniſhment and Perſecution; to this end, they aſſiſt and counſel the *Infidels* themſelves in it, and make uſe of their Hands to whip and impriſon them, and ſo to make them weary of being there. When they are left alone, they have the Liberty of telling their own *Stories*, and no one can diſprove them; but they were not ſo watchful, but ſome of the other *Orders* were ſent as *Spyes* among them; and although they knew they hazarded their Lives in it, yet they made full Diſcovery of the *Jeſuits* way of converting *Infidels*. And they diſcovered ſuch horrible things, in the *Catechiſms* they give to their new *Converts*, that they complained to the *Pope* of them; but, as appears by the event, to very little purpoſe; for although the *Jeſuits* could not deny the things they were charged with, and the *Congregation, de propagandâ fide*, at *Rome*, Sept. 12. A. D. 1645. in *Seventeen Decrees* condemned them; yet the *Rector* of the *Jeſuits Colledge*, in the *Philippines*, in a Book of 300 Pages, oppoſed thoſe Decrees, which was in the Hands of the *Biſhop* of *Angelopolis*, and he gave it to a *Dominican* to anſwer, who had been in thoſe Parts himſelf, who fully proved the Matter of Fact, and anſwered the *Jeſuits* Arguments, both which the *Biſhop* ſaith were in his Cuſtody. The ſhort of their Inſtructions to their *Converts* was this, to ſpeak little of *Chriſt crucified*, but to conceal that ſmall and inconſiderable Circumſtance of the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, as much as may be; to uſe all the ſame Cuſtoms that the *Idolaters* did, only directing all their Worſhip to Chriſt and the Saints; not to trouble themſelves about Faſting, Penance, Confeſſion, and Participation of the Euchariſt, or the Severity of Repentance and Mortification. They deſigned to recommend as eaſy a *Religion* to them as may be, the better to invite them to embrace it; and therefore, as the *Biſhop* obſerves, we read of no *Martyrs* among them. The poor *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans* are whipt and impriſoned, and baniſhed; but the *Jeſuits* who preach only a glorious *Chriſt*, without his *Paſſion* and *Croſs*, have far better and eaſier Entertainment among them. But theſe things the *Biſhop* there gives a larger account of: I return to the Controverſy between the *Biſhop* and them: An *Agent* was ſent to *Rome* by the *Biſhop* with this *Letter*, to negotiate his Buſineſs there againſt the *Jeſuits*: *A Man intelligent, vigorous, and undaunted,* ſaith Mr. *S. Amour* of him; who followed his Buſineſs ſo cloſe, that after long Solicitation S. Amours Journal. p. 5. ch. 15.

Index. Alex. A. D. 1658.

tion and Addreſs, he obtains another *Decree* againſt the *Jeſuits*, which is extant at large in the *Lyons* Edition of the *Bullarium*: But which ought to be obſerved, is ſince prohibited by the *Index Expurgatorius* of *Alexander* VII. by whoſe means that was procured, is eaſy to conjecture; when we conſider, with what difficulty the *Decree* was obtained; and for above a *Year* after the paſſing it, the coming of it forth was hindred by *Cardinal Spada* underhand, who was a great Friend to the *Jeſuits*. And when it did come forth, the *Jeſuits* bought up all the *Copies* of it they could, on purpoſe to aboliſh the Memory of it; which made them obtain the prohibition of the *Bullarium*, till that part were purged out of it. But if the *Popes* had any real kindneſs for the *Authority* of *Biſhops*, they would never ſuffer ſuch Encroachments to be made upon them, as they do; nor ſhew ſo much Favour to the Contemners of it. But this is one of the grand *Intrigues* of the *Roman Court*, to keep the *Biſhops* down by the *Privileges* of the *Regulars*, who are immediate *Dependents* on the *Popes*; only at ſome times when they cannot help it, they muſt ſeem to curb them; but yet ſo, as to keep them in heart enough to *bait* the *Biſhops*, when they begin to exerciſe their *Authority*, as they ought to do, in the Reformation of Abuſes and Diſorders. But by theſe heats and controverſies among them, about matters of *Government* and *Order*, it appears that they have no cauſe to upbraid us with our *Diſſentions* about them: And that they have no more effectual means to ſuppreſs them, than *We*.

S. Amours Journal. p. 7. ch. 5.

Of their differences in matters of doctrine.

§ 11. 2. As to *matters of Doctrine*. The leaſt thing any one could imagine, by all the Boaſts of *Unity* among them, and their upbraiding others with their *Diſſentions* is, that they are all of one mind, in *Matters of Doctrine*; but he muſt believe againſt common Senſe and Experience, that can believe this. For we know their *Diviſions* well enough, and that it is as eaſy a Matter to compoſe all the Differences among us, as among them. We may as ſoon perſwade the *Quakers* to *Uniformity*, as reconcile the *Dominicans* and the *Jeſuits*; and all our *Sects* will agree as ſoon as the *Factions* of the *Thomiſts* and *Scotiſts*; the *Preſbyterians* and *Independents* will yield to *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction*, as ſoon as the *Monaſtick Orders* will quit their *Priviledges*; the *Arminians* and *Calviniſts* will be all of a mind, when the *Janſeniſts* and *Moliniſts* are: And we are apt to think, that our Controverſies about *Ceremonies* are not altogether of ſo great Importance, as theirs about *Infallibility*. But it is a very pleaſant thing to ſee by what Arts they go about to perſwade credulous People, that what would be called *Diviſions* any where elſe, is an *admirable Union* among them; they might as ſoon perſwade them that the ſeven Hills at *Rome* are the *bottomleſs Pit*, or that Contradictions may be true. For either the *Pope* is infallible, or he is not; either the ſupream *Government* of the *Church*, is committed to him alone as St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor, or to the repreſentative Church in a *Council*; either he hath a temporal power to command *Princes*, or he hath not; either the *Virgin Mary* was conceived with *Original Sin*, or ſhe was not; either there is a *Pre-determination*, or there is not; either *Souls* may be delivered out of *Purgatory*, or they may not: Dare any of them ſay they are all of a mind in the *Church* of *Rome* about theſe Points? I am ſure they dare not.

But what then? Do they not differ from one another? Do they not write, and preach, and rail againſt each other, as much as any Sectaries can do? Are there not Factions of long continuance among them, upon theſe differences? Where then lies their *Unity* they boaſt of? Alas! We ſpeak like Ignorant Perſons, and do not conſider what artificial Men we have to deal with; who, with ſome pretty Tricks and ſlights of Hand, make all that which ſeems to us ſhattered and broken in pieces, to appear ſound and entire, without the leaſt crack and flaw in it. It will be worth the while to find out theſe Arts; for I do not queſtion, but by a diſcreet managing them, they may ſerve us as well as them: And our Church will have, (though not ſo much Splendor) yet as much *Unity* as theirs. They tell us therefore, that it is true they are not all of a mind, *and it is not neceſſary to the* Unity *of the Church that they ſhould be:* But, they have *the only way of compoſing differences*; and they do not differ *in matters of faith from each other; and their Differences lie only in their Schools, and do not diſturb the Peace of the Church.* This is the utmoſt I can find their beſt wits plead, for the *Unity* of the *Roman Church*; and if theſe be ſufficient, I believe they and we will be proved to be as much at Unity, as they are among themſelves.

1. They ſay, *the Unity of the Church doth not lie in actual agreement of the Members of it, in matters of Doctrine; but in having the beſt means to compoſe differences, and to preſerve conſent; which is, ſubmiſſion to the Popes Authority.* So *Gregory de Valentia* explains the *Unity* of their *Church*; *for actual conſent*, he grants, *may be in other Churches, as much as theirs; and there is nothing ſingular or peculiar attributed to their Church, ſuppoſing they were all of a mind, which it is plain they are not; but therein*, ſaith he, *lies the Unity of their Church, that they all acknowledge one Head, in whoſe Judgment they acquieſce: And therefore they have no more to do, but to know what the Pope determines.* If this be all their Unity, we have greater than they; for we have a more certain way of ending Controverſies, than they have: which I prove by an argument, like to one in great requeſt among them, when they go about to perſwade weak Perſons to their *Religion*; viz. *that it muſt needs be ſafer to be in that Religion, wherein both Parties agree a Man may be ſaved; than in that, where one ſide denies a poſſibility of Salvation*; ſo ſay I here, that muſt be a ſafer way for Unity, which both Parties agree to be infallible, than that which one ſide abſolutely denies to be ſo; but both Parties agree the *Scriptures* to be infallible, and all *Proteſtants* deny the P*ope* to be infallible; therefore ours is the more certain way for *Unity*. But this is not all; for it is far from being agreed among themſelves, that the *Pope* is infallible; it being utterly denied by ſome among them, and the aſſerting it accounted *Hereſie:* As is evident in ſome late Books written to that purpoſe, in *France* and *England:* What excellent means of *Unity* then is this among them, which it is accounted by ſome no leſs than *Hereſie* to aſſert?

Greg. de Valent. Analyſ. fidei l. 6. c. 49.

§ 13. But ſuppoſing they ſhould yield the *Pope* that ſubmiſſion, which they deny to be due to him; yet how is his definition ſo much a more certain way of ending Controverſies than the *Scriptures*? Let them name one Controverſie that hath been ended in their *Church*, meerly by the *Popes Decrees*; ſo as the oppoſite Party hath declared, that they believed contrary to what they believed before, on the account

The inſufficiency of the Popes *Authority for ending theſe differences.*

of the *Popes* definition. We have many inſtances to the contrary, wherein Controverſies have been heightened and increaſed by their interpoſing, but none concluded by them. Do they ſay the *Scripture* can be no means of *Unity*, becauſe of the various *Senſes* which have been put upon it? And have they no ways to evade the *Popes* definitions? Yes, ſo many, that his *Authority* in truth ſignifies nothing, any farther than they agree that the upholding it tends to their common intereſt. But when once he comes to croſs the Intereſt of any Party, if they do not in plain Terms defie him, yet they find out more civil ways of making his *Definitions* of no force. Either they ſay, the *Decree* was procured by *fraud*, and the *Pope* made it by Miſinformation, which is the common way, or he did not define it as a *matter of Faith*, ſitting in *Cathedra*; or the *ſenſe* of his definition is quite otherwiſe, than their *Adverſaries* underſtand it; or ſuppoſing that be the ſenſe, the *Pope* is never to be ſuppoſed to define any thing contrary to the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* and *antient Canons*: Of all which it were no difficult Taſk, to give late and particular inſtances; but no one, who is acquainted with the Hiſtory of that *Church*, can be ignorant of them; and the late Preceedings, in the matter of the *five* P*ropoſitions*, are a ſufficient evidence of theſe things, to any one who reads them. For when was their a fairer occaſion given to the P*ope*, to ſhew his *Authority* for preſervation of the *Churches* Unity, than at that time, when the matter of the *five* P*ropoſitions* was under debate at *Rome*? The ſame Controverſie was now revived, which had diſturbed their *Church* ſo often, and ſo much before. In the time of *Clement* VIII. the Heats were ſo great between the *Jeſuits* and *Dominicans*, that the *Pope* thought it neceſſary, for the peace of the *Church*, to put an end to them; to that end he appointed Congregations for ſeveral years to diſcuſs thoſe points, that he might come to a Reſolution in them. This *Pope* at firſt was ſtrangely prepoſſeſs'd by the Arts of the *Jeſuits*, againſt the *Dominicans*; but ſending for the *General* of the *Dominicans*, he told him what ſad Apprehenſions he had concerning the peace of the *Church*, by reaſon of the diſputes between the *Jeſuits* and them; and therefore charges him, that thoſe of his *Order* ſhould no longer moleſt the *Jeſuits*, about theſe things; to whom he replyed, *that he aſſur'd him with as great Proteſtation as he was able, that it was no meer Scholaſtical Diſpute between them, but it was the cauſe of faith that was concern'd*; which he diſcours'd largely upon to the *Pope*, and made ſuch impreſſions upon him, that the *Dominicans* verily believe, that had that *Pope* lived to the *Veſpers* of *Pentecoſt* that year he dyed in *March*, he had publiſhed a *Bull* againſt the *Jeſuits*, in preſence of the *College of Cardinals*, and created F. *Lemos Cardinal*. After his Death, the Congregations were continu'd in the time of *Paul* V. but at laſt were broken up without any deciſion at all. If the *Popes* Determination be ſuch an abſolute *Inſtrument of Peace* in the *Church*, it is the ſtrangeſt thing in the World it ſhould be made ſo little uſe of, in ſuch caſes where they all acknowledge, it would be of infinite advantage to their *Church*, to have an Iſſue put to ſuch troubleſome Controverſies as theſe were. But they know well enough that the *Popes Authority* is the more eſteemed, the leſs it is uſed, and that it hath always been very hazardous to determine, where there have been conſiderable Parties, on both ſides; for fear the condemned Party ſhould renounce his *Authority*, or ſpeak plainer truths than they

S. Amours Journal. p. 3. ch. 10. Journal. p. 6. ch. 26. P. 3. ch. 8.

are willing to hear. And therefore it was well obſerved by *Monſ. S. Amour, that they are very jealous at* Rome, *of maintaining the Authority of the Decrees which iſſue from thence; and that this Conſideration obliges the Makers of them, to look very well to the compliance and facility that may be expected in their Execution, before they paſs any at all.* Which is a moſt certain Argument they dare not truſt the *Popes Infallibility*, nor all the Promiſes they pretend *Chriſt* hath made to their *Church*; but govern their affairs wholly by the Rules of *human Policy*. And on this account, when the heats brake forth in *France*, about *Janſeniſm*, and both Parties made application to the *Court* of *Rome*, the *Pope* could never be prevailed with, to ſuffer the main Controverſies to be touched, or any Decree to paſs about them; but at laſt condemned ſome ambiguous *Propoſitions*, as taken out of *Janſenius* his Book; which both Parties condemned according to their different Senſes, and they were left to diſpute it out, which Senſe it was the *Pope* meant them in. And therefore the *Janſeniſts Advocate*, who was well verſed in the Practices of the *Court* of *Rome*, gave them the trueſt account of the Intentions of that *Court*, in their affairs; which was, *to delude both the one ſide and the other*; and that *Cardinal Ginetti* had told him, that *either nothing would be done*; *or if any thing, that which would do neither good nor hurt.* And therefore inſtead of ending the Controverſies, the *Popes* definition only produced more, *viz.* whether the *Propoſitions* condemned were in *Janſenius* or no? whether the *Pope* might not err in matter of fact? The *Janſeniſts* affirming this, the *Jeſuits* denying it; and charging each other, with no leſs than *Hereſie* about it. For upon the *Jeſuits* aſſerting *Octob.* 12. *A. D.* 1661. *that the Pope hath the ſame Infallibility that Jeſus Chriſt hath, not only in Queſtions of right but in matters of fact, and that thence thoſe of their Church are bound to believe with a divine faith, that the five condemned* Propoſitions *are in Janſenius*: "The *Janſeniſts* publiſh a charge of Hereſie againſt the *Jeſuits*, and ſuch a Hereſie as was never broached in the *Church* before: Being not only a ſolitary Error or ſimple *Hereſie*, but a whole Source of Errors; or rather an *univerſal Hereſie*, which overthrows all *Religion*. Which they go about at large to prove, by ſhewing that this builds Mens Faith, *on the Word of Man*, and not on *the Word of God*; becauſe it concerns a thing, neither revealed nor atteſted by *God*; as to know, whether *Propoſitions* are really an *Author*'s of this laſt Age; and (as he goes on) to make the *Popes* Word equal with the *Word of God*, is not only *Hereſie*, but horrid *Impiety*, and a *Species* of *Idolatry*: For this is given to Man the Honour due only to *God*: Becauſe ſuch an entire Submiſſion of our Mind and of all our Intellectuals comprehended in the Act of our Faith, is that Adoration which we pay to the prime *Verity* it ſelf. And I dare now leave any one to judge, whether upon ſo late an Experiment of the *Conſtitutions* of two *Popes Innocent* X. and *Alexander* VII. in order to the ending ſo great a Controverſie as this was, it be not apparent; that the *Popes Anthority* ſignifies no more to the ending Controverſies, than the Parties who are concerned are willing that it ſhould, *i. e.* as far as they do conſent to obey them, and no farther?

Journal. p. 1. ch 9.

Journal. p. 6 ch 3. Part. 6. ch. 13.

The Inſufficiency of Councils, to end Controverſies.

§. 14. But it may be ſaid, *that it is true, there are Differences among them about the Popes* Power *and Infallibility, and therefore he may not be ſo fit to end Controverſies; but there is no Diſpute among them,* *about Pope and Council together, therefore in that caſe they are all agreed, that they ought to ſubmit.* Theſe are fine things to be ſaid, and appear plauſibly, to thoſe who do not ſearch into them; but thoſe that do, will eaſily find this as ineffectual a Remedy as the other. For if we examine but the ways uſed by ſeveral Parties among them, to avoid the Deciſions of ſome *Councils* againſt their particular Opinions, we may ſee, how little the Decrees of *Councils* can bind thoſe, who have no mind to be tied up by them. Either they ſay, the Deciſion depended on a *matter of fact*, which the *Council* was not ſufficiently informed in, and they believe a *Council* may err in a matter of fact; or elſe it did not proceed *after the way of a Council*; or it was not general; or its *decrees* were not received by the *Catholick Church*; or though ſome were received, yet not all; or however, the Infallibility of a *Council* is not abſolute; but ſuppoſing that it proceeds according to the conſtant *Tradition* of the *Church*, this unavoidably leaves the matter as much under debate, as if the *Council* had never medled with it.

But if they do in earneſt believe that the *Pope* and *Council* can put an end to all Controverſies among them when they pleaſe; I would fain know, why they have not done this hitherto? Is not *Unity* deſirable among them? If not, why do they boaſt of it? If it be, why have they not obtained it, ſince they can ſo eaſily do it? What made them ſo extreamly cautious in the *Council* of *Trent*, of medling with any thing that was *in Controverſie among themſelves*? Or was it, that they were all ſo much of a mind, that they had nothing to do, but to condemn their Enemies? which was ſo far from being true, that there were very few things, which came into debate, that they were agreed in; and therefore they were put ſometimes to ſtrange ſhifts, to find out general and ambiguous terms, which might not diſpleaſe the *Diſſenters*, and yet leave the Diſputes as great as ever. They could not agree, ſo much as about the Title of the *Council*, many of the *Biſhops* were for adding to the Title of *the moſt holy Council*, [*Repreſenting the Church Univerſal*] which was eagerly oppoſed by the *Italians*, and with much ado avoided by the Legats; being no ſmall Controverſie about Words, but of very great Conſequence, about the *Power* and *Authority* of *Pope* and *Council*, if they had been ſuffered to go on in it. But the *Pope* hearing of this Diſpute, at the beginning, ſent word to the Legats, *not to broach any new Difficulties in matter of Faith; nor to determine any of the things controverſed among Catholicks, and to proceed ſlowly in the Reformation.* Excellent Inſtructions for the advancement of *Peace* and *Holineſs!* Whoever will for that end peruſe that incomparable Hiſtory of the *Council*, will find how high the *Controverſies* among themſelves were, between the *Biſhops* and the *Regulars* about *Privileges*; between the *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans*, in many weighty points; between the *Italian Biſhops* and others about *Reſidence*, and the extent of *Epiſcopal Power*; between the *Divines* in moſt of the matters of Doctrine; as might eaſily be ſhewed at large, if I loved the pains of tranſcribing; but I had rather refer the Reader to that excellent Hiſtory it ſelf. I only renew my demand, why muſt no Controverſies among *Catholicks* be ended in the *Council*? Could they be better decided any where elſe? If ſo, then the *Council* is not the beſt means of *Unity*; if not, then it ſeems there is no Neceſſity of ending Controverſies among them, but they have *Unity* enough without

Hiſtory of the Council of Trent l. 2. p. 138

P. 149.

out it. And in truth, it is *Intereſt*, and not *Unity* they look after; all ſuch as hold Opinions contrary to their *Intereſt*, muſt be proceeded againſt and condemned; but for others, let them quarrel and diſpute as long as they will, they let them alone, if they touch not the *Popes Authority*, nor any of the gainful Opinions and Practices, which are allowed amongſt them. And ſuppoſing their *Intereſt* be kept up, which the *Inquiſition* is deſign'd for, the *Court* of *Rome* is as great a *Friend* to Toleration as may be; only what others call *different Perſwaſions*, they call School points; and what others call *Diviſions*, they call *Diſputes*; the caſe is the ſame with their *Church* and others, only they have ſofter Names for the Differences among themſelves; and think none bad enough for thoſe, who caſt off the *Popes Authority*, and plead for a *Reformation*. Here then lies the profound Myſtery of their *Unity*, that they are all agreed againſt us, though not among themſelves; and are not we ſo againſt them too? May not we plead for the *Unity* that they have, on the ſame grounds? We are all agreed againſt *Popery*, as much as they are againſt *Proteſtants*; only we have ſome *Scholaſtick Diſputes* among us, about indifferent things, and the *Epiſcopal Authority*, as they have; we have ſome zealous *Dominicans*, and buſie and factious Men, ſuch as the *Jeſuits* among them are but ſetting aſide theſe Diſputes, we are admirably well agreed, juſt as they are in the *Roman Church*.

Their differences in matters of faith.

§. 15. 2. They ſay, *they do not differ in matters of Faith.* But this is as true, as the other; for are they agreed in *matters of faith*, who charge one another with *Hereſie*? As we have already ſeen that they do. But if they mean, that they do not differ in *matters of faith*, becauſe thoſe only are *matters of faith*, which they are agreed in; they were as good ſay, they are agreed in the things they do not differ about: For the Parties which differ, do believe the things in difference to be *matters of Faith*; and therefore, they think, differ from one another in *matters of faith*. But they are not agreed, what it is which makes a thing to be a *matter of faith*, and therefore no one can pronounce that their Differences are not about *matters of faith*; for what one may think not to be *de fide*, others may believe that it is; we ſee the *Popes* perſonal *Infallibility* is become a *Catholick Doctrine*, among the *Jeſuits*, and declared to be plain *Hereſie*, by their Adverſaries. The Deliverance of Souls from *Purgatory* by the Prayers of the living, is generally accounted a *matter of faith* in the *Roman Church*; but we know thoſe in it who deny it, and ſay it was a *novel Opinion*, introduced by *Gregory* I. againſt the conſent of *Antiquity*. It is a *matter of faith*, ſay the *Dominicans* and *Janſeniſts*, to attribute to God alone the praiſe of converting grace; and that grace efficacious by it ſelf, was the Doctrine of *Fathers*, and *Councils*, and the *Catholick Church*; and is it not then a *matter of faith*, in their opinion, wherein the *Jeſuits* and they differ from each other? To which purpoſe it was well ſaid, by the Author of a Book printed at *Paris*, A.D. 1651. containing *Eſſays* and *Reflexions on the State of Religion*; "that becauſe of the Controverſies between the *Janſeniſts* and "the *Jeſuits*, it might with more reaſon be affirmed now, than in the "time of *Arrianiſm* it ſelf, *that the whole Church ſeems to become heretical.* For admitting, ſaith he, what is moſt certain, that the Church "hath decreed *Calviniſm*, *Pelagianiſm*, and *Semi-pelagianiſm* to be "*Hereſies*; and that the *Doctors* are thoſe who ſit in the *Chair* to “be conſulted withal upon points of Religion, all *Catholicks* are reduced to a moſt ſtrange perplexity. For if a Man ſhall addreſs himſelf, to thoſe of the *Janſenian* Party; they will tell him, that thoſe who are termed *Moliniſts* are *Pelagians*, or at leaſt *Semi-pelagians*; and on the other ſide, the *Moliniſts* will bear him down, that their Adverſaries are *Calviniſts* or elſe *Novatians*. Now all the *Doctors* of the *Catholick Church* (a very few excepted) are either of the one, or the other Party. I leave you then to conſider, to what prodigious ſtreights Mens minds are reduced, ſince this is held as a general *Maxim*, that whoſoever fails in one point of faith, fails in all. It is a matter of *faith*, ſay the *Dominicans*, *that all Perſons, Chriſt only excepted, were born in ſin*, and therefore the contenders for the *Immaculate Conception* muſt, in their judgment, differ in a *point of faith* from them. But if this diſtinction ſhould be allowed, to preſerve the unity of their Church; why ſhall it not as well cure the *Diviſions* of ours? The moſt conſiderable, in all reſpects, of the *Diſſenters* from the *Church* of *England*, declare that they agree with us, in all the *Articles of Doctrine* required by our *Church*; will this be enough in their opinion, to make us at *unity* with each other? If not, let them not plead the ſame thing for themſelves, which they will not allow to us. I cannot underſtand that the controverſies about *Ceremonies* (conſidered in themſelves) among us, are of any greater weight, than the Diſputes among the *Friers*, concerning their *Habits* have been; and yet this controverſy, only about the ſize of their *Hoods*, laſted in one *Order*, almoſt an *Age* together; and was managed with as great a heat and animoſity, as ever theſe have been among us, and was with very much ado laid aſleep for a time, by the endeavours of four *Popes* ſucceſſively. But if this ſignifies nothing to *unity*, to ſay, *that the matters are not great about which the Controverſies are, if the diſturbances be great which are cauſed by them*; that will reflect more ſharply on their *Church*, than on ours, which hath ſo many differences which they account not to be about any *matters of faith*. But if theſe differences in point of Doctrine among them prove to be none in *matters of faith*, it would be no difficult task, upon the ſame grounds, to ſhew that they have no reaſon to quarrel with us, for breaking the *unity* of their *Church*; becauſe then we may differ from them as little in *matters of faith*, as they do from one another. This I need not take upon me to ſhew at large, becauſe I find it already done to my hand by *F. Davenport*, *al. Sancta Clara* in his Paraphraſtical Expoſition of the Thirty Nine Articles of our *Church*: “about half of them he acknowledges to be *Catholicks* as they are, without any further explication. The firſt he meets with difficulty in, is that *about the number of Canonical Books*, point-blank againſt the *Council of Trent*, but he acknowledges that *Cajetan*, and *Franciſcus Mirandula* fully agree with our *Church* in it, who quote *Hierom*, *Ruffinus*, *Antoninus*, and *Lyra* of the ſame Opinion, as they might have done many others; but becauſe our *Church* doth not caſt them wholly out of the *Canon*, he dares not ſay it is guilty of *Hereſy* ſimply; and the rather, becauſe *Waldenſis* and *Driedo* do hold, that it is only in the power of the whole *Church* ſucceſſively from the *Apoſtles*, do declare what Books are *Canonical*, and what not. For

“the 11. Article about *Juſtification*, he ſaith the Controverſy is
“only about words, becauſe we are agreed, that *God* alone is the
“efficient Cauſe of Juſtification, and that *Chriſt* and his Paſſion are
“the meritorious Cauſe of it; and the only Queſtion is about the
“formal Cauſe, which our *Church* doth not attribute to the Act of
“Faith, as he proves by the Book of *Homilies*, but only makes it
“a condition of our being juſtified; and they believe, that by Faith
“we obtain our Righteouſneſs by *Chriſt*; ſo that he can find no
“difference between them and us in that point. He ſaith the Con-
“troverſy about *Merit* may be ſoon ended, according to the Doctrine
“of our Church; for they deny as well as we, Article 13. *that any*
“*Works done before the Grace of Chriſt, and Inſpiration of his*
“*Spirit, can merit any thing*, and when we ſay, Article 12. *that*
“*good Works which follow Juſtification, are pleaſing and acceptable*
“*to God in Chriſt*; if by that we mean, that they are accepted by
“Chriſt in order to a Reward, by vertue of the Promiſe of God
“through Chriſt, that is all the ſenſe of Merit, which he or the
“School of *Scotus* contends for. For *Works of Supererogation*,
“Article 14. he ſaith our *Church* condemns them upon that ground,
“*that Men are ſaid to do more by them than of Duty they are bounden*
“*to do*, which being generally underſtood they condemn, he ſaith,
“as well as we; becauſe we can do no good Works, which upon
“the account of our natural Obligation we are not bound to
“perform, though by particular Precept we are not bound to them.
“In the 19. Article where our Church ſaith, *that the Church of*
“Rome *hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Cere-*
“*monies, but alſo in matters of Faith*; he diſtinguiſheth the par-
“ticular *Church* of *Rome* from the *Catholick Church*, which is
“frequently underſtood by that Name; and he ſaith, it is only a
“matter of Faith to believe, that the *Catholick Church* hath not
“erred, and not that the particular *Church* of *Rome* hath not. In
“the 20. Article our Church declares, *that the Church ought neither*
“*to decree any thing againſt holy Writ, ſo beſides the ſame it ought*
“*not to enforce any thing to be believed of neceſſity to Salvation*; this
“he interprets of what is neither actually nor potentially in the
“*Scriptures*, neither in Terms nor by Conſequence; and ſo he thinks
“it Orthodox, and not againſt Traditions. Article 21. wherein
“our Church determines expreſly *againſt the Infallibility of General*
“*Councils*; he underſtands it, only of things that are not neceſſary to
“Faith, or Manners; which he ſaith, is the common opinion among
them. The hardeſt Article one would think to bring us off in, was the
22. *viz. That the Romiſh Doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons,*
worſhipping and Adorations, as well of Images, as of Relicks, and
alſo Invocation of Saints is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded
upon no warranty of Scripture. But we need not deſpair, as long
as one bred up in the *Schools* of *Scotus* deſigns our Reſcue; “he
“confeſſes it to be a *difficult Adventure*, but what will not Sub-
“tilty and Kindneſs do together? He obſerves very cunningly,
“that theſe Doctrines are not condemned abſolutely and in them-
“ſelves, but only the *Romiſh* Doctrine about them; and therein,
“we are not to conſider what the *Church* of *Rome* doth teach,
“but what we apprehend they teach, or what we judge of their
“Doctrine, *i. e.* that they invocate *Saints*, as they do *God* him-
“ſelf;

“ ſelf; that *Purgatory* deſtroys the Croſs of *Chriſt*, and warms the
“ *Popes Kitchin*, that Pardons are the *Popes* Bills of *Exchange*;
“ whereby he diſcharges the *Debts* of what Sinners he pleaſes;
“ that they give proper *Divine Worſhip* to *Images* and *Relicks*;
“ all which, he ſaith, are impious Doctrines, and we do well to
“ condemn them. So that it is not *want of Faith, but want of*
Wit, this good Man condemns us for, which if we attain to any
competent meaſure of, whereby to underſtand their Doctrine, there
is nothing but abſolute *Peace* and *Harmony* between us. This
grand Difficulty being thus happily removed, all the reſt is done
with a wet Finger: for what though our *Church*, *Art.* 24. ſaith,
that it is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the
Cuſtom of the Primitive Church to have publick Prayers in the
Church, or to miniſter the Sacraments, in a Tongue not underſtood
of the People. “Yet what can hinder a *Scotiſt*, from understanding
“ by the *Scripture*, not the *Doctrine* or Command of it, but
“ the delivery of it, *viz.* that the *Scripture* was written in a known
“ Tongue? nay, he proves, that our *Church* is for praying in *Latin*,
“ by this Article, becauſe that either is a *known Tongue*, or ought to be
“ ſo, it being publickly taught every where: And if it be not understood,
“ he ſaith, it is not *per ſe*, but *per accidens* that it is ſo,
I ſuppoſe he means, the *Latin Tongue* is not to blame that the
People do not underſtand it; but they, that they learned their
Leſſons no better at *School*. But what is to be ſaid for Women,
who do not think themſelves bound to go to *School* to *learn Latin?*
“ He anſwers very plainly that St. *Paul* never meant them, for
“ he ſpeaks of thoſe who were to ſay *Amen* at the Prayers; but
“ both St. *Paul* and the *Canon Law*, he *tells us*, forbid Women
“ to ſpeak in the Church. The Caſe is then clear, St. *Paul* never
regarded what Language the *Women* uſed; and it was no great
matter, whether they underſtood their *Prayers* or not. But what is
to be ſaid to the *Council* of *Trent*, who pronouncs an *Anathema*
to thoſe who ſay, that *Prayers* are to be ſaid only in a known
Tongue? “ This doth not touch our *Church* at all he thinks;
“ becauſe, in ſome *Colledges*, the *Prayers* are ſaid in *Latin:* but
“ although that be a known Tongue there, it is no matter, as
“ long as the Council of *Trent* hath put in the word *only*; that clears
“ our Church ſufficiently. Beſides the Council of *Trent* ſpeaks ex-
“ preſly of the *Maſs* which our Article doth not mention, but only
“ *publick Prayers*: And the *Council* of *Trent* ſpeaks of thoſe, who
“ condemn it as contrary to the *Inſtitution of Chriſt*; but our *Church*
“ only condemns it as contrary to the *Inſtitution* of the *Apoſtles*;
“ but all the Commands of the Apoſtles are not the Commands of
“ Chriſt, therefore our Church declares nothing againſt *Faith* in
“ this Article. Are not we infinitely obliged to a Man that uſes ſo
much ſubtilty, to defend our *Church* from *Error* in *Faith?* “ But
“ that which is moſt conſiderable is, what he cites from *Canus*,
“ that it is no Hereſie, to condemn a Cuſtom or Law of the Church,
“ if it be not of ſomething neceſſary to Salvation; eſpecially if it be
“ a Cuſtom introduced ſince the Apoſtles Times, as moſt certainly
“ this was. For the five *Sacraments* rejected by our *Church*, *Art.* 25.
he ſaith, “ they are not abſolutely rejected as Sacraments, but as Sacraments
“ of the ſame Nature with Baptiſm and the Lords Supper,

which they yield to. For *Tranſubſtantiation*, which is utterly denyed by our *Church*, *Art.* 28. he very ſubtilly interprets it, of a carnal Preſence of *Chriſts* Body, which he grants to be repugnant to Scripture, and to deſtroy the nature of a Sacrament; but they do believe Chriſts Body to be preſent, after the manner of a Spirit, and ſo, our Church doth not condemn theirs. As *to Communion in both kinds*, aſſerted by our *Church*, *Art.* 30. he ſaith, “ it is not condemned by the *Council* of *Trent* therein, which only *anathematizes* thoſe, who make it neceſſary to Salvation, which our Church mentions not: And however we condemn Communion in one kind, *Canus* proves him not to be guilty of Hereſie, who ſhould ſay that the *Church* hath erred therein. The 31. Article condemns *the Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *i. e.* ſaith he, “ independently on the Sacrifice of the Croſs, which is propitiatory of it ſelf, and the other only by Vertue of it. The 32. of the *lawfulneſs of Prieſts Marriage*, “ he underſtands of the *Law of God*; in reſpect of which, it is the moſt common Opinion among them, he ſaith, that it is lawful. The 34. *about Traditions* he interprets of thoſe, which are not Doctrinal. The Book of *Homilies* approved *Art.* 35. he underſtands as they do Books approved by their Church, not of every Sentence contained therein, but the ſubſtance of the Doctrine; and he grants, there are many good things contained therein. For the 36. of *Conſecration of Biſhops and Miniſters*, he proves from *Vaſquez*, *Conink*, *Arcudius*, and *Innocent* IV. that our Church hath all the Eſſentials of *Ordination*, required in Scripture: And if the difference of form of Words did null our Ordinations, it would do thoſe of the Greek Church too. The laſt Article he examins is *Art.* 37. *Of the Civil Magiſtrates Power, in oppoſition to the Popes Authority*; and he grants, “ that the *King* may be allowed a *Supremacy*, *i. e.* ſuch as may not be taken away by any one, as his Superiour: And that by cuſtom, a ſufficient Right accrues to him, over all *Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes:* And that by divine and natural Right, he hath juriſdiction over all *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons*, ſo far as the publick Good is concerned. And withal he grants, that we yield no ſpiritual Juriſdiction to the King, and no more than is contended for by the *French*, and the *Parliament* of *Paris*. That part which denies the *Popes juriſdiction* in *England*, he ſaith, “ may be underſtood, of the *Popes challenging England* to be a *Fee* of the *Roman See*; but if it be otherwiſe underſtood, he makes uſe of many Scholaſtick Diſtinctions of *actus ſignatus & exercitus*, *&c.* the ſenſe of which is, that it is in ſome Caſes lawful, for a temporal Prince to withdraw his Obedience from the *Pope*; but leaves it to be diſcuſſed, whether he had ſufficient reaſon for doing it. But there can be no *Hereſie* in matter : of *Fact*: it remains then, according to the Senſe put upon our *Articles* by him with the help of his *Scholaſtick Subtilties*, we differ no more from them in points of *Faith*, than they do from one another. For ſuch kind of *Diſtinctions* and *Senſes* are they forced to uſe, and put upon each others Opinions, to excuſe them from diſagreeing in *Articles of Faith*; and there is no reaſon that we ſhould not enjoy the Benefit of them as well as they: So that either they muſt be guilty of differing in *matters* of *Faith*, or we are not.

Their differences not confined to their Schools.

§. 16. 3. They plead, that *their Differences are only confined to their Schools, and do not diſturb the Peace of the Church.* But there is as little Truth in this, as there is *Unity* in their *Church*: as plainly appears by what hath been ſaid already. Was the Controverſy about the *Popes* temporal Power, confined to the *Schools*? did not that make, for ſeveral *Ages*, as great diſturbances in the *Church*, as were ever known in it, upon any quarrel of *Religion*? Were the Controverſies between the *Biſhops* and the *Monks*, confined to their Schools, about the extent of the Epiſcopal Juriſdiction in former Times, or in the renewing of this *Hierarchical War* (as one of the *Janſeniſts* calls it) in *France*? But theſe things are at large diſcovered already, I ſhall only add one thing more, which ſeems more like a Diſpute of the *Schools* between the ſeveral *Orders* among them, about the *immaculate Conception*; and it will eaſily appear, that where-ever that Diſpute began, it did not reſt in the *Schools*; if we conſider the *Tumults* and *Diſturbances* which have been made only on the account of it. This Controverſy began in the *Schools*, about the beginning of the 14. Century; when *Scotus* ſet up for a new *Sect*, in oppoſition to *Thomas Aquinas*, and among other points of Controverſy, he made choice of this to diſtinguiſh his Followers by; but propoſed it himſelf very timerouſly, as appears by his Reſolution of it, in his Book on the *Sentences*; however, his Followers boaſt, that in this bleſſed Quarrel he was ſent for from *Oxford* to *Paris*, from *Paris* to *Cologne*, to overthrow all Adverſaries, and that he did great Feats every where. But however this were, there were ſome not long after him, who boldly aſſerted what he doubtfully propoſed, of whom *Franciſcus Mayronis* is accounted the firſt; after him *Petrus Aureolus*, *Occam* and the whole order of *Franciſcans*. But the great ſtrength of this Opinion lay not in the wit and ſubtilty of the Defenders of it, nor in any Arguments from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, but in that which they called the *Piety* of it, *i. e.* that it tended to advance the Honour of the *Bleſſed Virgin*. For after the Worſhip of her came to be ſo publick and ſolemn in their *Church*, I do not in the leaſt wonder, that they were willing to believe her to be *without Sin*. I much rather admire they do not believe all their *Canonized Saints*, to have been ſo too; I am ſure, the ſame Reaſons will hold for them all. But this Opinion by degrees obtaining among the People, it grew ſcandalous for any Man to oppoſe it. So *Walſingham* ſaith, towards the latter end of this Century, *the Dominicans preaching the contrary opinion againſt the Command firſt of the Biſhops in* France, *and then of the King and Nobles; they were outlawed by the King, and abſolutely forbid to go out of their own Convents, for fear of ſeducing the People: And not only ſo, but to receive any one more into their Order, that ſo the whole Order might in a little time be extinguiſhed.* The occaſion of this Perſecution aroſe from a diſturbance, which happened in *Paris*, upon this Controverſy; one *Joh. de Monteſono* publickly read againſt the *immaculate Conception*, at which ſo great Offence was taken, that he was convented before the *Faculty* of *Sorbonne*; but he declared, that he had done nothing but by advice of the *chief* of *his Order*, and that he would defend what he had ſaid to Death. His Propoſitions were condemned, by the *Faculty* and the *Biſhop* of *Paris*; upon which he appeals to the *Pope*, and goes

Scot. in 3 lib. ſent. l. diſt. 3. q. 1. *n.* 10. Apolog. pro vitâ & morte Joh. Duns Scoti.

Walſingham hiſt. circa *A.D.* 1389.

Sext. Seculum Univerſit. Pariſ. p. 618.

and goes to *Avignon* to *Clement* VII. where the whole *Order* of *Dominicans* appears for him, and the *Univerſity* againſt him by their *Deputies*, of whom *Pet. de Alliaco* was the chief. The Aſſertions which he was condemned for relating to this matter, were theſe following, as they are written in a *Manuſcript* of *Petr. de Alliaco*, from which they are publiſhed by the late Author of the *Hiſtory* of the *Univerſity of Paris.*

1. To aſſert any thing to be true which is againſt Scripture, is moſt expreſly contrary to Faith. This is condemned, as *falſe and injurious to the Saints and Doctors.*

2. That all Perſons, Chriſt only excepted, have not derived original Sin from *Adam*, is expreſly againſt Faith. This is condemned as *falſe*, *ſcandalous*, *preſumptuous* and *offenſive to pious ears.* Which he affirms particularly of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, and is in the ſame terms condemned.

3. It is as much againſt Scripture to exempt any *one* Perſon from original Sin, beſides *Chriſt*, as to exempt *Ten.*

4. It is more againſt Scripture, that the *Bleſſed Virgin* was not conceived in original Sin, than to ſay, that ſhe was both in Heaven and on Earth, from the firſt Inſtant of her Conception or Sanctification.

5. That no exception ought to be allowed in explication of Scripture, but what the Scripture it ſelf makes. All which are condemned as the former.

Againſt theſe cenſures he appeals to the *Pope*, becauſe therein the *Doctrine of St.* Thomas, *which is approved by the Church, is condemned*; and that it was only in the *Popes power, to determine any thing in theſe points.* Upon this, the *Univerſity* publiſhes an *Apologetical* Epiſtle; wherein they declare, that they will rather ſuffer any thing, than endure *Hereſie* to ſpring up among them, and vindicate their own Authority, in their cenſures, and earneſtly beg the aſſiſtance of all the *Biſhops* and *Clergy* in their cauſe, and their care to ſuppreſs ſuch dangerous Doctrines; this was dated *Feb.* 14. *A. D.* 1387. But being cited to *Avignon*, thither they ſend the *Deputies* of the *Univerſity*, where this cauſe was debated with great zeal and earneſtneſs, about a years time; and at laſt, the *Univerſities* cenſure was confirmed, and *Joh. de Monteſono* fled privately into *Spain.* But the *Dominicans* did not for all this give over preaching the ſame Doctrine; upon which a grievous Perſecution was raiſed againſt them, as appears, not only by the Teſtimony of *Walſingham*, but of the continuer of *Martinus Polonus*; who ſaith, *that Inſurrections were every where made againſt them, and many of them were impriſoned, and the People denied them Alms and Oblations, and they were forbidden to preach, or read Lectures, or hear Confeſſions, inſomuch that they were made*, he ſaith, *the Scorn and Contempt of the People:* And this Storm laſted *many years*; and there was none to help them: Becauſe their Enemies believed in perſecuting them, they did honour to the *Bleſſed Virgin.* Nay the *Kings* Confeſſor, the *Biſhop* of *Eureux*, was forced to recant, for holding with the *Dominicans*; and to declare, that their Opinions were falſe, and *againſt faith*; and they made him upon his knees beg of the *King*, that he would write to the *King* of *Arragon* and the *Pope*, that they would cauſe *Joh. de Monteſono* to be ſent Priſoner to *Paris*, there to receive condign Puniſhment. The

V. Meyer. Annal. Fland. l. 14. A. 1388.

next year, *A. D.* 1389. They made *Adam de Soiſſons*, *Prior* of a *Dominican Convent*, publickly recant the ſame Doctrine before the *Univerſity*; and *Stephen Gontier* was ſent Priſoner to *Paris* by the *Biſhop* of *Auxerre*, as ſuſpected of *Hereſie*, becauſe he joyned with his *Brethren* in the Appeal to the *Pope*: And another called *Johannes Ade*, was forced to recant four times, for ſaying that he favoured the Opinions of *Joh. de Monteſono*. But theſe Troubles were not confined only to *France*, for not long after, *A. D.* 1394. *John* King of *Arragon* publiſhed a Proclamation, that no one under Pain of Baniſhment ſhould preach or diſpute againſt the *immaculate Conception*: And in *Valencia*, one *Moſes Monerus* was baniſhed by *Ferdinand* on that account, becauſe the *Tumults* could not be appeaſed without it. *Lucas Wadingus*, in his *Hiſtory of the Embaſſy about the immaculate Conception*, gives a ſhort account of the *Scandals* that have happened, by the *Tumults* which have riſen in *Spain*, and elſewhere, on this Controverſie; which he dares not relate at large, he ſaith, becauſe of the *Greatneſs of them*: ſuch as happened in the *Kingdom* of *Valencia*, *A. D.* 1344. In the *Kingdom* of *Arragon*, *A. D.* 1398. In *Barcelona*, *A. D.* 1408. and 1435. and 1437. In *Catalonia*, *A. D.* 1451. and 1461. In all which, drawn from the *publick Records*, he ſaith, *the* Princes *were forced to uſe their utmoſt* Power, *to repreſs them for the preſent, and prevent them for the future*: So in the *Kingdom* of *Marcia*, *A. D.* 1507. In *Bæotica* or *Andaluzia*, *A. D.* 1503. In *Caſtile A. D.* 1480. The like *Scandals* he mentions in *Germany* and *Italy*, on the ſame account; and withal he ſaith, *that theſe continu'd notwithſtanding all the Endeavours of* Popes, *Princes*, *Biſhops* and *Univerſities*; *but the Tumults*, he ſaith, *that happen'd of later years in* Spain, *were incredibly turbulent and ſcandalous; and drawn from the authentick Regiſters which were ſent by the ſeveral Cities to the King, and by the King to the Pope; which were ſo great, that thoſe done were enough to move the P. to make a definition in this Controverſie.* Eſpecially conſidering, that the ſame *Scandals* had continued for 300 years among them, and did continue ſtill, notwithſtanding *Paul* V. *Conſtitution*. Which is no Wonder at all, conſidering what the *Biſhop* of *Malaga* reports, that the *Jeſuits* perſwade the People *to defend the immaculate Conception with Sword and Fire, and with their Blood.* I now only deſire to know, whether theſe be meer Diſputes of the *Schools* among them or no; and whether they have not produced as great *Diſorder* and *Tumults* among the people, as *Controverſies* about *points of faith* are wont to do? So that upon the whole matter (whether we reſpect the *Peace* of the *World*, or *factious Diſputes* in *Religion*) I ſee no advantage at all the *Church* of *Rome* hath above others; and therefore *reading* the *Scripture* can be no cauſe of *diviſions* among us; ſince there have been ſo many and great among thoſe, who have moſt *prudentially diſpenced* it, or rather forbidden it to be read. Which was the thing I intended to prove.

Cavelli Roſar. B. Mariæ teſt. 14. ſecul. Wadding. Legatio de Concept. Sect. 3. tract. 12. S. 1.

Moral Practice of the Jeſuits. pag. 383.

K F.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

84·22

An Anſwer to the Remainder of the Reply.

The miſ-interpreting Scripture doth not hinder its being a rule of faith. Of the ſuperſtitious Obſervations of the Roman Church. Of Indulgences; the practice of them, in what time begun; on what occaſion, and in what Terms granted. Of the Indulgences in Jubilees, in the Church at Rome, *and upon ſaying ſome Prayers. Inſtances of them produced. What Opinion hath been had of Indulgences, in the Churches of* Rome: *Some confeſs they have no foundation in Scripture, or Antiquity; others that they are pious frauds: the miſerable ſhifts the Defenders of Indulgences were put to: Plain Evidences of their fraud from the Diſputes of the Schools about them. The Treaſure of the Church invented by* Aquinas, *and on what occaſion. The Wickedneſs of Men increaſed by* Indulgences, *acknowledged by their own Writers: And therefore condemned by many of that Church. Of* Bellarmins *prudent Chriſtians Opinion of them. Indulgences no meer relaxations of Canonical Pennance. The great Abſurdity of the Doctrine of the Churches Treaſure, on which Indulgences are founded, at large manifeſted. The Tendency of them to deſtroy Devotion, proved by experience, and the Nature of the Doctrine. Of Communion in one kind: No Devotion in oppoſing an Inſtitution of Chriſt. Of the Popes power of diſpenſing contrary to the Law of God, in Oaths and Marriages. The ill Conſequence of aſſerting Marriage in a Prieſt to be worſe than Fornication, as it is in the Church of* Rome. *Of the uncertainty of Faith therein. How far Revelation to be believed againſt Senſe. The Arguments to prove the uncertainty of the Faith defended. The caſe of a Revolter and a bred* Papiſt *compared, as to Salvation: And the greater Danger of one than the other proved. The Motives of the Roman Church conſidered; thoſe laid down by* Biſhop Taylor, *fully anſwered by himſelf. An Account of the Faith of* Proteſtants, *laid down in the way of* Principles: *wherein the Grounds and Nature of our certainty of Faith are cleared. And from the whole concluded, that there can be no reaſonable cauſe to forſake the Communion of the Church of* England, *and to embrace that of the Church of* Rome.

The Miſinterpreting Scripture doth not hinder its being a rule of Faith.

§. 1. HAving thus far vindicated the *Scriptures*, from being the cauſe (by being read among us) of all the *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms*, which have been in *England*; now I return to the conſideration, of the *Remainder* of his *Reply*. And one thing ſtill remains to be cleared, concerning the *Scripture*, which is, *whether it can be a moſt certain Rule of Faith and Life, ſince amongſt* Proteſtants *it is left to the private Interpretation of every fanciful Spirit:* Which is as much as to ask, whether any thing can be a rule, which may be underſtood by thoſe who are to be guided by it? Or, whether it be fit the People ſhould know the *Laws*, they are to be governed by; becauſe it is a dangerous thing to miſ-interpret *Laws*, and none are ſo apt to do it as the common People? I dare ſay, St. *Auguſtin* never thought, that *Hereſies ariſing from miſ-underſtanding Scriptures*, were a ſufficient Argument againſt their being a *Rule* of *Faith*, or being read by the People; as appears by his diſcourſing to them, in the Place quoted by him. For then he muſt have ſaid to them to this purpoſe, "Good People ye perceive from whence Hereſies ſpring, therefore as you would preſerve your ſoundneſs in the Faith, abſtain from reading the Scriptures, or looking on them as your *Rule*; mind the Traditions of the *Church*, but truſt not your ſelves with the reading what *God* himſelf cauſed to be writ: It cannot be denyed, that the *Scriptures* have far greater excellency in them, than any other Writings in the World, but you ought to conſider, that the beſt and moſt uſeful things are the moſt dangerous when abuſed. What is more neceſſary to the Life of Man, than eating and drinking; yet where lies Intemperance and the Danger of ſurfeiting, but in the uſe of theſe? What keeps Men more in their wits, than ſleeping; yet when are Men ſo liable to have their Throats cut, as in the uſe of that? What more pleaſant to the Eyes, than to ſee the *Sun*; yet what is there ſo like to put them out as to ſtare too long upon him? Therefore ſince the moſt neceſſary and uſeful things are moſt dangerous, when they are abuſed; my Advice muſt be, that ye forbear eating, ſleeping, and ſeeing, for fear of being ſurfeited, murdered or looſing your ſight; which you know to be very bad Things. I cannot deny, but that the *Scriptures* are called *the Bread of Life, the Food of our Souls, the Light of our Eyes, the Guide of our ways*; yet ſince there may be ſo much danger in the uſe of Food, of *Light*, and of a *Guide*, it is beſt for you to abſtain from them. Would any Man have argued like St. *Auguſtin*, that ſhould talk at this rate? Yet this muſt have been his way of arguing, if his meaning had been to have kept the People from reading the *Scriptures*, becauſe Hereſies ariſe from miſ-underſtanding them. But all that he infers from thence, is what became a Wiſe Man to ſay, viz. *that they ſhould be cautious, in affirming what they did not underſtand; and that* hanc tenentes regulam ſanitatis, *holding this ſtill as our Rule of ſoundneſs in the* Faith, *with great Humility; what we are able to underſtand, according to the* Faith *we have received, we ought to rejoyce in it as our* Food; *what we cannot, we ought not preſently to doubt of, but take time to underſtand it; and though we know it not at preſent, we ought not to queſtion it to be good and true:* And afterwards ſaith, *that was his own caſe, as well as theirs.* What! St. *Auſtin*, a *Guide* and *Father* of the *Church*, put himſelf equal with the People in reading and underſtanding *Scriptures*! In which we not only ſee his Humility, but how far he was from thinking, that this Argument would any more exclude the People from reading the *Scriptures*, than the great *Doctors* of the *Church*. For I pray, were they the common People, who firſt broached Hereſies in the Chriſtian *Church*? Were *Arius, Neſtorius, Macedonius, Eutyches*, or the great Abettors of their Doctrines, any of the *Vulgar*? If this Argument then hold at all, it muſt hold eſpecially againſt them of Parts and Learning, that have any place in the *Church*; for they are much more in danger of ſpreading *Hereſies*, by miſinterpreting *Scriptures*, than any others are. *But among Proteſtants*, he ſaith, *Scripture is left to the*

S. Auguſt. tract. 18. in Joh. cap. 5.

the fanciful Interpretation of every private Spirit. If he ſpeaks of our *Church*, he knows the contrary; and that we profeſs to follow *the unanimous Conſent of the Primitive Fathers* as much as they, and embrace the Doctrine of the *four general Councils.* But if there have been ſome among us, who have followed their own *Fancies* in interpreting *Scripture*; we can no more help that, than they can do in theirs; and I dare undertake to make good, that there have never been more abſurd, ridiculous, and fanciful Interpretations of *Scripture*, than (not the common People, but) the *Heads* of their *Church* have made, and other Perſons in greateſt Reputation among them. Which, though too large a Taſk for this preſent Deſign, may ere long be the Subject of another.

For the *Authority* of *Henry* VIII. in the Teſtimony produced from him, when they yield to it in the point of *Supremacy*, we may do it in the Six Articles or other points of *Popery*, which he held to the laſt. But we think it an advantage to our Cauſe, in the Matter of *Supremacy*, that they who were Papiſts in other points, as well as this againſt *reading* the *Scriptures*, yet contended ſo earneſtly againſt the *Popes* Authority as *Henry* VIII. and *Stephen Gardiner*, *Bonner* and the reſt did. Doth he imagine that *Henry* VIII. is owned by us, to be *Head* of our *Church*, as the *Pope* is with them, ſo as to think him *infallible?* He *would* be *Head* of the *Popiſh Church* in *England*, in ſpight of the *Pope*; but he never pretended to be *Head* of the *Reformation*, any farther than the *Supremacy* went; and if they will not believe him, when he was influenced, as they think, by *Granmer*, neither are we to be tyed to his opinion, when he was guided by *Stephen Cardiner*, or any other; who were not greater Enemies to *Ganmer*, than to the *Reformation.*

§. 2. The next thing, wherein I ſaid the Sincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed in their Church, was by the multitude of ſuperſtitious Obſervations, never uſed in the Primitive Church, as I ſaid I was ready to defend. To this his Anſwer is very ſhort, 1. That *I ſhould have ſaid to prove*; but ſo weak was I, as to think the Affirmative was to be proved, and the Negative defended. 2. *He denies any ſuch to be uſed in their Church.* I deſire then to know his opinion, of baptizing Bells with God-fathers and God-mothers, holding the rope in their hands; being buried in a Monks Habit; Pilgrimages to Images of Saints; ſprinkling holy Water, ſpittle and ſalt in baptiſm; their Rites of Exorciſm; *Agnus Dei*'s; the Pageantry of the Paſſion Week; the carrying about of the Hoſt; the numbring of Ave Maria's and Pater Noſters, to make Roſaries and Pſalters of the Bleſſed Virgin; the burning Tapers at noon day, particularly on *Candlemas-day* with great Devotion; the incenſing of Images, with many others which might be mentioned: And if he can vindicate theſe from *Superſtition*, it will be no hard taſk to *vindicate* the *Heathens*, in the Ceremonies of their Devotion; and to prove, that there can be no ſuch thing as *Superſtition* in the World.

Of their ſuperſtitious Obſervations.

§. 3. I now come to the groſs abuſe of the People, in *Pardons* and *Indulgences*; by which I ſaid the Sincerity of Devotion was much obſtructed among them: He tells me, *as an Eye-witneſs, that there is great Devotion cauſed by them, in Catholick Countries; there being*

Of Indulgences.

being no Indulgence ordinarily granted, but enjoyns him that will avail himſelf of it, to confeſs his Sins, to receive the Sacraments, to pray, faſt and give Alms; all which Duties are with great Devotion, he ſaith, *performed by Catholick People, which without the incitement of an Indulgence had poſſibly been left undone.* I will not be ſo troubleſome to enquire, what ſincerity of Devotion that was he was an Eye-witneſs of, which was cauſed by Indulgences; nor what ſort of Perſons they were, who were thus devout at receiving them. I think it will be ſufficient for my purpoſe to prove, that no Perſons in the World, who underſtand what Indulgences mean, in the *Church* of *Rome*, can be excited to any *Devotion* by them; but that on the contrary, they tend exceedingly to the obſtructing of it: which I ſhall do by ſhewing, that either they are great and notorious Cheats, if that be not meant by them which is expreſſed in them; or if it be, that nothing could be invented that tends more to obſtructing their own way of Devotion, than theſe do. 1. That they are great and notorious Cheats, if that be not meant by them which is expreſſed in them. For which we are to underſtand firſt, what hath been expreſſed in their *Indulgences*. 2. What Opinion thoſe of their own *Church* have had concerning them.

The Practice of Indulgences.

§. 4. 1. What hath been expreſſed in their Indulgences; the eldeſt *Indulgences* we meet with, are thoſe which are made by the *Popes*, to ſuch who undertook their Quarrels againſt their Enemies; and the firſt of this kind I can meet with is, that of *Anſelm Biſhop* of *Luca*, *Legate* of *Gregory* VII. which he gave to thoſe of his Party, who would fight againſt the *Emperor Henry* IV. which *Baronius* relates from his *Penitentiary*; in which was promiſed *Remiſſion of all their Sins*, to ſuch who would venture their Lives in that *Holy* War. And *Gregorius* VII. himſelf in an Epiſtle to the *Monks* of *Marſeilles*, who ſtuck cloſe to him, promiſed an *Indulgence of all their Sins*, was granted to thoſe who would fight againſt the *Saracens* in *Africa* by *Victor*, who ſucceeded *Gregorius* VII. After him followed *Urban* II. who granted an *Indulgence* to all who would go in the War to the Holy Land, *of all their Sins*, and as *Gul. Tyrius* ſaith, *expreſly mentioned thoſe, which the Scripture ſaith do exclude from the Kingdom of God, as Murder, Theft, &c.* and not only abſolved them from all the Penances they deſerved by their *Sins*; but *bid them not doubt of an eternal Reward after Death*, as *Malmſbury* ſaith; the like is atteſted by *Ordericus Vitalis*, in whoſe younger Days this *Expedition* began: *upon which*, he ſaith, *all the Thieves, Pyrates, and other Rogues, came in great Numbers, and liſted themſelves, having made Confeſſion of their Sins*; and if we believe St. *Bernard*, *there were very few but ſuch among them*; *which he rejoyceth very much in:* and ſaith, *there was a double cauſe of Joy in it, both that they left the Countries where they were before, and now went upon ſuch an Enterpriſe which would carry them to Heaven.* This way of *Indulgences*, being thus introduced, was made uſe of afterwards, upon the like Occaſions by *Calliſtus* II. *A. D.* 1122. by *Eugenius* III. *A. D.* 1145. by *Clem.* III. *A. D.* 1195. and others after them, who all promiſed the *ſame Indulgences that Urban* II. *had given.* And it is well obſerved by *Morinus*, that theſe *Indulgences* cannot be underſtood of a meer Relaxation of *Canonical Penances*; becauſe ſuch a *remiſſion of all Sins is granted, upon which eternal Life*

Baron. ad *A. D.* 1084. *n.* 15.

Greg. 7. l. 6. Ep. 15.

Leo Caſin. hiſt. l. 3. c. 71.

Gul. Tyrius l. 1. hiſt. Orient.

Will. Malm. l. 4. c. 2.

Order. Vitalis hiſt. Eccleſ. ad *A. D.* 1095.

Bernard. Exhort. ad milit. templi c. 5.

Morinus de Sacram. Pœnit. l. 10. c. 2.

Life follows; and therefore muſt reſpect *God*, and not barely the *Church*: and becauſe *Abſolution* was to be given upon them, which, ſaith he, *according to the Diſcipline then in the Church, ought not to be given, but till the Canonical Penance had been gone through, or at leaſt the greateſt part of it.* But therein he is very much miſtaken, when he ſaith, *that the Popes never granted theſe plenary Indulgences, but only to encourage an Expedition to the Holy Land:* For *Gelaſius* II. *A. D.* 1118. granted the ſame to the Chriſtian Soldiers, at the Siege of *Saragoza*, as appears by the *Bull* it ſelf, in *Baronius. Honorius* II. in the quarrel he had with *Roger* of *Sicily*, gave the ſame to all, who having confeſſed their Sins ſhould dye in the War againſt him; but if they chanced to eſcape with their Lives, but half their Sins were pardoned. *Alexander* III. gave to his Friends at *Ancona*, who ſhould viſit the 12. *Churches* and their own Cathedral all Lent Faſting, as *full an Indulgence, as if they went to Hieruſalem*; and beſides this, every 1ſt. *Sunday* in the Month as great an *Indulgence*, (*i. e.* I ſuppoſe, for as many Days) *as a Man could take up Sands in both Hands.* This *Baronius* thinks a little too much: And therefore rejects it as fabulous, becauſe the ſame *Pope*, in an *Indulgence* given to the *Church* of *Ferrara*, grants but a *Year of Criminals, and a ſeventh part of Venials*; but he doth not conſider, that the Caſe of *Ancona* was peculiar, becauſe of the great Friendſhip that City had ſhewn to the *Pope* in his Diſtreſs; and this *Indulgence* was tranſcribed from a very ancient *Manuſcript*, and better atteſted than many other things, which he never diſputes. But if it be a *Cheat* let it paſs for one; and it is no great matter to me, whether it were a *Cheat* of the *Pope's*, or the *Church* of *Ancona.* But he doth not at all queſtion the *Indulgence* granted by the ſame *Pope*, to thoſe who would take up Arms againſt the *Albigenſes*, which to thoſe who dye in that Cauſe, is not only *pardon of all their Sins*, but *an eternal Reward:* But for ſuch as refuſed to go, no leſs than Excommunication is denounced againſt them. And *Honorius* III. in the ſame Cauſe granted an *Indulgence* in the ſame Terms, as to thoſe who went to the *Holy Land:* And *Gregorius* IX. to all who ſhould take his part againſt the *Emperor Frederic* II. which *Bzovius* confeſſeth to be uſual with the *Popes* to give, to thoſe *who would fight againſt Saracens, Hereticks, or any other Enemies of theirs.*

Cap. 23.
Baron. ap *A.D.*1118. *n.* 31.
Id. ad *A.D.* 1127 *n.* 5.
Id ad *A.D.* 1177. *n.* 8.
Id. ad *A. D.* 177. *n.* 76.
Ad A. D.] 1779 *n.* 7.
Bzov. ad A. D. 1219. *n.* 3.
Id ad A.D. 1239. *n.* 8.
Ad *A.* D. 1208 *n.* 5.

This Practice of *Indulgence* being once taken up, was found too beneficial to be ever let fall again; and private *Biſhops* began to make great uſe of it, not in ſuch manner as the *Popes*, but they were unwilling not to have as great a ſhare as they could get in it; thence they began to publiſh *Indulgences*, to thoſe who would give Money towards the building or repairing *Churches*, or other publick Works; for this, they promiſed them a Pardon of the ſeventh, or fourth, or third part of their *Sins*, according as their Bounty deſerved. This was firſt begun by *Gelaſius* II. for the building of the *Church* of *Saragoza A. D.* 1118. and was followed by other *Biſhops*; in ſo much that *Morinus* is of opinion, that *Maricius Biſhop* of *Paris* built the great *Church* of *Noſtredame* there, in that manner; and he ſaith, *he can find no ground for this practice of Indulgences, before the twelfth Century*, and anſwers *Bellarmins* Arguments, for a greater Antiquity of them, and proves all his Teſtimonies, from *Gregories*, *Stations*, *Ludgerus* his *Epiſtle*, and *Sergius* his *Indulgence* in the *Church*

Morinus de Pœnitent. l. 10. c. 20.

of St. *Martin* at *Rome* produced by *Baronius*, to be meer *Impoſtures.* But the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, finding how beneficial theſe *Indulgences* were, ſoon reſolved to keep the *Keys* of this *Treaſury* of the *Church*, in their own hands; and therefore quickly abridged other *Biſhops* of this Power; and made great Complaint, that *by the indiſcreet uſe of Indulgences by the Biſhops, the Keys of the Church were contemned and Diſcipline loſt*; ſo *Innocent* III. in the *Council* of *Lateran*, Can. 62. and therefore decrees, that in the dedication of a Church, though where there were ſeveral *Biſhops* together, they ſhould not grant any *Indulgence* above a year, nor any ſingle *Biſhop* above Forty days. But we are not to imagin, that the *Popes* ever intended to *tie their own hands*, by theſe *Canons*; but they were too wiſe, to let others have the managing of ſo rich a ſtock, as that of the Church was; which would bring in ſo great a Harveſt, from the *ſins* of the People. Thence *Boniface* VIII. firſt inſtituted the year of *Jubilee* A. D. 1300; and in his *Bull* publiſhed for that end, grants not only a *plenary* and *larger*, but *moſt plenary Remiſſions of Sins* to them, that (if *Romans* for Thirty, if Strangers for fifteen days in that year) ſhould *viſit the Churches of the Apoſtles.* This was brought afterwards by *Clem.* VI. to every Fifty years; and ſince, to Twenty five, or as often as his *Holineſs* pleaſe: But in all of them a *moſt plenary* Re*miſſion of ſins* is granted. It were worth the while to underſtand the difference between a *plenary larger*, and *moſt plenary Indulgence:* ſince *Bellarmine* tells us, *that a plenary Indulgence takes away all the Puniſhment due to Sin.* But theſe were the fitteſt Terms to let the People know, they ſhould have as much for their Mony as was to be had, and what could they deſire more? And although *Bellarmin* abhors the name of *ſelling Indulgences*, yet it comes all to one; the *Popes* give *Indulgences*, and they give money; or they do it not by way of *purchaſe*, but by way of alms: But commend me to the plain Honeſty of *Boniface* IX. who being not ſatisfied with the Oblations at *Rome*, ſent abroad his *Jubilees* to *Colen*, *Magdeburg*, and other Cities; but always ſent his Collectors, to take his ſhare of Mony that was gathered, and inſerted in them that Clauſe, *porrigentibus manus Adjutrices*, which in plain Engliſh, is *to thoſe who would give mony for them:* without which no *Indulgence* was to be had, as *Gobelinus* Per*ſona* ſaith: Who likewiſe adds this remarkable Paſſage, that the Preachers of the *Indulgences* told the People, to encourage them to deal for them, that they were not only *à pœnâ* but *à culpâ* too, i. e. not meerly from the temporal Puniſhment of ſin, but from the fault it ſelf which deſerved eternal; this made the People look into them, and not finding thoſe Terms but only a *moſt plenary* Re*miſſion*, they were unſatisfied, becauſe they were told that the Fault could be forgiven by *God* alone; but if they could but once find that the Pope would undertake to clear all ſcores with *God* for them, they did not doubt but they would be worth their Mony. Whereupon he ſaith *thoſe very terms were put into them:* Then the wiſer Men thought theſe were counterfeit, and made only by the Pardon-mongers; but upon further Enquiry they found it otherwiſe. How far this Trade of *Indulgences* was improved afterwards, in the time of *Alexander* VI. and *Leo* X. the R*eformation* which began upon occaſion

Baron. ad A. D. 846.

Extravag. Commun. l. 5. tit. 9. c 1. Bzov. ad A. D. 1300. n. 1.

Bell. de Indul. l. 1. c. 9.

Gobelin. Perſona Coſmogr. ӕt. 6. c. 86.

occaſion of them, will be a laſting Monument; which was the greateſt good the World ever received by them.

§. 5. But we are not to think, ſince *Indulgences* are ſuch great Kindneſſes to the Souls of Men, that they ſhould be only reſerved for Years of *Jubilee*, for what a hard caſe may they be in, who ſhould chance to die but the Year before? Therefore the *Popes* (thoſe tender Fathers of the Church) have granted very comfortable ones, to many particular Places, and for the doing ſome good Actions, that no one need be in any great Perplexity for want of them. Other Places it is probable a Man may go to Heaven as ſoon as from *Rome*, but there is none like that for eſcaping *Purgatory*; if a Man confeſs his Sins, and but ſtumble into one of the ſeven *Churches*, it is a hard caſe if he doth not eſcape, at leaſt for one Thouſand Years. It need not reckon up what vaſt Pardons are to be had there at eaſy rates, ſince they have been ſo kind at *Rome*, to publiſh a *Catalogue* of them in ſeveral Books; an Extract out of which, is very lately ſet forth in our own Language. Thoſe who have gone about to compute them, have found that *Indulgences* for a *Million* of Years are to be had at *Rome* on no hard Terms: *Bellarmine* would ſeem to deny theſe Pardons for ſo many Years, as far as he durſt, as though they were not delivered by *authentick* Writers; but I deſire no more than what *Onuphrius* hath tranſcribed from the *Archives* of the *Churches* themſelves; and we may judge of the reſt by what *Cæſar Raſponi*, a *Canon* of the *Lateran Church* and a preſent *Cardinal*, hath written lately of that one *Church*, in a Book dedicated to *Alexander* VII. He tells us therefore, *there is ſo vaſt a Bank of the Treaſure of the Church laid up there, that no one need go any further to get full* Pardon *of all his Sins; and that it is impoſſible for any one, to reckon up the Number of the Benefits to be had there by it.* In the *Feaſt* of the *Dedication* of that *Church*, at the firſt throw, if a Man be well confeſſed before, he gets, if he be a *Roman*, a Pardon of a Thouſand Years, if a *Tuſcan* Two Thouſand; but if he comes from beyond Sea Three Thouſand Years; this is well for the firſt time. The like *Lottery* is again at that Church, on *Cœna Domini*. But *Boniface* IX. would never ſtand indenting with Men for number of years, but declares, *if Men will come either for Devotion or* Pilgrimage, (no matter which) *he ſhall be clear from all ſin:* and what would a Man have more? But beſides this, there are other particular Seaſons of opening this *Treaſury*; and then one may take out as much as they can wiſh for: As when the *Image* of our *Saviour* is ſhewn, all that came thither *have their Sins pardoned* infallibly: And many other days in the year; which the Author punctually reckons up, and are ſo many that a *Canon* of that *Church* may diſpoſe of ſome Thouſands of years, nay *plenary Remiſſions*, and yet eſcape Purgatory at laſt himſelf. But beſides what belongs to the *Church* it ſelf, there is a little *Oratory* or *Chappel* belonging to it, called the *Holy of Holies*, where it is impoſſible for any Man to reckon up the number of *Indulgences* granted to it. Theſe vaſt numbers of years then are no fiction of *Pardon-mongers*, as *Bellarmin* is ſometimes ready to ſay; unleſs he will have the Popes called by that name, or charge the *Holy Churches* at *Rome* with ſo groſs Impoſtures.

Of *Indulgences at* Rome.

Hen. Foulis *Preface to the Hiſtory of Romiſh Uſurpations.*
Bell. de Indulg. l. 2. c. 20.

Onuphrius de 7. Urbis Eccleſiis.
Cæſar Raſpon. de Baſilicâ Lateranenſi. l. 2. c. 14. p. 204.

Raſponde Baſil. Later. l. 4. c. 19.

Of Indulgences for ſaying ſome Prayers. §. 6. But ſuppoſe it ſhould be a Man's Fortune never to ſee Rome (as it hath many a good Mans) muſt he be content to lie and rot in P*urgatory*, or truſt only to the Kindneſs of his Friends? No, we that live at this diſtance, have ſome comfort left: There are ſome good P*rayers*, appointed for us to uſe, which will help us at a need; or elſe the Book of the *hours* of the *Bleſſed Virgin ſecundum uſum Sarum*, is ſtrangely miſtaken; but herein I am likewiſe prevented by the Author of the P*reface* lately mentioned; but my Edition being elder than either of thoſe mentioned by him ſeems to have ſomething peculiar to it, or at leaſt omitted by him.

As when it ſaith of the Prayer *Obſecro te Domina Sancta Maria*, &c. Horæ B. V. Mariæ ſecundum uſum Sarum. p. 38. **Tho all them that be in the ſtate of Grace, that daily ſay devowteli this Prayer before owre bleſſed Lady of Pity ſhe wolle ſhowe them her bleſſed vyſage, and warn them the day and owre of deth, and in there laſt end, the Angels of God ſhall yield there ſowles to Heaven, and he ſhall obtain 5 hundreth yeres, and ſoo many Lentis of Pardon, graunted by 5 holy Fathers Popes of Rome.** That is pretty well for one Prayer!

But this is nothing to what follows, to a much ſhorter Prayer than that.

Page 42. **Our Holy Father Sixtus 4. Pope hath graunted, to all them that devoutly ſay this Prayer before the Image of our Lady in the ſone eleven thouſand years of Pardon.** A Prayer ſaid to good purpoſe! I confeſs I can hardly ſtoop now, to thoſe that have only days of Pardon promiſed them; yet for the ſake of the Procurer, I will mention one.

P. 45. **Our Holy Father Pope Sixtus hath graunted at the Inſtance of the highmoſt and excellent Princeſs Elizabeth late Queen of England and wyfe to our Soveraign liege Lord King Henry the** VII. **God have mercy on her ſweet ſoul, and all Chriſten ſouls that every day in the morning after 3 tollinges of the Ave bell ſay 3 times the hole ſalutation of our Lady** Ave Maria gratiâ, **that is to ſay, at 6 the klock in the morning 3 Ave Maria, at 12 of the klock at none 4 Ave Maria, and at 6 a klock at even, for every time ſo doing, is graunted of the ſpiritual treaſour of holy Church 3 hundreth days of parden totiens quotiens.** To which is annexed, the Pardon of the two Archbiſhops and nine Biſhops, forty days a piece, three times a day, which begun, *A. D.* 1429. the ſeventh year of *Henry* VII. And the ſum of the Indulgence and Pardon for every *Ave Maria*, is Eight Hundred days *totiens quotiens*.

But if a Man thinks himſelf well provided already, and hath a mind to help his Friends, there is nothing like the fifteen O. O s. of St. *Brigit*.

P. 50. **Thys be the 15** O. O s. **the which the holy Virgin S. Brygytta was woente to ſay dayle, before the holy rode in S. Pauls Church at Rome; who ſo ſays this a yere, he ſchall delver 15 ſoules out of Purgatory of his next kyndren, and convert other 15 ſinners to gode lyf and other 15 righteous men of his kynd ſhall perſevere in gode lyf. And wat ye deſyre of God ye ſchall have it, if yt be to the ſalvation of your ſowle.**

Not long after, we find a better endowment with number of years, than any we have yet met with.

To all them that before this Image of pytie devoutly ſay 5 Pater Noſter and 5 Aves and a Credo, pityouſly beholding theſe Arms of Cryſtes paſſion, are graunted thirty two thouſand ſeven hundred and fifty years of Pardon; and Sixtus the 4. Pope of Rome hath made the 4 and the 5 prayer, and hath doubled his foreſaid pardon. P. 54.

The Prayer with *Boniface* VI. his *Indulgence of Ten Thouſand years Pardon*, will hardly down with me now: Much leſs that niggardly grant of *John* 22. of a *Hundred days Pardon.* What Cuſtomers doth he hope to find at ſuch ſordid rates? P. 58.

Sixtus 4. for my money; witneſs this Indulgence.

Our holy Father Sixtus 4. graunted to all them that beyn in ſtate of Grace, ſayeing this prayer following immediately after the elevation of the body of our Lord clene remiſſion of all their ſins perpetually enduring. And alſo John 3 Pope of Rome, at the requeſt of the Queen of England, hath graunted unto all them that devoutly ſay this prayer before the Image of our Lord Crucified as many days of pardon as there were wounds in the body of our Lord in the tyme of his bitter paſſion, the which were 5365. P. 61.

It is well *Sixtus* came after him, or elſe his Market had been ſpoiled, the other ſo much out-bid him.

Next to clean Pardon, *John* 22. offers fair; only the task is ſomewhat harder, it being for three Prayers.

Thys 3 Prayers be writton in the Chappelle of the holy Croſs in Rome, otherwiſe called Sacellum ſanctæ Crucis 7 Romanorum, who that devoutly ſay them ſhall obtayn 90000 years of pardon for dedly ſins graunted by our holie Father Joh. 22. Pope of Rome. P. 66.

Methinks he ſhould have made them up a full Hundred Thouſand, when his Hand was in; but I perceive they are *prudential* in diſpenſing *Pardons*, as well as *Scripture*.

But there is one condition implyed in ſome of theſe Prayers, called *being in a ſtate of Grace*, the want of which may hinder the effect of them; but although due Confeſſion with Abſolution will at any time put a Man into it, yet is there no Remedy without it? We will try once more for that, and end theſe *Indulgences*. And I think the Prayer of St. *Bernardine* of *Siena* will relieve us.

Thys moſt devoutly Prayer ſaid the holy Father St. Bernardine daylie kneeling in the Worſhip of the moſt holy Name Jeſus. And yt is well to believe that through the invocation of that moſt excellent name of Jeſu, S. Bernard. obtayned a ſingular reward of perpetual conſolation of our L. Jeſu Chriſt. And thys Prayer is written in a Table that hangeth at Rome in S. Peters Church nere to the higher awter, there as our holy Father the Pope duely is wonte to ſay the office of the Maſſe. And who that devoutly with a contrite heart dayly ſay this Oryſon, yf he be that day in the ſtate of eternal Damnation, than this eternal payne ſhall be changed him in temporal payne of Purgatory, than yf he hath deſerved the payne of Purgatory, yt ſhall be forgotten and forgiven, thorow the infinite mercy of God. P. 72.

This is enough of all reaſon.

And ſo much ſhall ſerve, to ſet forth what the *Practice of Indulgences* hath been in the *Church of Rome*, and what is expreſſed in them.

What opinion hath been had of Indulgences in the Roman Church.

§. 7. I now come to give account, what opinion hath been had of theſe *Indulgences* in their own Church; wherein ſome have freely confeſſed, they have no Foundation in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*; others, that they are only *pious Frauds*, and thoſe who have gone about to defend them, have been driven to *miſerable Shifts* in the defence of them.

Durand. in ſentent. l. 4. diſt. 20. q. 3.
Joh. Major in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 20.
Cajetan opuſc. de Indulgent. init.
Soto in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 20.
Greg. de Valenc. de Indulg. c. 4.
Eſtius in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 20. S. 2.
Morinus de pœnitent. l. 20. c. 20 *n* 9.
Roff. c. Luther. art. 18.
Polyd. Virgil. de Invent. l. 8. c. 1.
Alphonſ. à Caſtro adverſ. Hæreſ. l. 8. v. Indulg.
Alphonſ. l. 1. c. 12.
Bellar. de amiſſ. gratiæ l. 6. c. 3. reſp. ad object. 6.

1. Some have confeſſed, that they have no Foundation in *Scripture*, or *Antiquity*. *Durandus* ſaith, *that very little can be affirmed, with any certainty, concerning Indulgences, becauſe neither the Scripture ſpeaks expreſly of them, and the Fathers,* Ambroſe, Hillary, Auguſt, Hierom *ſpeak not at all of them:* And therefore he hath no more to ſay, *but that the common opinion is to be followed therein.* The ſame is ſaid by another *School-man*; who adds this, *that though it be a negative Argument, yet it is of force, becauſe in the time of thoſe Fathers they were very much skilled in the Scriptures; and it were very ſtrange, if Indulgences were to be found there, that they did not find them.* This is likewiſe affirmed by *Cajetan*, *Dominicus Soto*, and all thoſe who aſſert that the uſe of *Indulgences* came into the *Church*, upon the *relaxing the ſeverity of the Primitive Diſcipline*; which they ſay, continued in uſe for a 1000 Years after *Chriſt*. But the moſt expreſs Teſtimonies in this caſe, are of *Biſhop Fiſher*, who ſaith *that the uſe of Indulgences came very late into the Church*; and of *Polydore Virgil*, following his words; and of *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, who ingenuouſly confeſſeth, *that among all the Controverſies he writes of, there is none which the Scripture or Fathers ſpeaks leſs of, than this; but however,* he ſaith, *though the uſe of them ſeem to have come very late into the Church, they ought not to be contemned; becauſe many other things are known to latter Ages, which the ancient Writers were wholly ignorant of, for which he inſtanceth in Tranſubſtantiation, proceſſion from the Son, and Purgatory.* But he ought to have remembred what himſelf had ſaid before, in a Chapter of *finding out Hereſies*; that, *the novelty of any Doctrine makes it of it ſelf to be ſuſpected, becauſe Chriſt and his Apoſtles did give ſufficient Inſtruction for attaining eternal Life; and after the Law given by Chriſt, no other Law is to be expected, becauſe his Teſtament is eternal.* Let this be applied to his own Confeſſion of theſe Doctrines, and the conſequence is eaſily diſcerned. And it is an excellent ſaying of *Bellarmin*, that *in things which depend on the Will of God, nothing ought to be affirmed, unleſs God hath revealed it in the Holy Scriptures.* Therefore, according to the opinion of theſe Perſons, who aſſert the Doctrine of *Indulgences* to have no *Foundation* in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, it can be no other than a *notorious Cheat.*

Aquin. ſupplement. ſum. q. 25. art. 2.
Bonavent. in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 20. q. 6.

2. Some in the Church of *Rome*, have called them *pious Frauds.* This appears by the Controverſies which aroſe upon *Indulgences* at the ſame time when they began to grow common. For *Aquinas* and *Bonaventure* tell us, *that there were ſome in the Church who ſaid, that the Intention of the Church in Indulgences was only by a pious Fraud to draw Men to Charitable Acts, which otherwiſe they would not have done; as a Mother which promiſeth her Child an Apple to run*

abroad, which ſhe never gives him, when ſhe hath brought him to it. Which is the very Inſtance they uſed, as *Gregory de Valencia* confeſſeth. Greg. de Valent. de Indulg. c. 2. But this *Aquinas* rejects, as a very dangerous Opinion; *becauſe this is in plain Terms, to make the Church guilty of a notorious Cheat; and,* as he ſaith, *from St.* Auguſtine, *if any Falſhood be found in Scripture, it takes away the Authority of the whole; ſo if the Church be guilty of a Cheat in one thing, ſhe will be ſuſpected in all the reſt.* This, ſaith *Bonaventure, is to make the Church to lie and deceive, and Indulgences to be vain and childiſh Toyes.* But for all theſe hard words, they had a great deal of Reaſon on their ſide: For the *Indulgences* were expreſs for the Remiſſion of the Sins of thoſe who did ſuch and ſuch things, as the giving a ſmall Sum of Money towards the building of a Church or an *Hoſpital*; they therefore asked, *whether the Indulgences were to be taken as they were given or no?* If they were, then all thoſe had *full Remiſſion of Sins,* on very eaſy Terms; if not, then what is this elſe but *fraud* and *cheating*; and can be only called *pious,* becauſe the Work was good which they did? This put the Defenders of *Indulgences* very hard to it; *Prepoſitivus,* one of the eldeſt of the *Schoolmen,* confeſſeth *that it looks a little odly for a Man to be abſolved from all his Sins for three pence,* Apud Morin. l. 10. c. 20. n. 5. *given in three ſeveral* Places; *and that the rich by his means have a mighty Advantage over the poor:* but he reſolves it all *into the Power of the Church. Petrus Cantor* confeſſeth the Difficulties great, but *only for the Churches Authority*; and eſpecially in thoſe general *Indulgences* which are pronounced without any Diſtinctions. Therefore Ib. n. 7. he ſaith, *Greg.* IV. as he calls him (*Morinus* thinks *Greg.* VIII.) in the Dedication of the *Church* of *Benevento,* told the People, *it was much ſafer for them to undergo their* Penance, *than to receive an Indulgence from him of any part of it:* And another *Biſhop,* being deſired an *Indulgence,* would give it but for two Days; but if any one asks, whether the Remiſſion of Sins were preſently obtained after *Indulgence,* or only when they are uncapable of Penance, *viz.* after Death; *for his part,* he ſaith, *he deſires them to conſult the Pope or the Biſhop that gives the Indulgence, whether of theſe opinions is true*; and when the *Biſhop* of *Paris* ſhewed him the magnificent *Church* he had built by vertue of *Indulgences, Cantor* told him, *he had done much better if he had let them alone, and perſwaded the People to undergo their Penance.*

But becauſe the Form of *Indulgences* ran in ſuch large and general Terms; it grew to be a great *Queſtion,* among the *Schoolmen, whether the validity of Indulgences was as great, as the words of them?* which in other Terms is, whether the *Church* did cheat or not, in giving them? For if they were not to underſtand them, according to the plain words of them, what is this but a *groſs Impoſture* to abuſe the credulous People, and laugh in their Sleeves at them for their ſimplicity? For while the People have ſo good an opinion of their *Church,* as to believe the Truth of what ſhe declares, and to take *Indulgences* according to the ſenſe of the Words; if their meaning who give them be otherwiſe than is expreſſed, it is one of the moſt abominable *Cheats* that ever was invented by Men. For picking Purſes, forging Deeds, or betraying Men are tollerable things in compariſon; but to abuſe and ruine their Souls, under a pretence of pardoning their Sins, is the utmoſt degree of Fraud and Impoſture.

Let us now ſee how theſe *Huckſters* defend their *Church* in this caſe; for the *Queſtion* hath been debated among the *Schoolmen*, ever ſince *Indulgences* came up. Some reſolve it thus; that *Indulgences* do ſignify as much as the *Church* declares, but with theſe Conditions; that there be ſufficient Authority in the Giver, Neceſſity in the Receiver, that he believes the Church hath Power to give them, that he be in a ſtate of Grace, and give a ſufficient Compenſation; which is to overthrow what they ſaid, unleſs thoſe Conditions were expreſſed in the Indulgences. Some ſay, that common Indulgences held only for Sins of Ignorance; others, for venial Sins; others, for Penances negligently performed; others, for Purgatory Pains. Some again ſaid, that theſe could ſignify no more than a Relaxation of *Canonical Penance*, what ever the words were, and that they were introduced for no other end, and they do not reach any farther, than the *Churches Canonical Power* or Judgment doth, and not to the Judgment of God. But this Opinion, ſaith *Greg. de Valenciâ*, doth not differ from the *Hereticks*; and *withall*, he ſaith, *upon this Principle Indulgences do more hurt than good*; *for if it were not for them, the Sinner by his Penance might take away ſome part of his Puniſhment; but now he relies upon his Indulgences, and does no penance, and ſo undergoes his whole Puniſhment. Albertus M.* ſaith, *they are much miſtaken, who ſay that Indulgences are to be underſtood as large as their words are, without any farther Condition; and that this is to enlarge the Court of Gods Mercy too far, and ſays many Conditions are to be underſtood, which are not expreſſed in them.* This gave the firſt occaſion to the *Treaſure* of the *Church*, invented by *Aquinas* to ſatisfy this Argument of *Albertus*, concerning the Mercy of *God* being extended too far by *Indulgences*; for hereby, what Puniſhment is taken away from one is made up by the Puniſhment of another, which is reckoned upon his account. And therefore, he ſaith, the cauſe of the Remiſſion of Puniſhment, is not the Devotion, Work, or Gift of the Receiver, but the Treaſure of Merits which was in the *Church* which the Pope might diſpenſe; and therefore the quantity of the Remiſſion was not to be proportioned to the *Acts* of the Receiver, but to the *ſtock* of the *Church*? This *rich Bank* of the Churches Stock being thus happily diſcovered, they do not queſtion now, but to ſet all Accounts even with it, and therefore *Aquinas* confidently affirms, that *Indulgences are to be underſtood ſimply, as they are expreſſed*; *for God*, ſaith he, *doth not need our lie or deceit*; *which he grants muſt have been, if Indulgences had not been meant as they were expreſſed: And all Men would ſin mortally, who preached Indulgences. Yet to obtain the Indulgence*, he ſaith, *that every Man muſt give according to his ability*; for the objection being put, concerning an *Indulgence* being given to three ſeveral places, that whoſoever gives a penny towards the building of a Church in every one of theſe places, ſhall for each of them have the third part of his Sins forgiven him, ſo that for Three-pence a Man gets a *plenary remiſſion*; he anſwers, *that a poor Man may indeed have it ſo, but it is to be underſtood that a rich Man ought to give more.* For it is all the reaſon in the World, that a rich Man ſhould pay greater *Uſe* for the *ſtock* of the *Church*, than a poor Man can do: And it is reaſonably to be preſumed, that he had more Sins to be pardoned, than the other; and therefore, whatever

Guil. Altiſſiodor. ſum. l. 4. tract. 6. c. 9.

Morin. l. 10. c. 21. *n.* 3.

Greg. de Valent. de Indulg. c. 2.

Albert. M. in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 20. art. 17.

whatever the general terms are, there muſt be ſome reſerve to hook in more from the Rich, than was expreſſed in the firſt Bargain. But if the rich Man ſhould plead *Law* in the caſe, and cry out it was *Coven* and *Fraud*, to demand more than the *firſt Contract* was; I am not skilful enough to determine, what *Action* the *Church* can have againſt him. But there is another ſhrewd objection, mentioned by *Bonaventure*; which is, *that a Man gets by ſinning*, as ſuppoſe two Men to receive the remiſſion of a *third part* of their Sins by an *Indulgence*, one owes but it may be 90 Years Penance for his Sins, and another hath run upon the ſcore ſo far that he owes 900 Years, both receive a third part *Indulgence*; in which caſe, we ſee plainly the greater Sinner hath mightily the advantage of the other, and where one gets but Thirty, the other gets Three Hundred. And therefore *Bonaventure* is fain to run back again, and to ſay, *that Indulgences are not to be underſtood as they are expreſſed, and that they are not equal to all, but it was not fit to expreſs it ſo, becauſe this would hinder the Peoples eſteem of the Indulgence.* Which in plainer terms is, that it is neceſſary to *cheat* the People, or elſe there is no good to be done by *Indulgences.* Thence *Petrarch* called them *nets, wherein the credulous multitude were caught*; and in the time of *Boniface* IX. the People obſerving what vaſt Summs of Money were gathered by them, cryed out they were *meer cheats* and *tricks* to get Money with; upon which *Paulus Langius* (a *Monk*) exclaims; *O God, to what are theſe things come! Thou holdeſt thy peace, but thou wilt not always; for the Day of the Lord will bring the hidden thing of darkneſs to light. Conrad. Urſpergenſis* ſaith, *that* Rome *might well rejoyce in the ſins of the* People, *becauſe ſhe grew rich by the compenſation which was made for them: Thou haſt* (ſaith he to her) *that which thou haſt always thirſted after; ſing and rejoyce, for thou haſt conquered the World, not by Religion, but by the wickedneſs of Men. Which is that which draws them to thee, not their Devotion and Piety. Platina* ſaith, *the ſelling Indulgences brought the Eccleſiaſtical Authority into contempt, and gave encouragement to many Sins. Urſpergenſis* complains, *that plenary Indulgences brought more wickedneſs into the World; for,* he ſaith, *Men did then ſay, Let me do what wickedneſs I will, by them I ſhall be free from puniſhment, and deliver the Souls of others from Purgatory.* Gerſon ſaith, *none can give a Pardon for ſo many Years, as are contained in the Popes Indulgences, but Chriſt alone:* Therefore what are they but cheats and impoſtures? In *Spain Indulgences* were condemned by *Petrus de Oſma*, a *Divine* of *Salamanca*, and his followers, as appears by the *Popes Bull* againſt them, *A. D.* 1478. In *Germany* by *Johannes de Veſaliâ*, a famous Preacher of *Mentz*; for *Serrarius* reckons this among the chief of his Opinions, *that Indulgences were only pious frauds and ways to deceive the People, and that they were fools who went to* Rome *for them.* About the ſame time flouriſhed *Weſſelus Groningenſis*, incomparably the beſt Scholar of his Age, and therefore called *Lux mundi*; he was not only skilled in *School Divinity* (almoſt the only learning of that time) but in the *Greek*, *Hebrew*, *Chaldee* and *Arabick*, having travelled into *Greece*, *Ægypt*, and been in moſt *Univerſities* of *Europe*, and read the moſt ancient Authors, in all kinds of learning; on the account of his learning, he was much in favour with *Sixtus* IV. and was preſent and admired at the *Council* of *Baſil*; but

Petrarch. ep 5.

Gobel. Perſona æt. 6. *c.* 68.

Paul. Langii Chronic. Citinenſ. ad A. D. 1395.

Urſperg. Chron. p. 307.

Platina in Bonif. 9.

Urſperg. Chron. p. 322.

Gerſon de Indulg. conſid. 8.

Bull. Rom. Tom. 1. *Sixt.* 4. *Conſt.* 17.

Serrar. Rerum Moguntiac. l. 1. *c.* 34.

Weſeli Groning. oper. p. 867, &c.

he was ſo far from being a Friend to *Indulgences*, that in his Epiſtle he ſaith, *that no Popes could grant an Indulgence for an hour, and that it is a ridiculous thing to imagine that for the ſame thing done, ſometimes an Indulgence ſhould be granted for Seven Years, ſometimes for Seven Hundred, ſometimes for Seven Thouſand, and ſometimes for ever by a plenary remiſſion; and that there is not the leaſt foundation in Scripture, for the diſtinction of remitting the fault and the puniſhment, upon which the Doctrine of Indulgences is founded. That the giving them was a deſign of covetouſneſs; and although the Pope once ſware to the King of* France's *Embaſſador, that he did not know the corruption of the ſellers of Indulgences, yet when he did know them he let them alone, and they ſpread farther. That God himſelf doth not give plenary remiſſion to contrition and confeſſion, and therefore the Pope can much leſs do it: But if God doth forgive, how comes the Pope to have power to retain? And if there be no puniſhment retained when God forgives, what hath the Pope to do to releaſe?* Againſt him writes one *Jacobus Angularis*; he confeſſeth, *there is nothing in Scripture or Antiquity expreſly for Indulgences; but that ought to be no Argument, for there are many other things owned in their Church, as neceſſary points, which have as little foundation as this,* viz. St. Peters *being at* Rome, *and Sacramental confeſſion; and therefore at laſt he takes Sanctuary in the Popes and Churches Authority.* To this *Weſſelus* anſwers, "that Indulgences were accounted *pious frauds*, before the time of *Albertus* and *Thomas*; that there was a great number of *Divines*, did ſtill oppoſe the errors and practice of the *Court* of *Rome*, in this matter; that ſuppoſing the Church were for them, yet the Authority of *Scripture* is to be preferred before it, and no multitude of Men whatſoever is to be believed againſt *Scripture*: that, he had not taken up this opinion raſhly, but had maintained it in *Paris* Thirty Three Years before, and in the *Popes* pœnitentiary Court at *Rome*, and was now ready to change it, if he could ſee better reaſon for the contrary. That the Doctrine of *Indulgences* was deliver'd very confuſedly and uncertainly, by which it appeared to be no *Catholick Doctrine*: That it is almoſt impoſſible to find Two Men agree, in the explication of them; that the Doctrine of *Indulgences* was ſo far from being firmly believ'd among them, that there was not the ſtricteſt Perſon of the *Carthuſian*, or other orders that ſhould receive a *plenary Indulgence* at the hour of Death, that yet would not deſire his *Brethren* to pray for his Soul; which is a plain Argument, he did not believe the validity of the *Indulgence*: That many in the *Court of Rome* did ſpeak more freely againſt them, than he did. That the *Popes* Authority is very far from being *infallible*, or being owned as ſuch in the *Church*; as appeared by the *Divines* at *Paris*, condemning the *Bull* of *Clement* VI. about *Indulgences*, wherein he took upon him to *command* the *Angels*, and gave *plenary remiſſions* both from the *fault* and *puniſhment*. Which authentick *Bulls*, he ſaith, were then to be ſeen at *Vienne*, *Limoges* and *Poictou*. It is notorious to the World, what complaints were made in *Germany*, after his time, of the *fraud* of *Indulgences*, before any other point of *Religion* came into diſpute; and how neceſſarily from this, the *Popes* Authority came to be queſtioned, that being the only pretence they had

Jac. Angular. in ep. Weſeli.

had to juſtify them by: And with what ſucceſs theſe things were then managed, it is no more purpoſe to write now, than to prove that it is day at Noon. The *Council* of *Trent* could not but confeſs *horrible Abuſes, in the ſale of Indulgences*; yet what amendment hath there been ſince that time? *Bellarmin* confeſſeth, *that it were better if the Church were very ſparing in giving Indulgences:* I wonder why ſo, if my Adverſaries experience and obſervation be true, *that they prove great helps to Devotion and Charity.* Can the *Church* be too liberal in thoſe things which tend to ſo good an end.

Bell. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 12.

Of Bellarmins prudent Chriſtian.

§. 8. But *Bellarmin would not have the People too confident of the effect of Indulgences*; *for though the Church may have power to give them, yet they may want their effect in particular Perſons*; *and therefore*, ſaith he, *all prudent Chriſtians do ſo receive Indulgences, as withal to ſatisfy God themſelves for their Sins*, *i. e.* in plain Terms, that all *prudent Chriſtians* are too wiſe to believe them, and none but *Fools* do rely on them. For if there were any thing but *Fraud* and *Impoſture* in them, why may not a *prudent Chriſtian* truſt a Church, which he believes infallible? If the Head of the Church publiſhes an Indulgence, wherein he remits to all that are confeſſed and contrite, upon doing ſuch Actions of Charity and Piety, the remaining temporal Puniſhment of their Sins: I deſire to know why a *prudent Chriſtian* of that *Church*, may not, yea, ought not, to rely upon his word? Doth he ſuſpect the *Head* of his *Church* may cheat and abuſe him? if he doth, what becomes of Infallibility? if he verily believes that the *Pope* cannot err, and will not deceive, why muſt not his word be taken? and how can his word be taken for the remitting of a Debt, when they take as much care of Payment, as if he had ſaid nothing? I know not how thoſe things paſs among the *prudent Chriſtians* of that *Church*, but to me they look like the greateſt ſuſpicion of a *Cheat* that may be. As ſuppoſe a great Perſon out of kindneſs to one that is in danger of lying in Priſon for Debt, gives him a Note under his Hand, that upon the acknowledgment of his Debt to his Attorney, and paying him his *Fees*, he will ſee his Debt wholly diſcharged; and a Friend of the Priſoner tells him *openly*, he ought to receive that Favour in an extraordinary manner, with all thankfulneſs; for that Perſon is one, who can never fail of his word; and he need not queſtion his Ability, for he hath a vaſt *Treaſure* in his Hands, to be diſpoſed of for ſuch Uſes; can we otherwiſe think, but that the poor Man would be ſtrangely ſurprized with joy at it; and if he hath any Money left, he will be ſure to give it to the Perſon imployed in ſo good a work? But withal if he ſhould *ſecretly* whiſper him, that he adviſes him as a Friend, that he would look out all other ways imaginable to ſatisfy his Creditors, and that all *prudent Perſons* in his caſe, had taken the ſame Courſe; what muſt the Thoughts of ſuch a Man be of ſuch a large and noble Offer? Truly, that the Gentleman was a great Courtier, but a Man muſt have a care of believing him too far; and his Friend underſtood the World, and that one thing was to be ſaid and done in *ſhew*, not to diſoblige ſo great a Perſon, but for all that, a Man muſt mind his own Buſineſs, or he may be chouſed at laſt, if he truſt too far to ſuch large Promiſes. This is juſt the caſe of *Indulgences* in the *Roman Church*; a Man is affrighted with the dreadful Priſon of *Purgatory*, as the temporal Puniſhment of his Sins, which God will certainly exact from him, either here by Satisfactions and Penances, or there in the Pains of that State; while the Man conſiders with himſelf the hardneſs of his Condition, he hears of *Indulgences* to be had; and after he hath enquired the meaning of them, is very well ſatisfied, that if he can get one of them, he ſhall do well enough. For he is told that his *Holineſs* is *infallible*, and that he cannot cheat or lie, or deceive like other Men; and therefore of all Perſons in the World, he would ſooneſt truſt him; but becauſe many others are in the ſame Condition with him, he may a little queſtion, whether his *Stock* will hold out or no: here his Friends aſſure him the *Treaſure* of the *Church*, (of which the *Pope* hath the *Keys*) is ſo large, that if it were a thouſand times more, he need not fear it; only he muſt confeſs his Sins, and have contrition for them, and do ſome charitable Acts, and pay ſome cuſtomary Fees and Duties, and he ſhall have a total Diſcharge. Well, ſays the Man, in a Tranſport of joy, this is the braveſt *Church* in the World for a Man to *ſin* in, if he may eſcape thus: and what need I queſtion, ſince the *Pope* is *infallible*, and the Treaſury of the *Church* is inexhauſtible? How am I freed now, not only from the Fears of *Hell* and *Purgatory*, but from crabbed and hateful Penance? that honeſt and kind-hearted Gentleman, the *Pope*, hath ſtruck a *Tally* for me in his *Exchequer*, and I ſhall have my ſhare in my courſe and order; without Laſhings, and Whippings, and Faſtings, and Mumblings, and I know not how many odd Tricks beſides: but *ſoft* and *fair* ſaith *Bellarmins prudent Chriſtian* to him, be not too confident of your Eaſe and Diſcharge, you muſt uſe as great Severities with your ſelf, and undergo as many Penances, and ſay as many Prayers as if you had no *Indulgences* at all. Say you ſo, I pray what Benefit then have I, ſaith he, by this which you call an Indulgence? what is it an Indulgence of? Is there not a *full Remiſſion of Sins* contained in it? And I have been always told, by that is meant the diſcharge of the temporary Puniſhment due to Sin, either here, or in Purgatory; Shall I be diſcharged, or ſhall I not upon it; If I ſhall, what do you tell me of that which I am diſcharged from? If not, the *Indulgence* is a *ſpiritual Trepan*, and the *Pope* an *infallible Cheat*. I cannot ſee how a Man can think otherwiſe, that made ſuch account of the great Benefit of *Indulgences*, and at laſt, finds they come to nothing, but deceiving the People, and getting Money.

The abſurdity of the Doctrine of Indulgences, and the Churches Treaſure.

Caſſander in conſult. art. 12.
Barns Cathol. Rom. Pacific. S. 9.
White de medio anim. ſtatu dem. 26.

§. 9. By this we ſee already, what miſerable ſhifts they are put to, who defend *Indulgences* but as an *honeſt Contract*; but they who will juſtify them, as containing ſomething divine and ſatisfactory for the Puniſhment of Mens Sins, are fain to build the Doctrine of them upon ſuch abſurd and unintelligible Notions, that it is almoſt as hard to underſtand as to believe it. It cannot be denyed, that there are ſome in the *Church* of *Rome*, whoſe Doctrine of *Indulgences* is eaſy enough, but then it mars the whole Market, and this Doctrine is therefore condemned by others as *heretical in Senſe:* Which is, that *Indulgences* are nothing elſe but a *Relaxation of the ancient ſeverity of Church Diſcipline, according to the old Penitential Canons*; which doth not reſpect the Juſtice of God, but the Diſcipline of the *Church* over Offenders. This is a Doctrine we have nothing to complain of the difficulty of Underſtanding, but we know not to what purpoſe (if this be all) any particular *Indulgences* are ever given; ſince there is ſo general an *Indulgence*, by the Practice of the whole *Church*, among them; wherein they cannot pretend to obſerve any of the old *Penitential Canons*. And to give a Man an *Indulgence*, to omit that which no Body requires and is wholly out of uſe, would be like the Kings giving a Man a *Pattent*, not to wear *Trunk-hoſe* and *Ruffs*, when it would be ridiculous to uſe them. And if this were all intended, why is it not ſo expreſſed if they meant honeſtly? but they know, if their *Pardons* ran ſo, no one would give a farthing for them. What need any talk of the *Churches Treaſure*, for this? Which *Clement* VI. made the ground of *Indulgences* in his *Bull*: And hath been aſſerted by the moſt zealous Defenders of them. This way of explaining *Indulgences* then, though it be eaſy and intelligible, yet it is not reconcileable with the Practice of the *Church* of *Rome*; nor with the Suppoſitions, on which that practice is built. We are therefore to enquire what they can make of it, who go about to defend it, as it is practiſed, and generally underſtood among them. To this end they tell us, "that although the Fault be remitted, upon the Sacrament of "Penance; yet the temporal Puniſhment of Sin remains, which God "muſt be ſatisfied for: That this temporal Puniſhment is either to "be undergone here, or in *Purgatory*; that every Man muſt have "undergone it himſelf, if there had not been a *Treaſure* of the "*Church* made up of the Satisfactions of *Chriſt*, and the *Saints*, to "make amends to *God* for every one, to whom that Treaſure is ap"plyed. That, the diſpenſing of this Treaſure is in the Hands of "the *Pope*, who gives it out by *Indulgences*; which being applyed "to any Perſon, upon the Condition required, he is thereby diſ"charged from the Debt of temporal Puniſhment, which he owed to "God.

This is the received Doctrine of *Indulgences*, in the *Roman Church*; which holds together till you touch it, and then it preſently flies in pieces like a *Glaſs drop*, or vaniſhes into Smoke and Air. It is of ſo tender a Compoſition that it can endure no rough handling; if you like it as it is, much good may it do you, but you muſt ask no *Queſtions*: But however, I ſhall; to ſhew the monſtrous abſurdities of this Doctrine.

1. Why, if the *Indulgence* only reſpect the *Puniſhment* and not the *Fault*, the terms of the Indulgence do not expreſs this, that the People may not be deceived? Why in all *Indulgences* ſince this Doctrine is ſo explained, as in the *Jubilees* of *Clement* VIII. and of *Urban* VIII. (the former of whom is applauded by *Bellarmin* for a Reformer of Indulgences) the moſt general Expreſſions are ſtill us'd of moſt *plenary Indulgence*, *Remiſſion* and *Pardon of all their Sins*? why it is not ſaid only of the *temporal Puniſhment due to Sin*, the Fault being ſuppoſed to be remitted?

Clem. 8. conſt. 58. Tom. 3. Bull. Urban. 8. conſt. 16. Tom. 4.

2. How *Puniſhment* doth become due, when the *Fault* is remitted? If the *Puniſhment* be juſt, it muſt have reſpect to the *Fault*; for to *puniſh* without *reſpect* to the *fault* is all one, as to *puniſh* without *fault*; if it have reſpect to the *fault*, how that fault can be ſaid to be remitted, which is puniſhed? So far as a Man is puniſhed, it is nonſenſe to ſay he is pardoned; and ſo far as he is not pardoned, his Fault is charged upon him.

3. Suppoſe temporal Puniſhment remain to be ſatisfied for; whether all, or only ſome one kind? whether Diſeaſes, Pains, and

Death, be not part of the *temporal Puniſhment* of ſin; and whether Men may be freed from theſe, by *Indulgences?* whether from the effects of the Juſtice of *God,* in extraordinary Judgments? if not, how can a Man be ſaid to be freed from the temporal Puniſhment of ſin, that is as liable to it as any one elſe?

4. If only one ſort of the temporal Puniſhment of ſin, why is not that *one ſort* declared what it is, that all Men may be ſatisfied from the *Pope* himſelf, whom ſome believe infallible in his *Indulgence?* Others we find, are not agreed about it; ſome ſay, it is only the Puniſhment due to ſin above the *Canonical Penance*; ſome, that it is only the *Canonical Penance* and not that which is due from the Juſtice of *God*; ſome that it is for both; ſome only for negligence in performing Penance; ſome that it is only for injoyned Penance; and others that it is for all that may be enjoyned. In this diverſity of Opinions, what ſecurity can any Man have, what Puniſhment he is to be freed from?

5. If it be from *Canonical Penance,* whether a Man is wholly freed from the Obligation to that, or no? if he be, what Power hath the *Prieſt,* to enjoyn *Penance* after? if he be not free, what is it he is freed from? and in what tolerable ſenſe can this be called a *moſt full Remiſſion of Sins,* which neither remits the *fault,* nor the *natural* or *divine Puniſhment,* nor ſo much as the *Canonical Penance* enjoyned by a *Prieſt?*

6. Although there needs no *Treaſure,* where nothing is diſcharged; yet ſince ſo great a one is ſpoken of for this purpoſe, wherein the Satisfaction of *Chriſt* bears the greateſt ſhare; it were worth the enquiring why the Satisfaction of *Chriſt* might not as well remit the temporal Puniſhment, when the Fault is remitted on the account of it, as afterwards by *Indulgences?*

7. How the Parts of *Chriſt's* Satisfaction come to be divided, into that which was *neceſſary,* and that which was *redundant,* ſo as the neceſſary ſatisfies for the fault, and the redundant for the temporal Puniſhment? whether *Chriſt* did any more, than *God* required? whether any thing which *God* required, can be ſaid to be redundant? if there be, how one Part comes to be applyed, and the other caſt into a *Treaſure?* What Parts can be made, of an infinite and entire Satisfaction? and if ſo little were neceſſary, and ſo much redundant, how the leaſt Part comes to ſatisfie for the fault and eternal Puniſhment; and the greateſt, only for the temporal Puniſhent?

8. Whether all the Satisfaction of *Chriſt* taken together, were not great enough to remit the eternal Puniſhment of the whole World? if it were, whether all the *redundant* Parts of that, be caſt into a *Treaſure* too? and who hath the keeping of it, and what *uſe* is made of ſo much more uſeful a *Treaſure,* than that which ſerves only to remit the temporal Puniſhment? What account can the *Pope* give of ſuffering ſo vaſt a part of the *Churches Treaſure* to lie idle, and make no uſe of it for the benefit of thoſe that need it?

9. May not the *Pope,* if he thinks of it, gather another mighty *Treaſure* of the *abſolute Power of God,* which is never uſed, as for making new Worlds, &c. May he not by the help of this, deliver Souls out of Hell, as well as by the other out of *Purgato-*

ry ? and if this be ſo much the greater kindneſs, he ought to think of it, and imploy this Treaſure for theſe purpoſes. Why may he not think of another Treaſure of the *Light* of the *Sun* that is more than enough for the uſe of the World, and lay it up in ſtore, for the benefit of the purblind and aged ?

10. If the Satisfaction of *Chriſt* be ſo redundant, how comes it not to be ſufficient for ſo poor an end as *Indulgences* ſerve for ; but the Satisfactions of the *Saints* muſt make up a ſhare, in this *Treaſure* too ? Is not this worſe, than to light a Candle to help the Sun, to ſuppoſe *Chriſt's* Satisfaction ſo infinite, as to be ſufficient to redeem more Worlds ; and yet not enough to deliver from temporal Puniſhment, without the Satisfactions of the *Saints ?*

11. How come the *Saints* to make ſuch large Satisfactions to the *Juſtice* of *God*, if the *Satiſfaction* of *Chriſt* were of ſo infinite a Nature ? and if they did make Satisfactions, were they not ſufficiently rewarded for them ? if they were, how come thoſe Satisfactions to help others, which they were ſo abundantly recompenſed for themſelves ?

12. If the Satisfaction of *Chriſt* doth only obtain grace for the *Saints*, to ſatisfie themſelves for the temporal Puniſhment of their Sins ; how can the Application of this Satisfaction by *Indulgences*, free any from the temporal Puniſhment of their Sins? Or have the Satisfactions of *Saints*, being joyned with *Chriſt's*, greater Power now in common Penitents, than the Satisfaction of *Chriſt* alone in the greateſt *Saints* ?

13. Why the Satisfaction of *Chriſt*, may not ſerve, without the *Saints*, to remit only the temporal Puniſhment of Sins ; when it was ſufficient alone, to remit both eternal and temporal in the *Sacrament* of *Baptiſm ?* or was the force of it ſpent then, that it needs a freſh Supply afterwards ? but if then it could be applied to a higher end, without any other help, why not where it is to have far leſs Efficacy ?

14. If Satisfaction be made to *God* for the temporal Puniſhments of Penitents, by *Indulgences* ; I deſire to know, when and by whom the *Payment* is made to *God ?* If it was made by the Perſons, whoſe Satisfactions make the *Churches* Treaſure, for that end, what hath the *Pope* to do to diſpenſe that, which *God* hath accepted long ago for Payment ? If it be made by the *Pope*, in what way doth he make it ? doth he take out ſo much ready *caſh* of the *Churches* Treaſure, and pay it down upon the nail, according to the Proportion of every ones Sins ? or doth he only tell *God*, where ſuch a *Treaſure* lies, and bid him go and ſatisfie himſelf, for as much as he diſcharges of his debt ?

15. How came this *Treaſure* of the *Church*, into the *Popes* keeping ? who gave him alone the *Keys* of it ? If there were any ſuch thing, methinks thoſe, who are truſted with the greater Treaſure of *Chriſt's neceſſary* Satisfaction for the remitting of eternal Puniſhment, as every *Prieſt* is by their own Doctrine in the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, ſhould not be denied the leſſer, of the *Superfluities* of *Chriſt* and the *Saints* Sufferings, for the remitting only temporal Puniſhment. When I once, ſee theſe queſtions ſatisfactorily anſwered, I may then think better of this Doctrine, than I do at preſent ; for the beſt I can think of it now is, that there never was a Doctrine

more abſurd in the ground of it, or more gainful in the Practice, than this of *Indulgences* in the *Roman Church*; and therefore ought to be accounted one of the moſt notorious *cheats* that ever was in the *Chriſtian* World.

The tendency of Indulgences to hinder devotion.

Durand. in ſentent. l. 4. diſt. 20. q. 4.

Polyd. Virg. de invent. rer. l. 8. c. 1. Onus Eccl. c. 14. S. 28.

Centum Gravamina art. 3. 4.

§. 10. But let us ſuppoſe it otherwiſe, and then we are to enquire, whether this would tend to promote or obſtruct that very way of Devotion, which is moſt in requeſt in the *Roman Church?* There are but two ways to judge of this, either by *experience*, or the *nature of the Doctrine* it ſelf. For *Experience*, my Adverſary alledges *his own*, and *that he hath ſeen great Devotion cauſed by them:* but by his Favour the Queſtion is not, what outward Acts of devotion may be performed by ſome ignorant and ſilly People, who are abuſed by great hopes of ſtrange Benefits by *Indulgences*, and therefore prepare themſelves with ſome ſhew of Devotion to receive them, eſpecially when they are unuſual; but the queſtion is, whether they have theſe effects, upon thoſe who underſtand the Nature and Deſign of them, and the Doctrine of their *Church* about them. For as *Durandus* reſolves it, *the validity of the Indulgence doth not depend on the Devotion of the Receiver; for then*, ſaith he, *the Indulgence would contain a Falſity in it, which is, that whoſoever doth ſuch a thing, as going to the ſeven Churches, ſhall have plenary Remiſſion of his Sins; therefore*, ſaith he, *whoever doth the thing, ſhall have the whole Benefit of the Indulgence, or elſe the Indulgence is falſe.* And to his *experience*, I ſhall oppoſe that of greater Obſervers of the World, than he hath been. I have already mentioned the Teſtimony of *Uſpergenſis*, and others, concerning the effects of plenary Indulgences in their times; how Men encouraged themſelves to ſin the more, becauſe of them. *Polydore Virgil* obſerves, *that when Indulgences were grown common, many Men did abſtain leſs from doing evil Actions.* The Author of the Book, called *Onus Eccleſiæ*, ſaith, *that they take Men off from the Fruits of Repentance, and are profitable only to the idle and wicked.* The *Princes* of *Germany*, in the *Diet* of *Norimberg*, among the grievances repreſented to the *Pope*, by the conſent of them all, upon the mention of *Indulgences* reckon, as the leaſt bad Conſequence of them, *that the People were cheated of their Mony by them*; but that they ſay was far more conſiderable, *that true Chriſtian Piety was deſtroyed by them; and that all manner of Wickedneſs did ſpring from thence; and that Men were afraid of committing no kind of Sin, when at ſo cheap a Rate they could purchaſe a Remiſſion of them.* But ſetting aſide the Experience of theſe things, let us conſider what the Nature of the Doctrine it ſelf tends to, to thoſe who believe it. The leaſt Benefit we ſee allowed them, is a Freedom from *enjoyned Penances*; and what are theſe *Penances* accounted among them, but *Fruits of true Repentance*, a ſevere Mortification, faſting, frequent Prayers and Alms? ſo that the ſhort of this Doctrine is, that Men by *Indulgences* are excuſed from doing the beſt Parts of their *Religion*, and if this be a way of promoting Devotion, I leave any one in his Senſes to judge.

Of Communion in one kind.

§. 11. I proceed now to *the denying the Cup to the Laity*, contrary to the Practice of the *Church* in the ſolemn Celebration of the Euchariſt, for a Thouſand years after Chriſt. To which he anſwers Three ways (1.) *that the receiving in one or both kinds was ever*

ever held a matter of Liberty in the Church, (2.) *that it was as much in the Churches Power to alter it after a Thouſand years, as in the firſt or ſecond Century* (3) *that the believing whole Chriſt to be preſent in one kind, tends more to excite Devotion, than receiving both Elements without that Belief.* This is the Subſtance of his Anſwer. But I have elſewhere at large proved, and need not repeat it here, that the Inſtitution of Chriſt, as to both kinds, was of an univerſally obligatory Nature, not only from the Will of the firſt Inſtitutor, but from the univerſal Senſe of the *Church* concerning the Nature of that Inſtitution. And there I have largely anſwer'd thoſe very Teſtimonies produced by him, and ſhewed, that they are ſo far from proving the uſe of one kind in the *Catholick Church*, that *Leo* in that very Place ſhews, that *it was the Token of an Heretick not to receive in both kinds*; and the other Inſtance, in the *Greek Church*, is only of a Woman in whoſe Mouth the Bread turned into a *Stone*, ſo that ſhe had not patience to ſtay to receive the *Cup*. So very pitiful are the Proofs, brought againſt the uſe of both kinds for a Thouſand years after Chriſt; which being ſuppoſed and acknowledged, by ſome of the moſt learned and ingenuous of their own *Church*, I wonder what Authority the *Church* afterwards can have to alter, what was always looked on before, as an obliging *Inſtitution of Chriſt*? Might it not as well alter any other *Inſtitution*, on the ſame grounds? and wholly forbid the Bread to the Laity, as well as the Cup? And I do not at all queſtion, but as ſubſtantial Reaſons might be brought for one, as the other. I had thought, the *Gentlemen* of the *Roman Church* had pretended a mighty Reverence to *Apoſtolical Traditions*, and the *Practice* of the *Catholick Church*, for a *Thouſand* years after *Chriſt*. But it ſeems, this ſignifies nothing to them, when it is contrary to their preſent Doctrine and Practice. Then it makes *a great Noiſe*, as he ſaith, but nothing elſe. Thus we *Proteſtants* have at laſt gained *Antiquity* of our ſide, it is now yielded that though the *Church* were for us, for a *Thouſand* years, yet if it now decree or act otherwiſe, this is enough for them. And we are contented to have *Chriſt* and *his Apoſtles*, and all the *Primitive Practice* for ſo long a time, on our ſide; and to leave them to enjoy the Satisfaction that follows taking the Part of the *Church* of *Rome*, againſt them all. But however *their Opinion tends more to Devotion*? Alas for us! We do not account it any piece of Devotion to believe Nonſenſe, and Contradictions, ſuch as the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation implies: we know not what Devotion there can be in oppoſing a plain Inſtitution of *Chriſt*; and not meerly, in leaving the People at Liberty to receive in one or both kinds, but in *prohibiting* the far greateſt Part of *Chriſtians*, to receive as *Chriſt* appointed; we know not what Devotion there can lie in worſhipping a piece of Bread for the *Son of God*; and believing, that when a Wafer is taken into our Mouths, *that God himſelf is perſonally entered under our Roof*. O horrible Devotion, and deteſtable Superſtition! to give the ſame Adoration to a *Wafer*, which we do to the *Eternal God*; and to believe *Chriſt* to go down as perſonally into our Bellies, as ever he went up and down when we was upon Earth.

Vindication of Archbiſhop Laud. Part. 3. c. 3. S. 14, 15, 16, 17.

Of the Popes power of diſpenſing.

§. 12. That which follows is, *the power of a Perſon's diſpenſing in Oaths and Marriages contrary to the Law of God*, which I therefore made a hindrance of the ſincerity of Devotion, becauſe it is apt to poſſeſs Mens minds with an apprehenſion that Religion is only a *Politick Cheat*, if any Perſon ſhall be thought able to diſpenſe with thoſe things, which are univerſally received among *Chriſtians* as the *Laws of God*. That which I meant, was the *Popes* taking upon him to diſpenſe with *Oaths* of *Allegiance* to *Princes*, and the *inceſtuous Marriages* of ſome great *Princes*. And now let any one conſider what his Anſwer ſignifies: He ſaith, *that ſome kinds of Oaths may be judged in ſome Circumſtances to be hurtful, and not fit to be kept: And the Diſpenſation in them is no more than to judge or determine them to be ſo: And for Marriages*, he adds, *that the Church may diſpence in ſome degrees of Affinity and Conſanguinity, but in nothing contrary to the Law of God.* But this doth not at all reach to the Buſineſs; for diſpenſing in this way may as well be done by a *Caſuiſt*, as the *Biſhop* of *Rome*; but the Queſtion lyes here, whether thoſe things which otherwiſe would be Sins by the Law of God, do therefore ceaſe to be ſo, becauſe of the *Popes* Power to diſcharge that obligation of Conſcience which lay upon the Perſon, either in Oaths or Marriages? Let him anſwer directly to this, for the other is ſhuffling, and not anſwering. As it is granted that a Subject hath an obligation of Conſcience upon him, to obey his Soveraign by vertue of the *Law* of *God*, and the univerſal ſenſe of the *Church* hath been, that there are ſome degrees of Conſanguinity and Affinity which it is *Inceſt* to marry within: I deſire to know, whether the *Popes* Power can make Diſobedience *lawful* in one caſe, and Marriage in another, which without that *Power* were utterly unlawful? This he could not but know was the thing meant, but not fit to be anſwered.

The ill conſequence of aſſerting Marriage in a Prieſt, to be worſe than Fornication.

§. 13. The laſt Inſtance is, *making Diſobedience to the Church in diſputable matters, more hainous, than Diſobedience to the Laws of Chriſt, in unqueſtionable things, as Marriage in a Prieſt to be a greater Crime than Fornication. To this he anſwers,* 1. *That the Law of the Church being ſuppoſed, forbidding the Marriage of a Prieſt, that is no diſputable matter: But it is out of Queſtion by the Law of God, that Obedience is to be given to the Commands or Prohibitions of the Church.* 2. *That Marriage in a Prieſt, the prohibition of the Church being ſuppoſed, and a voluntary Vow againſt it, is no better than Adultery in the Language of the Fathers, and therefore worſe than Fornication.* 3. *That the ſtate of ſingle Life is much more convenient for Prieſts, than the married ſtate is.* This laſt Anſwer is nothing at all to the purpoſe; for in matters of conveniency, not determined by any Law, every one is left to be his own Chooſer; but the caſe I put, was not between a *married Life* and a *ſingle Life*, for we know no harm either in one or the other of theſe; but every one is to judge, as moſt tends to the comfort of his Life, and the ends of his Calling; which hath now far different Circumſtances, from the *Apoſtolical* Times; which is a ſufficient anſwer to the *Apoſtles* words, 1 *Cor.* 7. 32. having a particular reſpect to the ſtate of the *Chriſtian Church*, in that time of Unfixedneſs and Perſecution: But the oppoſition was between *Marriage* in a *Prieſt*, and *Fornication*; whether the former were not by them made a greater Crime than the latter; and whether this were not diſhonour to the Laws of *Chriſt*, to make the Breach of a Conſtitution of the *Church*, in a matter left at liberty by the *Law* of *Chriſt*, a greater Crime than the violation of an indiſputable *Law* of his? And St. *Paul* hath given a general Rule, which equally holds in all Ages of the *Church*, *if they cannot contain let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn.* So that if St. *Paul* may reſolve the caſe, he makes no queſtion, that where there is but danger of *Fornication*, *Marriage* is ſo far from being a greater Crime than that, that it becomes a *Duty* to ſuch a one. *But hold*, ſay they of the Church of Rome to St. *Paul*, *this is only meant of thoſe whom the Church allows to marry*; *but if the Church once forbid it to any, they are not to marry, let their caſe be what it will.* Here then lies the Diſpute between St. *Paul* and them; St. *Paul* ſaith, *to avoid Fornication a Man ought to marry*; they ſay, that to marry, after the prohibition of the *Church*, is worſe than Fornication: St. *Paul* might it may be ask, *what Authority their Church had to determine contrary to what he had done in this caſe*; *Or Men to make vows*, againſt the moſt proper Remedy of ſome of the Infirmities of Humane Nature, and which *God* hath not promiſed to any to keep them from: If Obedience to the *Church* be indiſputable, it is only in ſuch things, which *God* hath not antecedently determin'd by his own *Law*; but, in the caſe between *Marriage* and *Fornication*, *God* himſelf hath given a *Law* before-hand, which no *Church* in the World can reverſe. And, however indifferent a thing in the general it be to marry or not, yet when it comes to that point, either *Marriage* or *Fornication*, I wonder at the Confidence of any, who dare upon any account whatſoever, make *Marriage* a greater Crime than *Fornication.* 1 Cor. 7. 9.

But, he ſaith, *it ſeems ſtrange to them who either cannot or will not take the word of Chriſt, that is his counſel of Chaſtity, that Marriage in a Prieſt ſhould be a greater Sin than Fornication.* It doth, I aſſure you ſeem ſtrange to us, becauſe we are deſirous to keep the *Commands* of *Chriſt*; and we are ſure, *Marriage* is againſt none of them, but *Fornication* is. Doth that Man take *Chriſts counſel of Chaſtity*, that rather chooſes to commit *Fornication*, than *Marry*? What admirable *Chaſtity* is that? and what a beaſtly Inſtitution muſt Marriage be, if *Fornication* be a leſs *Crime* than that? But what a reflection is this, the mean while, on the *Author* of it, and that *ſtate* of *Innocency* and Purity wherein it was firſt appointed: They muſt needs think themſelves very holy Men, who look on that ſtate as too impure for them, which was allotted to Man in his greateſt *Innocency*. But although the firſt *Ages* of the *Chriſtian Church* were ſo full of Hardſhip and Difficulties, that if ever it ſhould have been required of the *Governors* of the *Church* to have been above this *ſtate*, it ſhould have been at that time: Yet we find no ſuch thing in the *Apoſtolical* Times, or afterwards; when the neceſſities of Affairs would moſt have required it. But when the *Chriſtian Church* come to have ſettlement in the World, and by degrees Perſons were fixed with Endowments to particular Places, and ſome care of Affairs of the World was neceſſarily joyned with thoſe of the *Church*; there was far leſs reaſon, to make ſuch a prohibition of Marriage to the *Clergy* than ever was before. And the *Scandals* were ſo abominable, where thoſe Reſtraints were moſt in force, that on that very account, the wiſeſt Men (though as fond as any, of the

Churches Authority) thought there was more reaſon to give liberty to *Prieſts* to marry, than ever there had been to reſtrain them from it. I am not bound to defend all the extravagant and indiſcreet paſſages, which fell from ſome of the *Fathers* concerning *Marriage*, but I am ſure the *Church* preſerved her Liberty in it, notwithſtanding them; as I might eaſily prove, if it were ſuitable to my preſent deſign. And St. *Cyprian* ſpeaking of thoſe *Virgins*, who came neareſt to vows of Virginity, as *Rigaltius* obſerves, ſaith, *that it were better for them to marry, than to fall into Hell by their Sins; when they either will not, or cannot keep their promiſe*; the ſame thing is ſaid by St. *Auguſtin*, by *Epiphanius*, by the Author of the Epiſtle *ad Demetriadem*, as *Biſhop Jewel* hath long ſince proved; and need not here be repeated.

Cyprian. ep. 62.

Auguſt. de San. Virginit. l. c. 34. Epiph. c. hær. 61. Hieronym. ep. adv. Demetriad. *Jewels defence of the Apology. part.* 2. p. 174.

Two things he objects, to prove Marriage worſe than Fornication after a vow of Continency; one from the Authority of St. *Paul*, who ſaith, *the younger Widows that marry after the dedicating themſelves to the ſervice of the Church do incur Damnation; becauſe, by ſo doing they made void their firſt Faith*, i. e. *as the Fathers expound it*, *the Vow they had made*. But doth he really think, that they did not *break their firſt Faith* and *incur Damnation* by *Fornication*, as well as by *marrying?* If they did, how can this prove *Marriage* worſe than *Fornication?* I grant, that by their *firſt Faith* hath been underſtood the Promiſe made to the *Church*; and who denies breach of Promiſe to be a bad and ſcandalous thing, which is that St. *Paul* means by *Damnation*, and is not *Fornication* much more ſo, where a thing in it ſelf evil is committed, beſides the breach of the Promiſe? Can any one think, that is not more *waxing wanton againſt Chriſt*, than meer *marrying* is? Therefore St. *Paul* would have the *younger Women to marry*, and not make any ſuch Promiſes, which they would be in danger of breaking; he would have none admitted into the condition of *Church-Widows*, but thoſe that *were ſixty years of Age*, and ſo in reaſon to be ſuppoſed paſſed the Temptations to *Fornication*. Whereby he ſhews what Rule ought to be obſerved, in all ſuch Promiſes, and that none ought to be brought under them, but ſuch as are to be ſuppoſed paſt the common Temptations of Humane Nature in thoſe things. But his ſecond Authority is more to his purpoſe, (if it were good for any thing) which is the 104. *Canon of the* fourth *Council of Carthage*, as it is called; but he might have found, in *Juſtellus* his Preface to the *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Africanæ* that *this* fourth *Council of Carthage is of no Authority at all*; and we need not be concerned for any *Canon* contained therein, which is not in the *Code* of the *African Church*, as this is not; but ſeems taken out of ſome *Decretals* of the *Popes*, as will appear, by comparing the 101. *Canon* in the *Collection* of *Creſconius*, with the 104. of this *Council*. And it would be very ſtrange if St. *Auguſtin* were preſent in this *Council*, that he ſhould herein oppoſe, what he had ſaid elſewhere; for he determines, *that the marrying again of the Widows, that had vowed continuance in that ſtate, was no Adultery, but a lawful Marriage; and that Husband and Wife ought not to be ſeparated from each other, upon ſuch Marriages, and by that means make the Husbands truly Adulterers, when they ſeparate from them and marry other Wives: And therefore*, ſaith he, *that which the Apoſtle condemns in them, is not ſo much their marrying as their will to marry, whether they*

1 Tim. 5. 14.

v. 9.

Bibliotheca Juris Canonici. p. 317.

Auguſt. de bono viduitat. c. 9, 10, 11.

they do or no, whereby they break their firſt Faith; ſo that it is not *Marriage*, but *Luſt* which the *Apoſtle* condemns; from whence it appears, that St. *Auſtin* could never, if he ſpake conſonantly to himſelf, condemn *Marriage* after a vow of Continency, to be worſe than *Fornication*. Indeed, he ſaith, *that this falling from that holy Chaſtity which was vowed to God, may in ſome ſenſe be ſaid to be worſe than Adultery*; but he never imagined ſuch a conſtruction could be made of his words, as though the act of *Fornication* were not a greater *falling from it*, than meer *Marriage* could be.

So much ſhall ſuffice for the Inſtances produced in the *Roman Church*, of ſuch things which tend to obſtruct a good Life and Devotion.

Of the uncertainty of Faith in the Roman Church.

§. 14. The third Argument I uſed to prove the danger a Perſon runs of his *Salvation* in the *Communion* of the *Roman Church*, was, becauſe *it exposeth the Faith of Chriſtians to ſo great uncertainties*; which he looks *on as a ſtrange charge from the Pen of a Proteſtant*. As *ſtrange* as it is, I have at large proved it true, in a full examination of the whole Controverſy of the *reſolution of Faith* between us and them; to which I expect a particular Anſwer, before this Charge be renewed again. To which I muſt refer him for the main Proof of it, and ſhall here ſubjoyn only ſhort Replies to his Anſwers; or References to what is fully anſwered already.

Vindication of Archbiſhop Laud, *part.* 1. *ch.* 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

1. His diſtinction, *of the Authority of the Scripture in it ſelf and to us*, ſignifies nothing; for when we enquire into the proofs of the Authority of *Scripture*, it can be underſtood no otherwiſe than in reſpect *to us*; and if the *Scriptures Authority* as to *us*, is to be proved by the *Church*, and the *Churches Authority* as to *us*, to be proved by the *Scripture*, the Difficulty is not in the leaſt avoided by that diſtinction. And as little to the purpoſe is the other, *that it is only an Argument ad hominem, to prove the Infallibility of the Church from Scriptures*; for I would fain know upon what other grounds they build their own Belief of the *Churches Infallibility*, than on the *Promiſes* of *Chriſt* in the *Scriptures*? Theſe are miſerable Evaſions, and nothing elſe. For the trite ſaying of St. *Auſtin*, *that he would not believe the Goſpel*, &c. I have at large proved, that the meaning of it is no more, than that the *Teſtimony* of the *Univerſal Church* from the *Apoſtles* times, is the beſt way to prove the particular Books of *Scripture* to be *authentical*, and cannot be underſtood of the *Infallibility* of the *preſent Church*, and that the Teſtimony of ſome few Perſons, as the *Manichees* were, was not to be taken in oppoſition to the whole *Chriſtian Church*. Which is a thing we as much contend for, as they; but is far enough from making the *Infallibility* of our Faith to depend on the *Authority* of the preſent *Church*, which we ſay is the way to overthrow all certainty of Faith to any conſidering Man.

C. 7. Sect. 9.

2. To that of overthrowing the certainty of ſenſe in the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, he ſaith, *that Divine Revelation ought to be believed againſt the evidence of Senſe*. To which I anſwer (1.) that divine Revelation, in matters not capable of being judged by our *Senſes*, is to be believed, notwithſtanding any Argument can be drawn from ſenſible Experiments againſt it, as in the Belief of *God*, the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, the future ſtate of the Soul, *&c.* (2.) that in the proper Objects of ſenſe, to ſuppoſe a *Revelation* contrary to the evidence of Senſe, is to overthrow all certainty of Faith, where the matters to be believed depend upon matters of Fact. As for

inſtance, the Truth of the whole *Chriſtian Doctrine* depends upon the Truth of *Chriſt's* Reſurrection from the Dead: if Senſe be not here to be believed in a proper object of it, what aſſurance can we have that the *Apoſtles* were not deceived, when they ſaid they ſaw *Chriſt* after he was riſen?

If it be ſaid, *there was no Revelation againſt Senſe in that caſe:* that doth not take off the difficulty, for the reaſon why I am to believe *Revelation* at any time againſt Senſe muſt be, becauſe Senſe may be deceiv'd, but Revelation cannot; but if I yield to that Principle, that Senſe may be deceived in its moſt proper object, we can have no infallible Certainty by Senſe at all, and conſequently not in that Point, that *Chriſt* is riſen from the dead. If it be ſaid *that Senſe cannot be received, where there is no Revelation againſt it:* I deſire to know how it comes to be deceived, ſuppoſing a Revelation contrary to it? Doth *God* impoſe upon our Senſes, at that time? then he plainly deceives us; is it by telling us, we ought to believe more than we ſee? that we deny not, but we deſire only to believe according to our Senſes, in what we do ſee; as, that what we ſee to be Bread, is Bread; that what the *Apoſtles* ſaw to be the Body of *Chriſt*, was the *Body* of *Chriſt* really, and ſubſtantially, and not meerly the Accidents of a Body. Beſides, if Revelation is to be believed againſt Senſe, then either that Revelation is convey'd immediately to our Minds, which is to make every one a Prophet that believes Tranſubſtantiation; or mediately by our Senſes, as in thoſe words *this is my Body:* if ſo, then I am to believe this Revelation by my Senſes, and believing this Revelation, I am not to believe my Senſes: which is an excellent way of making Faith certain. All this on ſuppoſition there were a Revelation in this Caſe, which is not only falſe, but if it were true would overthrow the Certainty of Faith.

3. To what I objected, as to their denying to Men the uſe of their Judgment and Reaſon as to the matters of Faith propoſed by a Church, when they muſt uſe it in the choice of a Church, he anſwers, *that this cannot expoſe Faith to any Uncertainty, becauſe it is only preferring the Churches Judgment before our own:* but he doth not ſeem to underſtand the force of my objection, which lay in this. Every one muſt uſe his own Judgment and Reaſon, in the choice of the *Church* he is to relie upon; is he certain in this or not? if he be uncertain, all that he receives on the *Authority* of that *Church* muſt be uncertain too: if the uſe of Reaſon be certain, then how comes the *Authority* of a *Church* to be a neceſſary means of Certainty in matters of Faith? And they, who condemn the uſe of a Mans Reaſon and Judgment in *Religion*, muſt overthrow all Certainty on their own grounds; ſince the choice of his *infallible Guide* muſt depend upon it. Now that he underſtands my Argument better, he may know better how to anſwer it: but I aſſure him I meant no ſuch thing by the uſe of Reaſon *as he ſuppoſes I would have, which is to believe nothing, but what my Reaſon can comprehend*; for I believe an infinite Being, and all the Doctrines revealed by it in *Holy Scriptures*, although I cannot reconcile all particulars concerning them to thoſe Conceptions we call Reaſon. But therefore to argue againſt the uſe of Mens Judgments in matters of Faith, and the grounds of believing, is to diſpute againſt that, which all wiſe Men ever did, and will do to the Worlds End.

4. I proved, they made Faith uncertain, by making the *Churches* Power to extend to the making new Articles of Faith. This he grants *to be to the Purpoſe, if it were true: but* he ſaith, *the Church never owned any ſuch Power in her General Councils*, (which doth not hinder but that the *Heads* of their *Church* have pretended to it, and in caſe it be diſputable among them, whether the *Pope* be not *infallible*, that unavoidably leaves Faith at Uncertainties.) Yet he yields what I contend for, which is, *that it is in the Churches Power, to make that neceſſary to be believed, which was not ſo before:* for whether it be *by inventing new Articles*, or *declaring more explicitely the Truths not contained in Scripture and Tradition*, it is all one to my Purpoſe; as long as Men might be ſaved without believing them before, and cannot afterwards; which is to make the Conditions of Salvation *mutable*, according to the Pleaſure of the *Church*, which is the greateſt Inconveniency of inventing *new Doctrines*.

5. I ſhewed, they made Faith uncertain by pretending to Infallibility in determining Controverſies, and yet not uſing it to determine thoſe which are on foot among themſelves. The Force of the Argument did not lie in this as he imagins, *as though Faith could not be certain, unleſs all Controverſies were determined*, which was far from my Thoughts; but, that pretending there can be no Faith without *Infallibility* in their *Church* to end Controverſies, they ſhould give ſuch great occaſion to ſuſpect that they did not believe it themſelves by not imploying that *Infallibility* in ending the great Controverſies among themſelves; of which I have ſpoken already, and to this he gives no anſwer at all.

Thus much in Vindication of the Third Argument, I made uſe of to prove, that all thoſe who are in the Communion of the *Roman Church*, do run ſo great a Hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their Souls ought to embrace or continue in it.

The Caſe of a revolter, and a bred Papiſt, compared.

§. 15. I now come to the third Anſwer to the firſt Queſtion, which was, *that a* Proteſtant *leaving the Communion of our Church, doth incur a greater Guilt, than one who was bred up in the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *and continues therein by invincible Ignorance, and therefore cannot equally be ſaved with ſuch a one.* Three Things he objects againſt this Anſwer. 1. *That this makes them both damned, though unequally; becauſe the converted Catholick more deeply, than he that was bred ſo.* 2. *That this reflects as much upon St.* Auſtin *as them, who rejected the Communion of the* Manichees, *and embraced that of the Church of* Rome *upon their grounds.* 3. *That it is contrary to our Diſtinction of points fundamental and not fundamental.* To which I reply.

1. That the Deſign of my Anſwer was not to paſs the Sentence of Damnation on all who die in the Communion of the *Roman Church*; but to ſhew, that they who forſook a *better Church* for it do *incur greater Guilt*, than thoſe who are always *bred up* in it, and live and die in the Belief of its being the *true Church*; and therefore, are not in an *equal Capacity of Salvation* with them. I ſhall make my meaning more plain, by a parallel Inſtance or two; Many in the *Church* of *Rome* have aſſerted the Poſſibility of the *Salvation* of *Heathens* (though ſome *Bigots* have denyed it to *Proteſtants*)

teſtants) ſuppoſe this Queſtion were put, concerning two Perſons: *Whether a Chriſtian, having the ſame Motives to become a Heathen, which one bred and born and well grounded in Heatheniſm hath to remain in it, may not equally be ſaved in the Profeſſion of it?* and a third Perſon ſhould anſwer, *that a Chriſtian leaving the Communion of the Chriſtian Church, doth incur a greater Guilt, than one who was bred up in Heatheniſm, and continues therein by invincible Ignorance*: doth this Anſwer imply, that they *muſt both be damned though unequally?* or rather doth it not yield a greater Poſſibility of Salvation to one than to the other? Or ſuppoſe, (to come nearer our Caſe) the Queſtion were put, concerning one that *revolted* from the *Church of Judah* to the *Ten Tribes*, (which were guilty of *Idolatry*, though not of the higheſt kind,) whether he were equally capable of Salvation with one, who was *bred up* in the Communion of the *Church* of *Iſrael* all his days? I ſhould make no Queſtion, to pronounce his Condition more dangerous than the other; and yet not therein *damn them both*, but only imply that it was much harder for one to eſcape than the other. For he that was bred up in the *Church* of *Iſrael*, believing it was the true *God* he ſerved, and in a right manner, and looking on the *Church* of *Judah* as a *ſchiſmatical Church*, and ſeeing the greater Number of Tribes on their ſide, and wanting that Inſtruction which was in the *Church of Judah*, might in the Sincerity of his Heart ſerve *God* in a falſe way, and pray to him to pardon all his Errors and Corruptions, and have a general Repentance of all Sins, though not particularly convinced of the *Idolatry* of the *Ten Tribes*. I dare not ſay, but *God* will accept of ſuch a one, *that thus fears God and works Righteouſneſs* in the Simplicity of his Heart: but I cannot ſay the ſame, of one who revolts from *Judah*; where the *true God* was worſhipped in a *true manner*; where he had ſufficient means of Inſtruction, and either wilful Ignorance, or temporal Ends, or unreaſonable Prejudices makes him deliberately chooſe a worſe and more impure *Church* before a better; for that very Sin makes his Caſe much more dangerous than the other. Our Buſineſs is not, to enquire into the *Salvation* or *Damnation* of any *particular Perſons*; for that depends upon ſo many Circumſtances, as to the aggravation or extenuation of their Faults, the Nature and Sincerity of their Repentance, the Integrity and Simplicity of their Minds; which none but *God* himſelf can know: but to find out the *trueſt way to Salvation*, and to reject, whatever the *Church* requires, that which is in it ſelf ſinful; for though *God* may pardon thoſe who live in it in the Simplicity of their Minds, yet their Hopes lying in their *Ignorance* and *Repentance*, none who have a care of their Souls dare venture themſelves in ſo hazardous a State. Setting aſide then the Conſideration of the danger common to both, I ſay the Caſe of a *Revolter* from us to the *Church* of *Rome* is much worſe, than of one who was always bred up in it; becauſe he might far more eaſily underſtand the danger he runs into, and wilful *Ignorance* only keeps him from it, and he doth upon deliberation chooſe a ſtate of infinite Hazard before one of the greateſt ſafety.

2. This doth not reflect on *St. Auſtin* or the *Church* in his time, which was as far different from theirs, as the *Churches* of *Judah* and

Iſrael were from each other: neither can it deſtroy the *Diſtinction of Fundamentals and not Fundamentals*; for the *Poſſibility* of *Salvation* allowed to any in their *Church*, is built upon the Suppoſition that they have all that is *fundamentally neceſſary* in order to it, though there are many dangerous Errours and Corruptions in that *Church* whoſe Communion they live in.

The motives of the Roman Church conſidered.

§. 16. The Anſwers to the firſt Queſtion being thus vindicated; there remains little to be added concerning the ſecond. For he tells me, *that he agrees ſo far with me, that every Chriſtian is bound to chooſe the Communion of the pureſt Church. But which that Church is, muſt be ſeen by the grounds it brings to prove the Doctrines it teaches, to have been delivered by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles.* And to be even with him, I thus far agree with him, in the way of proof of a *Churches Purity, viz.* by Agreement with the Doctrine of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; and that that Church is to be judged pureſt, which ſhews the greateſt Evidence of that Conſent; and *that every one is bound to enquire, which Church hath the ſtrongeſt Motives for it, and to embrace the Communion of it.*

Preface to the ſecond part of his diſſuaſive.

Being thus far agreed, I muſt now enquire into what *Motives* he offers on behalf of their *Church*, and what Method he preſcribes for delivering *ours*. For the former, he produces *a large Catalogue of Catholick Motives* (as he calls them) *in the Words of Dr.* Taylor, *Libert yof Prophecy, Sect.* 20. And I do not know a better way of anſwering them, than in the Words of the ſame eminent and learned Perſon, which he uſes upon a like occaſion to his demonſtrating Friend *J. S.* " But now in my Conſcience, (ſaith the *Biſhop*) " this was unkindly done, that when I had ſpoken for them what " I could, and more then I knew they had ever ſaid for themſelves, " and yet to ſave them harmleſs from the iron Hands of a Tyrant " and unreaſonable Power, to keep them from being perſecuted for " their Errours and Opinions, that they ſhould take the Arms I " had lent them for their defence, and throw them at my head. " But the beſt of it is, though *J. S.* be unthankful, yet the Weapons themſelves are but wooden Daggers, intended only to re- " preſent, how the Poor Men are cozened by themſelves; and that " under fair and fraudulent Pretences even pious well meaning " Men, Men wiſe enough in other things, may be abuſed. And " though what I ſaid, was but tinſel and pretence, imagery " and whipt Cream, yet I could not be blamed to uſe no better " than the beſt their Cauſe could bear: yet if that be the beſt " they have to ſay for themſelves, their Probabilities will be ſoon " out-ballanced by one Scripture-teſtimony urged by Proteſtants, and " *thou ſhalt not worſhip any graven Images*, will out-weigh all the " beſt and faireſt Imaginations of their Chnrch.—— But then *J. S.* " might, if he had pleaſed, have conſidered, that I did not intend to " make that harangue, to repreſent that the Roman Religion had " Probabilities of being true, but Probabilities that the Religion might " be tolerated, or might be endured: And if I was deceived, it was but " a well meant error, hereafter they ſhall ſpeak for themſelves; only " for their comfort, this they might have alſo obſerved in that " Book, that there is not half ſo much excuſe for the Papiſts, as " there is for the Anabaptiſts, and yet it was but an excuſe at the " beſt. But ſince from me, ſaith he, they borrow their light Armour, *Polemical Diſcourſes* p. 705, &c.

“ mour, which is not Piſtol-proof, from me if they pleaſe they may
“ borrow a remedy to undeceive them, and that in the ſame kind
“ and way of arguing; for which he refers to a Letter written by
him to a Gentlewoman, ſeduced to the *Church* of *Rome*; out of
which I ſhall tranſcribe ſo much as may over-ballance the probabilities
produced elſewhere by him. “ After directions given, rather
“ to enquire what her *Religion* is than what her *Church* is, for
“ that which is a true *Religion* to day, will be ſo to morrow and
“ for ever, but that which is a holy *Church* to day, may be Heretical
“ at the next change, or may betray her truſt, or obtrude
“ new Articles in contradiction to the old, *&c.* and ſhewing the
unreaſonableneſs of believing the Roman to be the Catholick Church;
he deſcends thus to particulars. “ You are now gone to a Church
“ that protects it ſelf by arts of ſubtlety and arms, by violence
“ and perſecuting all that are not of their minds; to a Church,
“ in which you are to be a ſubject of the King, ſo long as it
“ pleaſes the Pope: In which you may be abſolved from your Vows
“ made to God, your Oaths to the King, your Promiſes to Men,
“ your Duty to your Parents in ſome caſes: A Church in which
“ Men Pray to God and to Saints, in the ſame Form of words in
“ which they Pray to God; as you may ſee in the Offices of
“ Saints, and particularly of our Lady; a Church in which Men
“ are taught, by moſt of the principal Leaders, to Worſhip Images
“ with the ſame Worſhip with which they Worſhip God or Chriſt,
“ or him or her, whoſe Image it is, and in which they uſually
“ picture God the Father and the Holy Trinity, to the great diſhonour
“ of that Sacred Myſtery, againſt the Doctrine and Practice
“ of the Primitive Church, againſt the expreſs Doctrine of Scripture,
“ againſt the honour of a Divine Attribute; I mean the immenſity,
“ and ſpirituality of the Divine Nature: You are gone to a Church,
“ that pretends to be infallible, and yet is infinitely deceived in
“ many particulars, and yet endures no contradiction, and is impatient
“ her Children ſhould enquire into any thing her Prieſts obtrude.
“ You are gone from receiving the whole Sacrament, to
“ receive it but half; from Chriſt's Inſtitution, to a humane Invention;
“ from Scripture, to uncertain Traditions; and from ancient
“ Tradition, to new pretences; from Prayers which ye underſtood,
“ to Prayers which ye underſtand not; from confidence in
“ God, to relie upon Creatures; from intire dependance upon inward
“ acts, to a dangerous temptation of reſting too much in outward
“ Miniſteries, in the external Work of Sacraments and Sacramentals.
“ You are gone from a Church, whoſe worſhipping is ſimple,
“ Chriſtian, and Apoſtolical, to a Church where Mens Conſciences
“ are loaden with a burden of Ceremonies, greater than that
“ in the days of the Jewiſh Religion, (for the Ceremonial of the
“ Church of *Rome* is a great Book in Folio.) You are gone from
“ a Church, where you were exhorted to read the Word of God,
“ the Holy Scriptures, from whence you found inſtruction, inſtitution,
“ comfort, reproof, a treaſure of all excellencies, to a Church
“ that ſeals up that fountain from you, and gives you drink by
“ drops, out of ſuch Ciſterns, as they firſt make, and then ſtain,
“ and then reach out. And if it be told you, that ſome Men abuſe
“ Scripture, it is true; for if your Prieſts had not abuſed Scripture,
“ they

“they could not thus have abuſed you; but there is no neceſſity they ſhould, and you need not unleſs you liſt; any more than you need to abuſe the Sacrament, or Decrees of the Church, or the Meſſengers of your Friend, or the Letters you receive, or the Laws of the Land, all which are liable to be abuſed by evil Perſons, but not by good People and modeſt underſtandings. It is now become a part of your Religion, to be Ignorant, to walk in blindneſs, to believe the Man that hears your Confeſſions, to hear none but him, not to hear God ſpeaking but by him, and ſo you are liable to be abuſed by him, as he pleaſes, without remedy. You are gone from us, where you are only taught to worſhip God through Jeſus Chriſt, and now you are taught to worſhip Saints and Angels, with a Worſhip at leaſt dangerous and in ſome things proper to God; for your Church worſhips the *Virgin Mary* with burning Incenſe and Candles to her, and you give her Preſents, which by the conſent of all Nations uſed to be eſteemed a Worſhip peculiar to God, and it is the ſame thing which was condemned in the *Collyridians*, who offered a Cake to the *Virgin Mary*. A Candle and a Cake make no difference in the Worſhip; and your joyning God and the Saints, is like the device of them that fought for King and Parliament; the latter deſtroys the former. To which he ſubjoyns, that the points of difference, between us and the Church of *Rome*, are ſuch as do evidently ſerve the ends of covetouſneſs and ambition in them: and that very many of her Doctrines are very ill Friends to a good Life, and that our Religion is incomparably beyond theirs in point of ſafety; as in point of praying to God alone, and without Images, relying on God as Infallible, which are ſurely lawful; but it is at leaſt hugely diſputable, and not at all certain, that any Man or ſociety of Men can be infallible, that we may put our truſt in Saints, or worſhip Images, *&c.* From whence he concludes; ſo that unleſs you mean to prefer a danger before ſafety, temptation to unholineſs before a ſevere and holy Religion; unleſs you mean to loſe the benefit of your Prayers, by praying what you perceive not, and the benefit of the Sacrament in great degrees, by falling from Chriſt's Inſtitution, and taking half inſtead of all; unleſs you deſire to provoke God to jealouſie by Images, and Man to jealouſie in profeſſing a Religion, in which you may in many caſes have leave to forfeit your Faith and lawful Truſt, unleſs you will chooſe a Catechiſm without the ſecond Commandment, and a Faith that grows bigger or leſſer as Men pleaſe, and an hope that in many degrees relies on Men and vain confidences, and a Charity that damns all the World but your ſelves, unleſs you will do all this, that is, ſuffer an abuſe in your Prayers, in the Sacrament, in the Commandments, in Faith, in Hope, in Charity, in the Communion of Saints, and your duty to your ſupreme, you muſt return to the boſom of your Mother the Church of *England*, and I doubt not but you will find the comfort of it in all your Life, and in the day of your Death, and in the Day of Judgment.

Thus far that excellent Perſon, and I leave you now to judge between the Motives on both ſides, as they are laid down by him whom my Adverſary appeals to; and I muſt thank him for the kindneſs of mentioning him againſt me, without which I had wanted ſo good a Repreſentation of the Motives of either ſide, and ſo full an Anſwer to the pretences brought for the *Church* of *Rome*. The other Motives which he adds of *Fathers*, *Councils*, and *Tradition*, he knows are utterly denyed by us; and I wonder he ſhould inſiſt upon them; ſince in the matters of our debate, *Antiquity* is ſo evidently of our ſide, as againſt Worſhip of Images and Saints, againſt Purgatory, Tranſubſtantiation, Prayers in an unknown tongue; and he thinks it no great matter to allow us a *Thouſand Years* againſt Communion in one kind, and yet all this while *Scripture*, *Fathers*, *Councils* and *Tradition* are all on their ſide. For the *teſtimony of the preſent Church*; we deny that St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of it, as of it ſelf ſufficient; and though he did, that concerns not the *Roman Church*, any more than other parts of the *Catholick Church*; and he may as ſoon prove *Tyber* to be the *Ocean*, or St. *Peters* at *Rome* to have been before the *Temple* at *Hieruſalem*, as prove the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, or the *Mother* of all *others*.

The Faith of Proteſtants reduced to Principles.

§. 17. But I muſt conclude, with *the method he preſcribes to you* for ſatisfaction from me; which is *not to meddle with particular Diſputes*, (which we know very well the reaſon of) *but to call upon me for a Catalogue of our grounds*, *and to bring things to Grounds and Principles* (as they have learnt to Cant of late) *and then*, he ſaith, *Controverſie will ſoon be at an end*. I ſhould be glad to ſee it ſo; notwithſtanding his Friend *J. S.* accounts it ſo *noble a Science*, unleſs he hath changed his mind, ſince for ſo many Years now, he hath failed in the *Defence* of his *Demonſtrations*. But to ſatisfie the *Men of Principles*, and to let them ſee we can do more *than find fault with their Religion*, I ſhall give an account of the *Faith* of *Proteſtants* in the way of *Principles*; and of the reaſon of our rejecting their impoſitions, which is all we can underſtand by *Negative Points*; and if we can give an account of the *Chriſtian Faith*, independently on their *Churches Authority* and *Infallibility*, it evidently follows, that cannot be the *foundation* of Faith, and ſo we may be very *good Chriſtians* without having any thing to do with the *Church* of *Rome*. And I know no other Anſwer neceſſary, not only to this preſent demand, but to a Book called *Proteſtants without Principles*, the falſity of which will appear by what follows.

Principles Agreed on both Sides.

1. THat there is a *God*, from whom Man, and all other Creatures, had their Being.

2. That the notion of God doth imply, that he is a Being abſolutely perfect, and therefore Juſtice, Goodneſs, Wiſdom and Truth muſt be in him, to the higheſt degree of perfection.

3. That Man receiving his Being from God, is thereby bound to obey his Will; and conſequently, is liable to puniſhment in caſe of diſobedience.

4. That in order to Mans obeying the Will of God, it is neceſſary that he know what it is; for which, ſome manifeſtation of the Will of God is neceſſary, both that Man may know what he hath to do, and that God may juſtly puniſh him if he do not.

5. Whatever God reveals to Man is infallibly true, and being intended for the Rule of Mans obedience may be certainly known to be his Will.

6. God cannot act contrary to thoſe eſſential Attributes of Juſtice, Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Truth, in any way which he makes choice of, to make known his will unto Man by.

Theſe things being agreed on both ſides, we are now to enquire into the particular ways which God hath made choice of, for revealing his Will to Mankind.

1. AN entire Obedience to the Will of God being agreed to be the condition of Mans happineſs, no other way of Revelation is in it ſelf neceſſary to that end, than ſuch whereby Man may know what the Will of God is.

2. Man being framed a rational Creature, capable of reflecting upon himſelf, may antecedently to any external Revelation certainly know the Being of God, and his Dependance upon him, and thoſe things which are naturally pleaſing unto him; elſe there could be no ſuch thing as a law of Nature, or any Principles of natural Religion.

3. All ſupernatural and external Revelation, muſt ſuppoſe the truth of natural Religion, for unleſs we be antecedently certain that there is a God, and that we are capable of knowing him, it is impoſſible to be certain that *God* hath revealed his will to us by any ſupernatural means.

4. Nothing ought to be admitted for divine Revelation, which overthrows the certainty of thoſe Principles which muſt be antecedently ſuppoſed to all Divine Revelation. For that were to overthrow the means, whereby we are to judge concerning the truth of of any Divine Revelation.

5. There can be no other means imagined, whereby we are to judge of the truth of Divine Revelation, but a Faculty in us diſcerning Truth and Falſhood, in matters propoſed to our Belief; which if we do not exerciſe in judging the Truth of Divine Revelation, we muſt be impoſed upon by every thing which pretends to be ſo.

6. The pretence of Infallibility, in any Perſon or Society of Men, muſt be judged in the ſame way, that the Truth of a Divine Revelation is; for that Infallibility being challenged by vertue of a ſupernatural Aſſiſtance, and for that end, to aſſure Men what the will of God is, the ſame means muſt be uſed for the Trial of that, as for any other ſupernatural way of Gods making known his Will to Men.

7. It being in the Power of God, to make choice of ſeveral ways of revealing his Will to us, we ought not to diſpute from the Attributes of God the neceſſity of one particular way, to the Excluſion of

all others; but we ought to enquire, what way God himſelf hath choſen: And whatever he hath done we are ſure cannot be repugnant to Infinite Juſtice, Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Truth.

8. Whatever way is capable of certainly conveying the Will of God to us, may be made choice of by him for the means of making known his Will, in order to the happineſs of Mankind; ſo that no Argument can be ſufficient *à priori* to prove that God cannot chooſe any particular way to reveal his mind by, but ſuch which evidently proves the Inſufficiency of that means for conveying the Will of God to us.

9. There are ſeveral ways conceivable by us, how God may make known his Will to us; either by immediate voice from Heaven, or inward Inſpiration to every particular Perſon; or inſpiring ſome to ſpeak perſonally to others, or aſſiſting them with an infallible Spirit in writing ſuch Books, which ſhall contain the Will of God for the Benefit of diſtant Perſons and future Ages.

10. If the Will of God cannot be ſufficiently declared to Men by Writing, it muſt either be, becauſe no Writing can be intelligible enough for that end, or that it can never be known to be written by Men infallibly aſſiſted; the former is repugnant to common ſenſe, for Words are equally capable of being underſtood, ſpoken, or written; the latter overthrows the poſſibility of the Scriptures being known to be the Word of God.

11. It is agreed among all Chriſtians, that although *God* in the firſt Ages of the World did reveal his mind to Men immediately by a voice or ſecret Inſpirations; yet afterwards he did communicate his mind to ſome immediately inſpired to write his Will, in Books to be preſerved for the benefit of future Ages; and particularly, that theſe Books of the New Teſtament which we now receive, were ſo written by the Apoſtles and Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt.

12. Such Writings having been received by the *Chriſtian* Church of the firſt Ages as Divine and Infallible, and being delivered down as ſuch to us, by an univerſal conſent of all Ages ſince they ought to be owned by us as the certain rule of Faith; whereby we are to judge, what the Will of God is in order to our Salvation; unleſs it appear, with an evidence equal to that whereby we believe thoſe Books to be the word of God, that they were never intended for that end, becauſe of their Obſcurity or Imperfection.

13. Although we cannot argue againſt any particular way of Revelation, from the neceſſary Attributes of God; yet ſuch a way as Writing being made choice of by him, we may juſtly ſay, that it is repugnant to the nature of the Deſign, and the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God to give infallible aſſurance to Perſons in writing his Will, for the benefit of Mankind, if thoſe Writings may not be underſtood by all Perſons, who ſincerely endeavour to know the meanning of them, in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their Salvation.

14. To ſuppoſe the Books ſo written to be imperfect, *i. e.* that any things neceſſary to be believed or practiſed are not contained in them, is either to charge the firſt Author of them with Fraud, and not delivering his whole mind, or the Writers, with Inſincerity in not ſetting it down, and the whole Chriſtian Church of the firſt Ages with Folly, in believing the Fulneſs and Perfection of the Scriptures in order to Salvation.

15. Theſe Writings being owned, as containing in them the whole

Will of God, ſo plainly revealed, that no ſober Enquirer can miſs of what is neceſſary for Salvation; there can be no neceſſity ſuppoſed of an infallible ſociety of Men, either to atteſt, or explain theſe Writings among Chriſtians; any more than there was for ſome Ages before *Chriſt*, of ſuch a Body of Men among the *Jews*, to atteſt or explain to them the Writings of *Moſes* or the *Prophets*.

16. There can be no more intollerable uſurpation upon the Faith of *Chriſtians*; than for any Perſon, or Society of Men to pretend to an Aſſiſtance, as infallible in what they propoſe, as was in *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, without giving an equal degree of Evidence that they are ſo aſſiſted as *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* were, *viz.* by *Miracles* as great, publick, and convincing as theirs were; by which I mean, ſuch as are wrought by thoſe very Perſons who challenge this Infallibility, and with a deſign for the Conviction of thoſe who do not believe it.

17. Nothing can be more abſurd, than to pretend the neceſſity of ſuch an infallible Commiſſion and Aſſiſtance, to aſſure us of the truth of theſe Writings, and to interpret them; and at the ſame time to prove that Commiſſion from thoſe Writings, from which we are told nothing can be certainly deduced, ſuch an Aſſiſtance not being ſuppoſed, or to pretend, that Infaillibility in a body of Men, is not as liable to Doubts and Diſputes, as in thoſe Books from whence onlly they derive their Infallibility.

18. There can be no hazard to any Perſon, in miſtaking the meaning of any particular place in thoſe Books, ſuppoſing he uſe the beſt means for underſtanding them, comparable to that which every one runs, who believes any Perſon or Society of Men to be infallible, who are not: for in this latter, he runs unavoidably into one great Errour, and by that may be led into a Thouſand; but in the former, God hath promiſed either, he ſhall not err, or he ſhall not be damned for it.

19. The Aſſiſtance which God hath promiſed to thoſe, who ſincerely deſire to know his will, may give them greater aſſurance of the Truth of what is contained in the Books of Scripture, than it is poſſible for the greateſt Infallibility in any other Perſons to do, ſuppoſing they have not ſuch aſſurance of their Infallibility.

20. No Mans Faith can therefore be infallible, meerly becauſe the Proponent is ſaid to be infallible; becauſe the nature of *Aſſent* doth not depend upon the objective Infallibility of any thing without us, but is agreeable to the evidence we have of it in our minds; for aſſent is not built on the nature of things, but their Evidence to us.

21. It is therefore neceſſary in order to an infallible Aſſent, that every particular Perſon be infallibly aſſiſted in judging of the matters propoſed by him to be believed; ſo that the ground, on which a neceſſity of ſome external infallible Proponent is aſſerted, muſt rather make every particular Perſon infallible, if no divine Faith can be without an infallible Aſſent, and ſo renders any other Infallibility uſeleſs.

22. If no particular Perſon be infallible, in the Aſſent he gives to matters propoſed by others to him, then no Man can be infallibly ſure that the Church is infallible; and ſo the Churches Infallibility can ſignify nothing to our infallible Aſſurance, without an equal Infallibility in our ſelves in the Belief of it.

23. The Infallibility of every particular Perſon being not aſſerted by thoſe who plead for the Infallibility of a Church, and the one rendring the other uſeleſs (or if every Perſon be infallible, what need any repreſentative Church to be ſo) and the Infallibility of a Church being of no effect, if every Perſon be not infallible in the Belief of it; we are farther to enquire, what certainty Men may have in matters of Faith, ſuppoſing no external Proponent to be infallible.

24. There are different Degrees of Certainty to be attained, according to the different degrees of Evidence, and Meaſure of divine Aſſiſtance; but every Chriſtian, by the uſe of his Reaſon, and common Helps of Grace, may attain to ſo great a Degree of Certainty, from the convincing Argument of the Chriſtian Religion and Authority of the Scriptures, that on the ſame grounds, on which Men doubt of the Truth of them, they may as well doubt of the Truth of thoſe Things which they judge to be moſt evident to Senſe or Reaſon.

25. No Man, who firmly aſſents to any Things as true, can at the ſame time entertain any Suſpicion of the Falſhood of it; for that were to make him certain and uncertain of the ſame thing: It is therefore abſurd to ſay that thoſe who are certain of what they believe, may at the ſame time not know but it may be falſe; which is an apparent Contradiction, and overthrows any Faculty in us of judging of Truth or Falſhood.

26. Whatever neceſſarily proves a thing to be true, doth at the ſame time prove it impoſſible to be falſe; becauſe it is impoſſible the ſame thing ſhould be true and falſe at the ſame time. Therefore they who aſſent firmly to the Doctrine of the Goſpel as true, do thereby declare their Belief of the Impoſſibility of the Falſhood of it.

27. The Nature of Certainty doth receive ſeveral Names, either according to the Nature of the Proof or the degrees of the aſſent. Thus *moral Certainty* may be ſo called, either as it is oppoſed to *Mathematical Evidence*, but implying a firm aſſent upon the higheſt Evidence that Moral Things can receive: or as it is oppoſed to a higher degree of Certainty, in the ſame kind; ſo Moral Certainty implies only greater *Probabilities* of one ſide than the other; in the former Senſe, we aſſert the *Certainty* of Chriſtian Faith to be *moral*, but not only in the latter.

28. A Chriſtian being thus certain to the higheſt degree of a firm aſſent, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, his Faith is thereby reſolved into the Scriptures, as into the Rule and Meaſure of what he is to believe; as it is into the Veracity of God, as the ground of his believing what is therein contained.

29. No Chriſtian can be obliged under any Pretence of Infallibility, to believe any thing as a matter of Faith, but what was revealed by God himſelf, in that Book wherein he believes his will to be contained; and conſequently he is bound to reject whatſoever is offered to be impoſed upon his Faith, which hath no Foundation in Scripture, or is contrary thereto; which Rejection is no making *Negative Articles of Faith*, but only applying the general grounds of Faith to particular Inſtances; as, becauſe I believe nothing neceſſary to Salvation, but that which is contained in Scripture, therefore

no ſuch particular things which neither are there nor can be deduced thence.

30. There can be no better way to prevent Mens Miſtakes in the Senſe of Scripture, (which Men being fallible are Subject to) than the conſidering the Conſequence of miſtaking, in a matter wherein their Salvation is concerned: and there can be no ſufficient Reaſon given why that may not ſerve in matters of Faith, which God himſelf hath made uſe of, as the means to keep Men from Sin in their Lives: unleſs any imagine, that Errors in opinion are far more dangerous to Mens Souls than a vitious Life; and therefore that God is bound to take more care to prevent the one, than the other.

It followeth that,

1. There is no Neceſſity at all or Uſe, of an infallible Society of Men, to aſſure Men of the Truth of thoſe Things, which they may be certain of without it; and cannot have any greater Aſſurance, ſuppoſing ſuch Infallibility to be in them.

2. The Infallibility of that Society of Men, who call themſelves the Catholick Church, muſt be examined by the ſame Faculties in Man, the ſame Rules of Tryal, the ſame Motives, by which the Infallibility of any divine Revelation is.

3. The leſs convincing the Miracles, the more doubtfult he Marks, the more obſcure the Senſe of, either what is called the Catholick Church, or declared by it, the leſs Reaſon hath any Chriſtian, to believe upon the account of any, who call themſelves by the Name of the *Catholick Church.*

4. The more abſurd any Opinions are, and repugnant to the firſt Principles of Senſe and Reaſon, which any *Church* obtrudes upon the Faith of Men; the greater Reaſon Men ſtill have, to reject the Pretence of Infallibility in that Church, as a grand impoſture.

5. To diſown, what is taught by ſuch a Church, is not to queſtion the Veracity of God, but ſo firmly to adhere to it, as to what he hath revealed in Scriptures, that Men dare not out of Love to their Souls reject what is ſo taught.

6. Though nothing were to be believed as the Will of God, but what is by the Catholick Church declared to be ſo; yet this doth not at all concern the *Church* of *Rome*, which neither is the *Catholick Church*, nor any ſound Part or Member of it. This may ſuffice, to ſhew the Validity of the Principles, on which the Faith of Proteſtants ſtands, and the Weakneſs of thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*.

From all which it follows, that it can be nothing but wilful Ignorance, Weakneſs of Judgment, Strength of Prejudice, or ſome ſinful Paſſion, *which makes any one* forſake the Communion of the Church of *England*, to embrace that of the Church of *Rome*.

AN ANSWER
To ſeveral late
TREATISES.
Occaſioned by a Book, entituled a
DISCOURSE
CONCERNING THE
IDOLATRY
Practiſed in the
Church of Rome,
AND
The Hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it.

THE General Preface.

IT is not for any Pleaſure I take in Controverſie, nor out of a Reſolution to maintain what I have once written, that I expoſe my ſelf again to the Cenſures of ſome, and the Rage of others, in Defence of our Church againſt the Church of Rome: *But out of a juſt Senſe of the Weight and Goodneſs of the Cauſe I have undertaken; which (if my Affection to it hath not ſtrangely blinded my Judgment) doth highly concern us as Men, as Engliſh Men, and as Chriſtians. For it is the Cauſe of Senſe and Reaſon, againſt the abſurd Doctrines they impoſe on both; it is the Cauſe of our Nation againſt the Uſur-*

pation and Tyranny of a foreign Power; it is the Cauſe of the true Faith and Chriſtianity, againſt the Errors and Corruptions of the Roman *Church. To abandon ſuch a Cauſe as this, were to betray the Things which ought to be moſt dear to us: For we cannot be reconciled to that Church on any eaſier Terms, than renouncing our Senſe and Reaſon, enſlaving our Country, and hazarding our Salvation.* And what can they give us in Exchange for theſe?

It was the laſt of thoſe three Heads, which gave Occaſion to the late ſo much railed at, and ſo little confuted Book: Which no ſooner appeared, but as if ſome dreadful Monſter had riſen out of the Earth, ſome croſſed themſelves and kept as far out of the ſight of it, as they could; others made hideous Out-cryes and grievous Complaints; and the more fearful ſort were forbidden either looking on it, or entertaining any diſcourſe about it. Upon which I pleaſed my ſelf that I had not added another Chapter to the Book; for if that Number had agreed with the Ten particulars, it had paſſed among them for the Beaſt with ſeven Heads and ten Horns; *and they would have been glad their* City upon ſeven Hills *could have been ſo excuſed. But this unuſual Noiſe and Clamour awakened the Curioſity of many who love to ſee ſtrange Sights; and that which otherwiſe might have been wholly neglected as a Book, was enquired after and looked into; being repreſented as a Monſter.*

But when they found that this evil Spirit (as they accounted it) which themſelves had raiſed, was not to be laid again by hard Words and ill Language; they began to conſider what other Courſe was to be taken to ſuppreſs it. And forthwith there ſtarts up a young Sophiſter among them, and bids them be of good Heart; for by letting flye at him ſome Squibs and Crackers, he did not queſtion, but he ſhould put this Monſter into ſuch a Rage, as to make him fall upon himſelf; which deſign being highly approved; in a ſhort time came forth that dapper piece, called Doct. Stillingfleet againſt *Doct.* Stillingfleet. *It was a notable Plot, and cunningly managed, as the Reader may ſee by the following Anſwer to it. After him a graver Perſon undertakes the Service; but as* Haſenmullerus *tells us, when* Ignatius Loyola *ſent one of his Brethren at* Rome *to diſpoſſeſs a Perſon, he gave him this inſtruction, that* he ſhould be ſure to come behind the Devil, if he would drive him out; *accordingly this* N. O. *ſteals quite behind my Book, and began to confute it at the wrong end, hoping by that means to drive out the evil Spirit which he ſuppoſed to lodge in the Body of it. Which he hath performed with great Dexterity and Succeſs, as the* Reader *may be fully ſatisfied in the Reply here following. Theſe two I undertook, before any other appeared, and intended to have publiſhed theſe two Anſwers by themſelves; but finding others that had written againſt me on the ſame Argument I was willing to bring as much as I could together to prevent Confuſion or Repetition. All which relating to the Principles of Faith, and the Reſolution, and Rule of it, I made account to have diſpatched at once; but finding the Book begin to ſwell into too great a Bulk, I have reſpited ſome Parts of it to another Opportunity.*

Haſenmull. hiſt. Jeſuit. ordin. c. 8.

When thoſe two Men had done their Feats, an antient and experienced Exorciſt; (and yet for all that no Conjurer) ſaw plainly this Spirit muſt be conjured down; and therefore knowing the great

Efficacy of Charms, he gives his Book the Title of ΤΩ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΩ Stillingfleeton. *Which Words put me almoſt in as great a fright as the* Holy Chair *would have done; I began to conſider, whether* Mengus *or any other of their skilful Men had ever uſed thoſe Emphatical Words before; but I am willing to believe the ſole Invention of* J. V. C. *And I doubt not, but they will do well hereafter in* Exorciſms, *eſpecially after the* holy Potion, *when the Perſon to be diſpoſſeſſed is made ſufficiently ſick with Rue and Salet-oyl and other excellent Phyſick for Devils. I find by ſome of their Authors, it is a great matter to get the right Name of the Spirit; this* J. V. C. *hath hit unluckily, in calling this Monſter* the Leviathan ſporting in the Waters, *ſince they have thrown out ſo many empty Veſſels for him to play with. And his three Books of Charms, have been no unpleaſant Entertainment; But he is gone; and I love not to tread hard on the Graves of my Enemies. What there appears material in him (if any thing do ſo) I ſhall conſider it in its proper place; chiefly for the ſake of my judicious Adverſary* Dr. T. G. *who* [illegible] *the firſt, and I think the only Perſon that hath diſcovered his Book to be a* Learned Treatiſe.

But my generous Adverſaries, finding ſo little Succeſs on ſingle Attempts, they next fall upon me with Chain-ſhot; viz. A Collection of ſeveral Treatiſes againſt Doct. Stillingfleet. *To make up the number, they bring in one before publiſhed, to try an Experiment what Force they can have in conjunction, which had none of it ſelf.*

The firſt undertaker therein, is, the very calm and (according to his new Chriſtian Name) Serene *Mr.* Creſſy, *the Man that hath learnt to mortifie Paſſions by myſtical Divinity; but is ſo far from being ſublimed and rectified, by that Chymical way of Devotion, that he ſeems yet to remain in the very Dregs of them: the Man, that hath ſo accuſtomed himſelf to Legends, that he cannot write againſt an Adverſary, without making one of him. And although there be many very pleaſant ones in his Church Hiſtory, yet I hardly think there are many more wonderful, than (if his Inſinuations had any colour of Truth in them) the firſt Part of my Life had been. For by making me ſo active in thoſe times, when I was uncapable of Underſtanding what they were, he ſeems to repreſent me as one that had ſo paſſionate a Zeal for Preſbytery in my Cradle, that I would ſuck of none but a* Scottiſh *Nurſe; that the firſt Word I pronounced was* Covenant; *that I would go to School to none but* Lay-Elders; *and was curſing* Meroz *before the* Parliament *at eight years old. Is not this a hopeful Beginning for a good Legend?* Will *he, ſaith he,* or they damn the execrable Covenant? *as though, I had ever any thing to do with it but when I renounced it! If I ſhould tell him, that as great a Friend as he takes me to have been to Preſbytery and the late times, even then I was entered into Epiſcopal Orders by a moſt worthy and learned Prelate of our* Church, *that, I never ſubſcribed any Addreſs to the Uſurpers, as ſome in the World have done, and thoſe who would now be thought the Kings moſt loyal Subjects; that I never drew off any one Perſon from their Allegiance to the King to ſubmit to the Popes* Nuncio, *(let thoſe who did it clear themſelves) even ſuch an Apology would give too much Countenance to ſo pitiful a Calumniator. I thank him that he hath not charged me with laying the firſt Platform*

S.C. p. 79.

form of Preſbytery at Geneva, *or having a hand in the firſt and ſecond Admonitions in the Days of Queen* Elizabeth; *and I might as well charge him with the* Gunpowder Treaſon, *as he doth me with any thing about the* Covenant. *By this we may gueſs what Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory we are to expect from him, who writes ſo at random about the matters of our own times. But the Man is to be pitied; he was under one of Mother* Juliana's *Fits, he writ with a good mind, but he knew not what. Some vent muſt be given to a violent Fermentation, elſe the Veſſel might burſt aſunder; and I hope the good Man is ſomewhat more at eaſe, ſince he purged away ſo much Choler. I aſſure him I can with Pleaſure read what he wrote with Rage; and laugh at the violence of ſuch Paſſions, which like a Gun ill charged may give Fire and make a great Noiſe, but doth the greateſt Miſchief to him that holds it. If I would purſue him through all his Heats, I muſt undergo the* Ordeal-tryal, *touch Firebrands without hurting my ſelf: which although I might do, yet I know my Adverſaries are ſo implacable, that even that would not convince them of my Innocence. I leave him therefore to grow cooler and wiſer; but I beſeech him for his own ſake, that he would* S.C. p.46. *attempt no more the juſtifying* the Union of nothing with nothing, *and for the ſake of Religion, that he would not call* God *any more* an incomprehenſible Nothing; *a Deſcription fit only for the Atheiſts Catechiſm. If there were any thing in his railing Book which looked like Reaſon or Argument, I might perhaps at my leiſure be perſwaded to anſwer it; though I do not love to have to do with mad Men, no not in their lucid Intervals.*

The next that follows, is one that goes about to vindicate the Roman Churches Devotions and Doctrine of Repentance and Indulgences, *he is a meer pattern of Meekneſs compared with* S. C. *he writes pertinently and without the others Bitterneſs and Paſſion. His great endeavour is to clear the honour of his* Church, *from the abſurd Doctrines and Practices charged upon it. And the force of all, he* *Roman Doctrine of Repentance, &c. vindicated p. 19.* *ſaith lies in this,* That where the Church hath defined nothing in her Councils, it is to no purpoſe to object that ſuch Doctrines are taught by ſome in it; for thoſe who defend their Separation from the Communion of a Church by reaſon of its erroneous or corrupt Doctrines muſt make it appear, that thoſe are taught by it, and the Belief of them alſo exacted from its Subjects. *To this purpoſe* S. C. *likewiſe (in ſome of his lucid Intervals) and I perceive this is become a common Topick among them, to take off the* odium *of ſuch Opinions and Practices as they are willing enough, but aſhamed to defend, which I ſhall in this place briefly remove. The thing I was to prove was that Perſons in the Communion of the* Roman Church *do run great hazard of their Salvation: for which I inſtanced particularly in ſeveral Opinions and Practices which are very apt to hinder a good Life which is neceſſary to Salvation. Now a twofold Queſtion here ariſes.* 1. *Whether the* Church *may juſtly be charged with thoſe Doctrines and Practices?* 2. *Whether, although the* Church *may not directly be charged to have decreed them in her Councils, yet ſo much Countenance and Encouragement be not commonly given to them in that* Church, *that particular Perſons do run great hazard of their Salvation by reaſon of them? For which we are to conſider, that it hath been the method of the* Roman Church *to allow many more things in common Belief and Practice, than it hath dared for very ſhame to decree in Councils,* *eſpecially when ſuch things have been objected by her Enemies. In this caſe it hath been thought the moſt prudent Courſe for the Councils to ſpeak deceitfully and in general Terms, ſo as to give as little Advantage as may be to their Enemies, and yet to retain ground enough to uphold their former Opinions and Practices: Which ſtill continuing in Vogue and Reputation, become ſo much the more dangerous to Mens Souls, becauſe their Councils having had opportunity to have declared effectually againſt them were ſo far from it, that by their doubtful Expreſſions they have left ground enough for the continuance of them. Now from hence the Directors of Conſcience among them frame their Opinions, and the People think it their Duty blindly to follow them; and ſuppoſing any one among them ſhould ſcruple any ſuch Doctrine or Practice, to whom muſt he reſort but to his Confeſſors, and will any ſuch dare to condemn what is generally received, although not decreed by Councils? or if he ſhould, dare any Perſon rely on his private judgment when it is contrary to the moſt received Doctrine or Practice? Beſides the Promiſes of Infallibility are ſuppoſed by them to be primarily made to the* Church, *and only by way of repreſentation to the Council; and therefore Doctrines or Practices generally received and allowed by the Teachers of the* Church *and the Guides of Conſcience, muſt be received by them as true and good; for otherwiſe thoſe Promiſes would fail to the* Church *in its diffuſive Capacity, and conſequently, ſuppoſing no General Council, it were poſſible for the moſt erroneous and pernicious Doctrines and Practices to prevail in the* Church, *which muſt utterly overthrow all pretence to Infallibility. But in our preſent caſe we need not run ſo far, for I ſhall here prove that in the moſt material points inſiſted on by* N. O. *viz.* the Doctrine of the efficacy of the Sacraments *ex opere Operato*, and of Indulgences, *we do juſtly charge the* Church *of* Rome *even in the decrees of her Councils with laying ſuch a Foundation, as doth overthrow the neceſſity of a good Life. The way he takes to vindicate thoſe Points from this conſequence is this, That the* Sacramenta mortuorum, *viz.* Baptiſm and Penance which confer juſtifying Grace, do require a Subject rightly diſpoſed; *And the* Sacramenta vivorum, *viz.* Confirmation, Euchariſt and Extreme Unction, do require the Receiver to be actually to be in a State of Grace; *the ſame, he ſaith of* Indulgences, that the benefit of them doth ſuppoſe a Man put into a State of Grace by the Sacrament of Penance; *ſo that the whole matter is put upon this Iſſue, whether their Doctrine concerning the Conditions by which a Man may be put into a* State *of Grace, be not ſuch as doth overthrow the neceſſity of a good Life? And it being acknowledged that the Sacrament of Penance doth confer the Grace of Juſtification on all Perſons rightly diſpoſed for it, our only Buſineſs is to enquire what neceſſary Conditions their Church requires in order to it. For which we appeal to the words of the* Council *of* Trent, *for* Seſſion 14. c. 4. *That plainly determines, that* imperfect Contrition or Attrition although it cannot bring Men to Juſtification without the Sacrament of Penance, yet it doth diſpoſe Men for obtaining the Grace of God by the Sacrament of Penance. *If we join this now with another Decree of the ſame Council, viz.* *That the Sacraments

P. 44.
P. 47.
P. 79.
Et quamvis ſine Sacramento pœnitentiæ per ſe ad juſtificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat (attritio) tamen cum ad Dei gratiam in Sacramento Pœnitentiæ impetrandam diſponit. Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 14. c. 4.

---

* Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ Legis non continere gratiam quam ſignificant, aut gratiam ipſam non ponentibus obicem non conferre———Anathema ſit. Seſſ. 7. Can. 6.

Si quis dixerit non dari gratiam per hujus modi Sacramenta ſemper & omnibus, quantum eſt ex parte Dei, etiamſi ritè ea ſuſcipiant, ſed aliquando & aliquibus, Anathema ſit. Can. 7.

do confer Grace on all thoſe who are diſpoſed to receive it; *I leave it now to any one to judge, whether from hence it doth not neceſſarily follow, that all thoſe that have but imperfect Contrition, or bare Attrition for their Sins, are by the Sacrament of* Penance *put into a ſtate of Grace, according to the Doctrine of the* Council *of* Trent? *And how far this overthrows the neceſſity of a good Life, will appear from the explication of* Contrition *and* Attrition *given by the ſame Council.* Contrition *is defined, to be,* a grief of Mind and deteſtation of Sin committed, with a purpoſe of ſinning no more; *therefore* imperfect Contrition *or* Attrition *muſt be ſuch a grief and deteſtation of Sin paſt, as implies but an imperfect purpoſe of ſinning no more. From which it evidently follows, that by the Doctrine of this Council a Man may be put into a ſtate of Grace without ſo much as a firm or perfect purpoſe of ſinning no more. And can there be a Doctrine invented by Men that doth more effectually deſtroy the neceſſity of a good Life than this doth? For the State of Grace puts a Man actually into the Favour of God; and ſuppoſing him to fall into mortal ſin afterwards, all he needs to do, is only to repeat the ſame kind of Attrition and receive the Sacrament of Penance, and he is perfectly ſound again and reovers the Favour of God. I know the Council there ſaith, That* this Attrition muſt exclude voluntatem peccandi, *as* O. N. *obſerves; but that implies no more than a Mans not having at that time a purpoſe to ſin again; and the Council diſtinguiſhes it from the* propoſitum non peccandi de cætero, *or the* P. 45. *purpoſe not to ſin again, which the Council applies to* Contrition, *as the other to* Attrition. *And* Cajetan *himſelf quoted by* O. N. *calls it* an imperfect purpoſe of not ſinning. *So that after all the Evaſions which have been yet, or can be produced, the* Roman Churches *Doctrine of* Repentance and Indulgences *doth moſt dangerouſly obſtruct Devotion and a good Life. I deſire therefore* O. N. *and his Brethren to be a little more ſparing in their Cenſures of us as unfaithfully repreſenting the Doctrine of their* Church, *for we underſtand it much better, and repreſent it more truly, than they deſire.*

But ſuppoſing the words of the Council were ambiguous in this matter, what better help can we have to underſtand it, than the ſenſe of their moſt eminent and learned Inſtructors of Conſcience? And thoſe not of the ſingle Order of Jeſuits, *as ſome would have it believed, but of* Melch. Cano Relect. de Pœnit. part. 6. p. 932. *all ſorts among them.* Melchior Canus *who was far enough from being a Friend of the* Jeſuits, *ſaith expreſly,* although a Man knows he hath not Contrition, but bare Attrition, he may come to the Sacrament and receive Grace by it; *for which he gives this reaſon,* becauſe Baptiſm and Penance, are *Sacramenta mortuorum*; and therefore thoſe who are under mortal ſin if they have Attrition whereby the Impediment is removed may not only come to them, but go away with the Grace conferred, becauſe the Sacraments Morinus de Pœnit. Sacramento l. 8. c. 4. n. 27. always confer Grace, where the Impediment is removed. *And he is followed herein, ſaith* Morinus, *not only by* Lopez, Peſantius, Nichol. Iſambertus *Profeſſor of Divinity at* Paris, *but by the far greateſt number of their modern Divines. I ſhall not ſo much as* La Morale de Jeſuits liv. 2. ch. 2. p. 253. *mention the* Jeſuitical Caſuiſts *whoſe Teſtimonies are produced in the* Jeſuits Morals, *or* Provincial Letters, *ſuch as* Fillilutius, Amicus, Sa, Layman Tho. Moral l. 5. tract. 6. c. 2. ſect. 2. Eſcobar, Bauny, *&c. But I ſhall name ſome of far greater Authority among them.* O. N. *frequently cites* Paul Layman *with expreſſions of Eſteem, and he determines that* true Contrition is not neceſſary to the Sacrament of Penance after the commiſſion of mortal ſin, but Attrition is ſufficient although a Man know it to be only Attrition. *If they had made Attrition only neceſſary to the Sacrament of Baptiſm, they might have pleaded, that they had not deſtroyed the neceſſity of a good Life afterwards to preſerve the Grace conveyed in Baptiſm; but we ſee in the caſe of mortal Sin afterwards* toties quoties *no more is neceſſary but a new Act of* Attrition, *and that not only when a Man miſtakes it to be* Contrition; *but though a Man knows it to be bare* Attrition. *I confeſs* Cardinal Tolet, *although he aſſerts the ſubſtance of the Doctrine, yet he ſaith,* Attrition only ſerves when it is miſtaken for Contrition; *but this* Morinus *tells us the later Divines laugh at and explode.* Cardinal Lugo *not only contends for the Doctrine, but aſſerts it to be the Doctrine of the* Council *of* Trent, *viz.* That Attrition with the Sacrament of Penance is ſufficient for the Grace of Juſtification; *and quotes* Suarez, Vaſquez and Meratius, *as ſufficiently proving from the words of the* Council, that Attrition is the next diſpoſition to the Grace of Juſtification conveyed by the Sacrament; *and this* Attrition *he there ſhews againſt* Sylvius, *doth not imply* an imperfect Love of God above all, *which is directly contrary to* O. N. *And in another place he proves,* that a Man is not bound always to Contrition for his ſins, although they be mortal; *for ſaith he,* if he were, then a Man having Attrition cannot be excuſed, but only by invincible Ignorance from a new mortal Sin in coming to the Sacrament of Penance without Contrition, becauſe ſome time is commonly ſuppoſed to intervene between a Mans Attrition and his Juſtification by the Sacrament, in which time he would ſin mortally by omitting Contrition, if he were obliged to it; but this, *ſaith he*, is againſt the common opinion of Divines, that a Man contracts any new guilt by omitting Contrition. *Nay, he afterwards determines,* that a Man that hath received the Sacrament of Penance with bare Attrition is not bound, under the guilt of mortal Sin, for omitting it, to an act of Contrition at the point of Death? which is, *he ſaith*, the commonly received opinion among them, and he quotes Diana, Coninch, Becanus, Layman, Fagundez, Faber, Turrianus, Salas *and others for it. The great Argument he brings, is,* becauſe Confeſſors do not think themſelves obliged to put Men in mind of an Act of Contrition at that time as neceſſary, as common Experience ſhews. *And are not ſuch Confeſſors excellent Guides to Heaven the mean while? If they be, they have found out a much broader way and wider gate than ever Chriſt intended. What not one ſingle Act of Contrition neceſſary! No, not at the point of Death! What Pity it is for Sinners, you have not the keeping of Heaven-gates? How do they want the Sacrament of Penance in Hell, for no doubt there is* Attrition *good ſtore there! But above all of them, commend me to honeſt* Gregor. de Valentiâ, *who not only makes Contrition unneceſſary, but ſaith,* it is rather a hindrance to the effect of the Sacraments. *From whence* Morinus *juſtly infers,* that a Confeſſor ought not to perſwade the Penitent to Contrition; nor the Penitent to endeavour after it. *Nay,* Morinus *ſhews,* that grave Men and Famous in their Church do aſſert, that a Penitent having received the Sacrament of Penance, is not bound to ſo much as one Act of Contrition or the Love of God in order to his Reconciliation with God. *Yea,* although a Man hath hated God to the laſt Act of his Life if he receives

Tolet. Summ. Caſ. l. 3. c. 4.

Morinus de Pœnit. l. 8. c. 4. n. 1.

Lugo de Pœnit. diſp. 5. ſect. 9. n. 130, 135.

O. N. p. 45.

Lugo diſp. 7. ſect. 11. n. 201.

Sect. 13. n. 263.

Greg. de Valent. Tom. 4. diſp. 7. q. 8. pun. 4. ſect. Secundo poteſt.

Morin. de pœnit. l. 8. c. 4. n. 15.

Id. ib. n. 26.

receives the Sacrament of Penance, they deny that it is neceſſary for him to be contrite for his Sins or to love God. *Nothing could go beyond this but what follows in him,* That the Excellency of the Evangelical Sacraments above the legal conſiſts in this, that the Evangelical Sacraments have freed us from the moſt heavy Yoke of Contrition and the Love of God. *O admirable Guides of Conſcience! I do not at all queſtion, but* Jews, Turks *and* Heathens *have a much better and truer Notion of* Repentance, *than theſe Men*; *the* Pagan Philoſophers *were* Chriſtians *to them. And what Injury have I done them now, in charging ſuch things upon them which obſtruct Devotion, and overthrow the neceſſity of a good Life? For I hardly think it poſſible to contrive a Doctrine more effectual for that end, than to tell Men that the Sacraments of the Goſpel do free Men from that heavy yoke of Contrition and the Love of God.*

Sacramentorum Evangelicorum ſupra legalia præſtantiam & prærogativam in hoc potiſſimum fulgent, quod Evangelica graviſſimo Contritionis, & Directionis Dei jugo nos liberaverint. Morin. de Pænit. l. 8. *c.* 4. *n.* 26.

But ſuppoſing there were no ſuch Foundation for this Doctrine in the Council *of* Trent, *as we ſee there is, would there be no danger to Mens Salvation, if their Confeſſors generally told them theſe things and they knew it to be the current Opinion among them? Is there no danger of* falling into the ditch when the Blind lead the Blind, *unleſs a general Council expreſly allow of it? Is there no danger by* Empiricks *and* Mountebanks, *unleſs the whole* Colledge *of* Phyſitians *approve them? And of all ſorts of* Empiricks, *the worſt are ſuch* Caſuiſts *and* Confeſſors. *Is there no way to magnify the* Sacerdotal *Office, unleſs they have a Power to* trepan *Souls into eternal Flames for want of true Repentance; by making them believe the Prieſts Abſolution with bare* Attrition *will make all even with God? Or is this Doctrine only a* Decoy *to draw* great Sinners *into your Nets? And all this while is your* Church *innocent, which at leaſt ſees and will not reform theſe things? In* A. D. 1665. 24. *of* September *and* 18. May, 1666. *the* Congregation *of the* Inquiſition *at* Rome *under* Alexander VII. *took upon them to cenſure forty five ſeveral* Propoſitions *of the late* Caſuiſts, *as ſcandalous and pernicious to the Souls of Men, but not one of them relates to this Doctrine of* Repentance, *although the* Janſeniſts *in* France *had complained of it. Whence could this ariſe but from looking on it as the Doctrine of their* Church? *Indeed I find that on* May 5. 1667. *The Pope cauſed a* Decree *to be publiſhed* ſtraitly forbidding all Perſons in their debates about Attrition, to condemn each other; *but it is worth our while to underſtand, what this Controverſie was, viz.* Whether bare Attrition doth require an act of the Love of God; *and* although the Negative *be there ſaid to be* the more common Opinion, yet the Pope would not have the others that affirmed it to be cenſured. *But not the leaſt Word againſt the Sufficiency of bare* Attrition. *Are any of the Books cenſured which aſſert this Doctrine? Nay, they are publiſhed with great Approbations. Are any of the Defenders of it diſcountenanced? Nay, they are Perſons in the higheſt Eſteem, Dignity, and Authority among them. Are any Cautions given to Confeſſors to beware of theſe Doctrines? Nay, theſe very Books are purpoſely written and approved for their Inſtruction and Uſe. And if their* Church *be Innocent after all this, ſo was the* Jewiſh Church *in our Saviour's time; for the Corruptions that were then among them had no Decree of the* Sanhedrin, *that I find, for them; it was only their* Schoolmen *and* Caſuiſts, *the* Scribes *and*

Index expurg. Alex. 7. n. 87. 88.

Phariſees *which introduced them. And yet our Saviour thought Mens Souls in danger, when he bid them* beware of the leaven of the Phariſees. *I confeſs, when we debate the Cauſes of Separation from their Communion, we think it then reaſonable to alledge no more, than what they impoſe on all to believe and practiſe (and we have enough of all Conſcience in that kind, without going farther) but when we repreſent the Hazard of Salvation to particular Perſons, we may then juſtly charge them with the pernicious Doctrines and Practices which are received and allowed among them, although not decreed by the* Church *in Councils. For otherwiſe it would be juſt, as if one ſhould ſay to a Man, that asked him, whether he might ſafely travel thro' ſuch a Country?* yes, without doubt you may, for although there be abundance of Thieves and High-way-men, yet the Prince or the State never approved them, or gave them licence to rob Travellers. *Do you think any Man would venture his Perſon or his Purſe, on no better Security? Yet ſuch Security as this, if it were true is all that ſuch moderate Men as* O. N. *or his Brethren can give as to the* Roman Church; *for they dare not deny the bad Conſequence of the Doctrines and Practices charged upon them, but only ſay,* The Church hath not decreed them. *So much I thought neceſſary to ſay to this neweſt and moſt plauſible Pretence, which is made uſe of by the beſt Advocates for the* Roman Church.

And now farewell to Moderation; for the two next which appeared on the Stage againſt me, were two Jeſuits; *the one ſent over a Book, which if we look only at the bulk and thickneſs was a very ſubſtantial one, called by an odd* Antiphraſis, Reaſon and Religion: *I have endeavoured to draw off all the* Spirit *I could find in it, in the following diſcourſes, but I am forced to leave a vaſt quantity of Phlegm and* Caput Mortuum *behind. I ſhall ſay no more of him here, having occaſion to ſpeak ſo much of him in the Diſcourſes about the Principles of Faith, which will in a little time be ready to appear.*

The other is the ſtout Defender of Ignatius Loyola *and the whole* Order *of* Jeſuits; *What one Man undertake to defend the* Jeſuits *as to their* Principles *and* Practices! *and that in this Age, which ſo well underſtands their Maxims and Conduct! and in* England *too, where thoſe of other* Orders *and the* Secular Prieſts *love them ſo dearly! But nothing is too brave or difficult, for a* Jeſuit *to attempt, however he comes off in it. As to* Ignatius Loyola, *I will come to terms with him; if what he confeſſes as to his ignorant Zeal, pious Simplicity, frequent Viſions and Extaſies, extravagant preaching, unmannerly Contempt of Superiors do not prove him a* Fanatick, *I am content to let him go. But what if* Ignatius *himſelf being grown old, did ſuſpect ſuch frequent Extaſies and Viſions for Illuſions? I deſire him to look* Ribadineira, *in his larger Life to that purpoſe. But this matter of* Fanaticiſm *muſt be referred to another place. I ſhall now only give a taſt of the* Jeſuits *excellent way of defending the Principles deſtructive to Government which I charged his* Order *with.*

Ribadin. vit. Ignat. l. 5. c. 10.

The firſt was, That Government was ſo originally in the People, that they by their Repreſentatives may call their Sovereign to an account, and alter the form of Government. *Now mark this Anſwer.* This Principle (whatſoever Truth it may have in ſpeculation) is by no means to be preached to the People, who are apt

P. 38.

enough of themſelves to ſtretch caſes, and pick quarrels with their beſt Governours, yet was it taught many Ages before the Jeſuits were ſo much as thought of. *Well fare the Man for his plain dealing; the Doctrine it ſeems is true enough, but the People are not fit to be truſted with the Management of it, no* not in their Places and Callings; *no, no, let the* Jeſuits *alone with theſe things, they know juſt the very nick of time, when to be Judges and Executioners too.*

P. 39. *The next Principle is,* the Popes Power of depoſing Princes, *to which he again anſwers roundly.* You are then to know, Sir, that the Doctrine was long ago taught by almoſt all Orders and Profeſſions, Seculars, Regulars, Divines, Lawyers, before the Jeſuits were in Being. *A very Catholick Doctrine it ſeems it is! What a ſtir do other People make with mincing this matter, I know not how; give me a Man that ſpeaks out, and lets Princes underſtand what their general is in this matter, leſt they may poſſibly be deceived, as though it were only the bold Aſſertion of ſome few Perſons among them.* What Wonder then, *ſaith he,* if *Bellarmin* and three or four more Jeſuits were carryed away with ſuch a Torrent of Doctors who went before them? *Nay, in my Opinion the only Wonder is, how any Perſons among them dare think otherwiſe, this Doctrine having as he tells us, ſo Catholick a Conſent to the Truth of it. But in earneſt, Sir, is the Doctrine true, or falſe?* Nay, Sir, I beſeech you to excuſe me in that: *for as he ſaith, afterwards* about the Popes Power of abſolving Subjects, I beg leave to wave ſuch P. 50. curious Controverſies: *What, a* Jeſuit *beg leave to wave* curious Controverſies! *What is become of all their vaſt Tomes of Scholaſtical and Caſuiſtical Divinity? Are no* curious Controverſies *handled in them? And were you bred up among them and yet hate* Controverſies *meerly becauſe* curious? *No, no. We underſtand you better than ſo. That is only a* curious Controverſie *with you which endangers your Safety, if you ſpeak out, for it is a needleſs kind of Curioſity for a Man to betray himſelf. Here in theſe* practical Countries *it is ſometimes dangerous ſpeaking Truth in their Senſe; but at ſuch a* ſpeculative Place *as* Rome *is, there thoſe may be wholſome and Catholick Truths,* P. 4c. *which here are but Niceties and Curioſities.* But doth he not ſay, the Jeſuits have ſolemnly renounced the Doctrine? *Yes, but have a care how far you believe him: we poor ſimple Iſlanders might underſtand by this, that they had declared it to be falſe and pernicious. There is no ſuch matter I will aſſure you, but upon the ſtirs in* France *they renounced the publiſhing it, they renounced it as they were in* France, *but thought it good Doctrine at* Rome: *they are forbidden to treat any more of it, becauſe of the Odiouſneſs of it to Princes, and that is all the* renouncing *they ever meant.*

The Third Principle is, the Lawfulneſs of killing Kings, *as to which, he ſaith,* he cannot name the Perſon that ever taught it in thoſe Terms: *a good Reaſon for that, becauſe when they would have them killed they call them* Tyrants. *And ſo he grants* Dominicus Soto *and* Mariana *have aſſerted it, he might have named more if he had pleaſed. I could not deſire a more pleaſant Task, than to purſue him through the Remainder of his Diſcourſe, wherein he undertakes to vindicate the* Jeſuits *Practices, but theſe have been ſo much expoſed by Men of their own Religion, that I may ſpare my*

Pains in this Preface; and we may eaſily gueſs how hard he was put to it, when he makes the Letter of the Biſhop *of* Angelopolis *to be forged at* Port-royal *by the* Janſeniſts. *And thus he hath ſhifted the Fault from the* Indies to Europe, *and to vindicate ſome Papiſts there from Idolatry, he charges others here with Forgery. And yet to this as a full Anſwer, the late* Anſwerer *of the* ſeaſonable Diſcourſe *doth referr us. And out of his admirable Learning and Skill in Hiſtory deſires his Adverſary, for his Satisfaction that there can be no danger of reſuming Abby Lands if Popery ſhould return,* to go into *Germany* where there are ſo many Papiſt and Proteſtant Princes, Noble-men and Gentlemen, that have (eſpecially ſince the Treaty at *Munſter*) either Biſhopricks, Abbeys or the like confirmed to them by the Pope. *How! confirmed to them by the Pope! What will not theſe Men dare to ſay? I perceive* Ignorance *ſerves them for other purpoſes than meerly to be the* Mother of Devotion. *If at leaſt this worthy Author could be Ignorant of ſo notorious a thing as* Pope Innocents Bull *publiſhed on purpoſe to* Null the Treaty at *Munſter, as* prejudicial to the Catholick Religion, to the Apoſtolical See, to Churches and other Holy Places and Perſons and Eccleſiaſtical Rights. *In the Body of the* Bull *he ſaith,* that his Nuncio there (*who was afterwards Pope* Alexander *VII.*) did proteſt againſt theſe Articles, as void, null, unjuſt, and agreed upon by Perſons that had no Power, and that they were to be ſo looked on by all. But the Pope did not think this ſufficient, *but declares* all thoſe Articles that related to liberty of Religion, Church-lands, or any Eccleſiaſtical Rights, or brought any the leaſt prejudice to them, or might be thought or pretended ſo to do, to be null, void, invalid, unjuſt, damned, reprobate, vain, and without any force or power, and that they ſhall remain ſo for ever; and that no Perſon, though never ſo much ſworn to obſerve thoſe Articles ſhall be bound by ſuch Oath; no right, title, plea, preſcription, ſhall accrue to any by virtue of them: And therefore out of the Plenitude of Apoſtolical power he doth abſolutely damn, reprobate, null and caſſate all thoſe Articles, and proteſts before God of the nullity of them; and reſtores all Perſons and Places to their antient poſſeſſions notwithſtanding them, *with very much more to the ſame purpoſe. This was dated at* Rome apud Sanctam Mariam Mariam Majorem ſub Annulo Piſcatoris die 26 Novemb. *and ſolemnly publiſhed there the third of* Jan. 1651. *in the eighth Year of his* Pontificat. *Call you this, Sir, the Popes confirming them! Is it credible that he who in the beginning of his Anſwer had charged the late Proteſtant Books, (which he moſt ingeniouſly calls* Libels*) to be* crammed with nothing elſe but what we know to be falſe, *ſhould within a few Pages have the confidence to affirm in the face of the World ſo notorious an untruth? But I leave this ingenious Author, to be Chaſtiſed for this and other his extravagancies, by his worthy Adverſary, and return to my own.*

P. 21.

P. 13.

Sanctiſſimi Domini N.D. Innocentii Divina Providentia Papæ 10. *Declaratio nullitatis Articulorum Nuperæ Pacis Germaniæ Religioni Catholicæ, Sedi Apoſtolicæ, Eccleſiis, aliiſque Locis piis ac Perſonis, & Juribus Eccleſiaſticis quomodo libet præjudicialium. Romæ ex Typographiâ Reverend. Cameræ Apoſtolicæ.* A.D. 1651.

After all theſe unſucceſsful attempts, at laſt the Knight *himſelf reſolves to encounter the* Dragon; *and accordingly he buckles on his armour, mounts his Steed, and, according to all antient and modern Pictures of the combat, directs his lance into the very mouth of it; wiſely conſidering, if the Head were mortally wounded, the whole Body would fall to the ground. After him at a convenient diſtance follows his Squire* J. S. *who had a particular ſpight at the* Dragons

Tayl, *and without fear or wit falls unmercifully upon it, and in his own opinion, hath chopt it into a Thouſand pieces. But ſuch miſchievous Creatures whoſe ſtrength lies ſcattered in all their parts, do often riſe up when they are triumphed over as dead, and give their moſt deadly wounds, when they are thought to lie gaſping for breath.*

P. 312.

It happened that when T. G'*s Anſwer to the firſt part of my Book came out, I was before engaged in the Defence of the Proteſtant Principles of faith againſt the Guide in Controverſies and* E. W. (*the Author of* thoſe two learned Treatiſes *as* T. G. *calls them,* Proteſtancy without Principles, and Religion and Reaſon) *part of which being then in the Preſs, I was forced to go through with that, before I could take his Book into conſideration. And thereupon I reſolved to diſpatch all thoſe which relate to the Principles of Faith together; and then to proceed to the Principles of Worſhip in anſwer to him, which* (*God willing*) *I intend as ſoon as the former part is finiſhed.*

All that I ſhall take notice of him here, is to repreſent the ingenuity of his dealing with me in his Preface, wherein he charges me with diſſenting from the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in accuſing the Church of *Rome* of Idolatry. *And by this one Inſtance I deſire the Reader to judge what Candour and Sincerity he is to expect in his Book.*

Book of Hom. ſecond Tom. p. 40.

For the ſenſe of the Church of England, *I appealed to the* Book *of* Homilies: *Not to any doubtful, or general, or ſingle Paſſage therein, but to the deſign of one of the largeſt and moſt elaborate* Homilies *in the whole* Book; *conſiſting of three ſeveral Parts, the laſt of which is ſaid not to be meerly for the People, but for the inſtruction of thoſe who were to teach them. The deſign of that laſt part is thus ſet down.* 1. That Popiſh Images and the Idols of the Gentiles are all one concerning themſelves. 2. That they have been and be worſhipped in our time in like form and manner as were the Idols of the Gentiles. And for that Idolatry ſtandeth chiefly in the mind, it ſhall in this part firſt be proved that our Image-maintainers, have had, and have the ſame Opinions and Judgment of Saints whoſe Images they have made and worſhipped as the Gentiles Idolaters had of their Gods; and afterwards ſhall be declared that our Image-maintainers and Worſhippers have uſed and uſe the ſame outward Rites, and manner of honouring, and worſhipping their Images, as the Gentiles did uſe before their Idols, and that therefore they commit Idolatry, as well inwardly as outwardly, as did the wicked Gentiles Idolaters; *and this that* Homily *is intended for the proof of: which it doth very fully. But, ſaith* T. G. why did I not appeal for the ſenſe of our Church to the 39 Articles? *As though the approbation of* the Book of Homilies *were not one of them, viz. the* 35. The ſecond Book of Homilies, the ſeveral Titles whereof we have joyned under this Article (*among which Titles the ſecond is this of the Peril of Idolatry*) doth contain a godly and wholeſome Doctrine and neceſſary for theſe times. *Which Articles were not only allowed and approved by the Queen, but confirmed by the ſubſcription of the hand of the Archbiſhop and Biſhops of the upper Houſe, and by the ſubſcription of the whole Clergy in the nether Houſe of Convocation* A. D. 1571. *Now I deſire* T. G. *to reſolve me whether Men of any common underſtanding would have ſubſcribed to this* Book *of* Homilies *in this manner, if they had believed the main Doctrine and Deſign of one of them* *had been falſe and pernicious? as they muſt have done if they had thought the practice of the* Roman Church *to be free from* Idolatry. *I will put the caſe, that any of the Biſhops then had thought the charge of* Idolatry *had been unjuſt, and that it had ſubverted the Foundation of Eccleſiaſtical Authority, that there could have been no* Church, *or right ordination if the* Roman Church *had been guilty of* Idolatry; *would they have inſerted this into the Articles, when it was in their power to have left it out? and that* the Homilies contained a wholeſome and godly Doctrine, *which in their Conſciences they believed to be falſe and pernicious? I might as well think that the* Council of Trent *would have allowed* Calvins Inſtitutions, *as containing a* wholeſome and godly Doctrine; *as that Men ſo perſwaded would have allowed it the* Homily againſt the Peril of Idolatry. *And how is it poſſible to underſtand the Senſe of our* Church *better, than by ſuch publick and authentick Acts of it, which all Perſons who are in any Place of Truſt in the* Church *muſt ſubſcribe, and declare their Approbation of them? This* Homily *hath ſtill continued the ſame, the Article the very ſame, and if ſo, they muſt acknowledge this hath been, and is to this day the Senſe of our Church. But ſaith* T. G. the ſubſcribing the Book of Homilies, as containing a godly and wholeſome Doctrine, doth not evince that every particular Doctrine contained in it is ſuch. *Be it ſo: but I hope it doth evince, that the Subſcribers did not think the main Doctrine of any one* Homily *to be falſe? Surely there is a great deal of Difference between ſome particular Paſſages and Expreſſions in theſe* Homilies, *and that which is the main Deſign and Foundation of any one of them. But in this caſe we are to obſerve, that they who deny the* Church *of* Rome *to be guilty of Idolatry, do not only look on the Charge as falſe, but as of dangerous Conſequence; and therefore although Men may ſubſcribe to a* Book *in general, as containing wholeſome and godly Doctrine, though they be not ſo certain of the Truth of every Paſſage in it, yet they can never do it with a good Conſcience, if they believe any great and conſiderable Part of the Doctrine therein contained to be falſe and dangerous. Such a Subſcription would be as apparently ſhuffling and diſhoneſt as is the Evaſion of this Teſtimony which* T. G. *makes uſe of for want of a better.*

I ſhall in the next place ſhew the current Doctrine of the Church ever ſince the Reformation to have been agreeable to this Homily *of the* Peril of Idolatry. *In the* Injunctions *publiſhed by* K. Edward VI. A. D. 1547. *the Extirpation of Popery is called* the Suppreſſion of Idolatry and Superſtition. *In the ſecond year of* Edward VI. Arch-biſhop Cranmer *publiſhed his* Articles *of* Viſitation, *whereof the ſixth and the laſt are about* the taking away Images, Pictures, and all other Monuments of feigned Miracles, Pilgrimages, Idolatry and Superſtition. *In the ſecond* Liturgy *by* Edward VI. *after the Communion, was a* Rubrick *annexed, in which* the Adoration of the Hoſt is expreſly called Idolatry. *This is that very* Rubrick, *of which* T. G. *according to his excellent skill in the Offices of our Church, ſaith* P. 214. it is not yet more than a dozen years ſince it was inſerted into the Communion Book; *which he might have found above a* 110. *years before in the Book of* Edward VI.

In the Injunctions *of Queen* Elizabeth, A. D. 1559. *Art.* 2. *and* 23. all Shrines, Tables, Pictures, *&c.* are commanded to be taken away and deſtroyed, and all other Monuments of feigned Miracles, Idolatry and Superſtition. *And that we may not think it was only a ſudden Heat at the firſt Reformation which made them charge the* Church of Rome *with Idolatry, long after in* A form of Thankſgiving *in the* 37. *of Queen* Elizabeth, A. D. 1594. Popery is called that Idolatrous Religion: *as it was in the beginning of her Reign in the excellent* Apology for the Church of England. *And I deſire him, or any one elſe, to produce any one Biſhop or Divine of note in the* Church of England, *who during all her Reign did deny the* Church of Rome *to be guilty of* Idolatry. But why then was P. 197. it not inſerted in the 39. Articles? *in which* T. G. *obſerves,* the Adoration of Images is not rejected as Idolatry, but only as a fond thing, vainly invented, nor as repugnant to the plain Words of Scripture, but as being rather repugnant to the Word of God, which plainly gives us to underſtand, that they had done their Endeavours to find a Command, but could not. *A moſt ingenious Criticiſm! when himſelf and all others of their Divines yield, that* Adoration of Images, *which our* Church *charges them with,* Art. 22. (viz. *not barely worſhipping, but* Adoration of Images) *to be* Idolatry, *and plainly repugnant to Scripture. Were the Compoſers of our Articles ſo ſenſleſs as not to think Idolatry repugnant to Scripture; or not to think Adoration of Images to be Idolatry; or not to think the* Church *of* Rome *guilty of it, when the Article ſaith,* the Romiſh Doctrine concerning worſhipping and Adoration as well of Images as of Reliques, *&c? It is not meerly the Practice uſed in the* Church of Rome *but their very* Doctrine *concerning* Adoration of Images *which is here charged; and can any Church teach Adoration of Images, and not be guilty of Idolatry? And for his Criticiſm about being* rather repugnant, *it had been utterly loſt if he had looked into the Latin Articles where the Words are,* immo Verbo Dei contradicit; *whereby it appears, that* rather *is not uſed as a Term of Diminution, but of a more vehement Affirmation.*

I now come to the Exceptions he takes to the particular Teſtimonies I produced of the moſt eminent Biſhops and Divines of our Church, ever ſince the Reformation, who have all concurred in this Charge of Idolatry. Two parts in three he excepts againſt as incompetent Witneſſes in the Caſe: how few of the Jury would any Malefactor allow if ſuch frivolous Exceptions might ſerve his turn?

The two firſt he excepts againſt, are the two Archbiſhops Whitgift *and* Abbot *as* puritanically inclined. *But as it unhappily falls out, one of them was never mentioned by me, and the other never till now ſuſpected for a* Puritan. *The* Abbot *I mentioned, was not* George Abbot Arch-biſhop *of* Canterbury, *but* Robert Abbot *Biſhop of* Saliſbury; *and it is the firſt time we ever heard that* a Biſhop of *Saliſbury* was ſuſpended from his Metropolitical Juriſdiction. *But they of the Church of* Rome *have a Faculty of doing greater Wonders with five Words, than changing a Biſhop into an Archbiſhop. I hope he underſtands the Church he is of, better than that he hath left, or elſe we are like to have a ſad account of Hiſtory from him. But why I beſeech you, after all his Zeal and indefatigable Pains for the* Church *of* England *muſt* Archbiſhop Whitgift *be thrown away to the* Puritans? *If he had proved* T. C. *at the ſame time* Archbiſhop *of* Canterbury, *there might have been ſome Reaſon*

ſon to ſuſpect Whitgift *to have been of the* Puritan *ſide; for all the World know they were great Adverſaries on that very account of the Puritan Cauſe.* But was not *Whitgiſt* for the *Lambeth* Articles? *And what then? Are the* Dominicans Puritans *and no* Papiſts? *If your Church may have Liberty not to determine thoſe nice points, why may not ours? and ſo both Parties remain of our Church, as long as they contradict no received Articles among us. But the* Lambeth-Articles *were never intended for any more than as* Reſponſa Prudentum *to ſilence diſputes in the Univerſity. And I believe none of the* Puritan *Party after that, took* Archbiſhop Whitgift *to be a Patron of their Cauſe.*

But if theſe will not ſerve his turn, I have others ready, whom for meer ſhame he will not ſay where Puritans, *or* puritanically inclined. *And the firſt of theſe is an* Archbiſhop *too, and that is* Arch-biſhop Bancroft; *and if he be caſt out for a* Puritan, *ſurely there never was any Biſhop of the* Church *of* England. *In his Sermon preached at* Paul's Croſs, *on* 1 John 4. 1. *he hath theſe Words ſpeaking of the* Papiſts. The Popiſh falſe Prophets will ſuffer the People to try nothing, but do teach them wholly to depend on them; and to that purpoſe they have indeed three notable ſleights. Firſt they forbid them the reading of the Scriptures. And the better to be obeyed therein, they will not permit the Scriptures to be tranſlated into the vulgar Tongue. Whereof it came to paſs, that the People were ſo eaſily ſeduced, and drawn from Chriſt to the Pope; from his Merits to the Saints, and their own Merits; from his bloody Sacrifice, whereby only Sins are remitted, to their moſt dry and fruitleſs Sacrifice; from the ſpiritual Food of his Body and Blood, unto a carnal and Capernaitical Tranſubſtantiation, from the calling upon his Name to an Invocation of Saints: and from their ſure Truſt and Confidence in his Death, to a vain Imagination of the Vertue of their Maſſes, Pilgrimages, Pardons, and I know not what intolerable Superſtition and Idolatry. *I hope* Archbiſhop Bancroft *may for once paſs for no* Puritan *with* T. G. *But what will he ſay, if the only Perſons he produces as moſt partial of his ſide, do give in evidence againſt him?* Biſhop Mountague *is the firſt, whoſe Words are theſe in the Book cited by him.* Our Predeceſſors and Fathers coming late out of Popery, living near unto Papiſts and Popiſh times, converſing with them, having been muzzled and brought up amongſt them, and knowing that Images uſed to be crept unto, incenſed, worſhipped, and adored among them, *&c. What thinks he, is not this all one as to charge them with Idolatry? And more plainly in his former* Book, But whatſoever you ſay, however you qualifie the thing with gentle Words, we ſay in your practice you far exceed; and give them that Honour which is *Latria*, a part of divine Reſpect and Worſhip. *And afterwards ſaith,* the People go to it with downright Adoration, and your new Schools defend that the ſame Reſpect is due to the Repreſenter, as muſt be given to the Repreſentee. So that the Crucifix is to be reverenced with the ſelf ſame Honour that Chriſt Jeſus is. A Blaſphemy not heard of till *Thomas Aquinas* ſet it on foot. Clear theſe Enormities, and others like theſe, then come and we may talk and ſoon agree concerning Honour and Reſpect unto Reliques or Images of Saints, or Chriſt; till then we cannot anſwer it unto our Maker, to give his

P. 30.

Appeal. p. 263.

Anſwer to the Gang. p. 319.

P. 110.

Honour unto a Creature. *His next is* Pet. Heylin; *And now I hope we have at laſt hit upon a Man far enough from being a* Puritan; *yet this very Perſon gives plain Evidence againſt him. For in his fourth Sermon on the* Tares *preached at* White-hall, *January* 27. 1638. *He hath theſe Words.* So it is alſo in the point of Images, firſt introduced into the Church for Ornament, Hiſtory, and Imitation. Had they ſtaid there it had been well, and no Fault found with them.—— But when the Schools began to ſtate it, that the ſame Veneration was to be afforded to the Type and Prototype, then came the Doctrine to the growth. When and by whom, and where it was firſt ſo ſtated, is not eaſie to determine, and indeed not neceſſary. It is enough that we behold it in the Fruits. And what Fruits think you could it bear, but moſt groſs Idolatry, greater than which was never known among the Gentiles? Witneſs their praying not before, but to the Crucifix, and calling on the very Croſs; the wooden and material Croſs, both to increaſe their Righteouſneſs and remit their Sins. And for the Images of the Saints, they that obſerve with what laborious Pilgrimages, magnificent Proceſſions, ſolemn Offerings, and in a word, with what Affections, Prayers, and humble Bendings of the Body, they have been and are worſhipped in the Church of *Rome*, might very eaſily conceive that ſhe was once again relapſed into her antient Paganiſm. *With much more to the ſame purpoſe. His only Perſon remaining, is Mr.* Thorndike, *a Man of excellent Learning and great Piety, but if we ſhould grant, that he held ſome thing ſingular in this matter; what is that to the conſtant Opinion of our Church? and yet even Mr.* Thorndike *himſelf in a Paper ſent by him to ſome whom* T. G. *knows, not long before his Death, ſaith,* That, to pray to Saints for thoſe things which only God can give (as all Papiſts do) is by the proper Senſe of the Words down-right Idolatry. If they ſay, their meaning is by a Figure only to deſire them to procure their Requeſts of God: How dare any Chriſtian truſt his Soul with that Church which teaches that which muſt needs be Idolatry in all that underſtand not the Figure? *So that upon the whole matter* T. G. *cannot produce any one Perſon of our Church that hath clearly and wholly acquitted the Church of* Rome *from the Charge of Idolatry. It ſeems then our Church hath been made up of* Puritans *in* T. G's *Senſe of them. But if theſe do not ſatisfie him, what doth he think of the* Archbiſhops *and* Biſhops *and Clergy of the* Convocation, A. D. 1640. *Were all theſe* Puritans *too? And yet in the ſeventh* Canon *they have theſe Words,* And albeit at the time of reforming this Church from that groſs Superſtition of Popery, it was carefully provided that all means ſhould be uſed to root out of the minds of the People, both the Inclination thereto, and Memory thereof; eſpecially of the Idolatry committed in the Maſs, for which cauſe all Popiſh Altars were demoliſhed, *&c. What can more expreſs the Senſe of our Church, than the concurrent Opinion of* Archbiſhops, Biſhops *and* Clergy *of both* Provinces *met in* Convocation? *When we ſee they ſo lately charged the* Church *of* Rome *with* Idolatry.

Let us now conſider what Exceptions he takes againſt the other Witneſſes produced by me. Jewel, Bilſon, Davenant, *all eminent Biſhops of our Church, and of great Learning, are caſt away at once,* *as incompetent Perſons. But why ſo? Why, ſaith* T. G. they were all excepted againſt by our late Soveraign King *Charles* the Firſt in his third Paper to *Henderſon. That is a ſhrewd prejudice indeed to their Authority to be rejected by a Prince of ſo excellent a Judgment and ſo cordial a Friend to the* Church *of* England. *But it is good to be ſure whether it be ſo or no. All that he ſaith of* Biſhop *Jewel* is this, and though I much reverence Biſhop *Jewel*'s memory, I never thought him infallible. *So then, he muſt be* Puritanically inclined; *but whence does that follow? Not ſurely* from the Kings reverencing his memory, *for that were to reflect upon the King himſelf; not* from his not thinking him infallible, *for I dare ſay, the King never thought the* Pope infallible; *muſt he needs therefore think him a* Puritan? *Surely never Man was ſuch a Friend to the* Puritans *as this* T. G. *who without any ground gives them away ſome of the greateſt Honours of our Church, and (if the Teſtimony laſt cited be of any Force to prove one a* Puritan,) *all Mankind, and himſelf too: For I plainly perceive by this Preface that he is not infallible. Yet for all this, we will not let go* Jewel, *no nor* Bilſon, Davenant, White, Uſher, Downam, *whatever* T. G. *ſaith againſt them. Indeed King* Charles *excepts againſt* Bilſon *for his Principles of Civil Government, but not a word of his Diſaffection to the Church of* England: *For* Biſhop Davenant, *the King ſaith* he is none of thoſe to whom he appealed, or would ſubmit unto, *and with very good reaſon; for the King had appealed to* the Practice of the Primitive Church, and the univerſal conſent of Fathers; *therefore* Biſhop Davenant *was a* Puritan. *It ſeems they have been all* Puritans *ſince* the Primitive Times; *and I hope the* Church *of* Rome *then hath good ſtore of them, for that is far enough from the* Fathers *or the* Primitive Church. *But how comes* Biſhop White *in for a* Puritan; *being ſo great a Friend of* Archbiſhop Laud; *why, forſooth,* Heylin reports that for licenſing Biſhop *Montagu*'s *Appello Cæſarem*, it was ſaid, that White was turned Black. *And canſt thou for thy heart, good Reader, expect a more pregnant Proof? It was a notable ſaying, and it is great pity, the Hiſtorian did not preſerve the memory of the Author of it; but by whom was it ſaid? That muſt be ſuppoſed by the* Puritans; *and could none but they be the Authors of ſo witty a ſaying? But ſuppoſe they were the* Puritans *that ſaid it? It is plain then, they thought him no ſound* Puritan, *for they hold no falling from Grace. All then that can be inferred from this witty ſaying is, that* White *ſunk in his eſteem among them by this Act. And it is not poſſible for them to have Eſteem for thoſe who are not of their own Party? Concerning* Archbiſhop Uſher, *Dr.* Heylin *was known to be too much his Enemy to be allowed to give a Character of him: And his Name will not want a due Veneration as long as Learning and Piety have any Eſteem among us.*

But he is moſt troubled what to do with Six that remain, viz. King James, Biſhop Andrews, Archbiſhop Laud, Iſaac Caſaubon, Doctor Field, *and* Doctor Jackſon; *theſe he could not for ſhame faſten the name of* Puritans *upon (as he doth with ſcorn on* Biſhop Downam, Reynolds, Whitaker, *and* Fulk; *whoſe Teſtimonies I ſaid to prevent Cavils, I need not to produce, although they are all capable of ſufficient Vindication.) For* King James, *he ſaith,* that in the place cited by me he ſaith expreſly, that what he condemns is adoring of Images, praying to them, and imagining a kind of Sanctity in them, all which are deteſted by Catholicks. *Was ever Man put to ſuch miſerable* *ſhifts? Are not theſe* King James *his words?* But for worſhipping either them, (Reliques) or Images, I muſt account it damnable Idolatry. *And doth not* King James *a little after take off their Diſtinctions and Evaſions in theſe words,* and they worſhip (forſooth) the Images of things in Being, and the Image of the true God, but Scripture forbiddeth to worſhip the Image of any thing that God created. Yea, the Image of God himſelf is not only expreſly forbidden to be worſhipped, but even to be made. Let them therefore that maintain this Doctrine, anſwer it to Chriſt at the latter Day, when he ſhall accuſe them of Idolatry; and then I doubt if he will be paid with ſuch nice Sophiſtical Diſtinctions. *Is all this nothing but to charge them with ſuch Practices which they deteſt? Doth he not mention* their Doctrine, *and* their Diſtinctions? *Did not* King James *underſtand what he ſaid, and what they did? It is plain he charges them with Idolatry in what they did, which was that I brought his Teſtimony for. The like anſwer he gives to the reſt of them,* viz. that they charged them, with what they thought they did, but the Papiſts deny that they do any ſuch thing: i. e. *in plain Terms, they charge them with* Idolatry, *but the* Papiſts *deny they commit it. And ſo they do when I charge them with it; ſo that* T. G. *by the very ſame reaſon might have acquitted me from charging them with it, and have ſpared his Book. Is not this now an admirable way of proving, that they do not charge them with* Idolatry, *becauſe the* Papiſts *deny they commit it? Who meddles with what they profeſs they do, or do not? I was to ſhew what theſe Perſons charged them with. And do any of theſe excuſe them by ſaying any Doctrine of theirs was contrary to theſe Particulars? Do they not expreſly ſet themſelves to diſprove their Diſtinctions upon which their Doctrine is founded? And ſhew the vanity of them becauſe their open and allowed Practices do plainly contradict them; and ſhew that they do give Divine Honour to Images, however in words they deny it. But this way of defending them is, as if thoſe whom* St. Paul *charges that* they profeſſed that they knew God, but in Works they denied him, *ſhould reply to him, how can we deny him in our Works, ſince we profeſs him in our Words? Juſt ſo ſaith* T. G. *how can they be charged with Idolatry, ſince they profeſs to do no ſuch thing? As though ſuch Perſons, as thoſe I mentioned, did not underſtand both what the Papiſts ſaid for themſelves and what they did notwithſtanding. And now I joyn with* T. G. in deſiring the Reader may be Judge between us, whether I have betrayed my truſt in pretending to defend the Church of *England*; and whether in charging the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry, I have contradicted the ſenſe of it? *ſince I have made it appear, that* her moſt true and genuin Sons, *the moſt remote from all ſuſpicion of diſaffection to her, or inclination to* Puritaniſm, *have concurred in the ſame charge which I undertook to make good.*

But there is one Blow yet remaining in his Preface, which I muſt endeavour to ward off, otherwiſe it will be a terrible one to the Church of England; *for* by this charge of Idolatry, he makes me to ſubvert the very Foundation of Eccleſiaſtical Authority in it. *This it is to charge home.* For, *ſaith he,* it being a received Maxime, and not being denyable by any Man of common ſenſe, that no Man can give to another that which he hath not himſelf, it lies open to the Conſcience of every Man, that if the Church of *Rome* be guilty of Hereſie, much more if guilty of Idolatry, it falls under the Apoſtles Excommunication, (*Gal.* 1. 8.) and ſo remains deprived of the Lawful Authority to uſe and exerciſe the power of Orders; and conſequently the Authority of Governing, Preaching and Adminiſtring the Sacraments, which thoſe of the *Church* of *England* challenge to themſelves, as deriv'd from the *Church* of *Rome*, can be no true and lawful Juriſdiction, but uſurped and Anti-Chriſtian. *And ſo farewell to the Church of* England, *if the Church of* Rome *were not more kind in this caſe than* T. G. *is. Hitherto we have ſeen his skill in the Affairs of our Church, and now we ſhall ſee juſt as much in the Doctrine of his own. For doth not the* Council *of* Trent *make* Orders a Sacrament? *and one of thoſe which doth imprint* an indelible Character? *And doth not that Council pronounce an Anathema againſt thoſe*, that denyed the validity of the Sacrament adminiſtred by one in mortal ſin, in caſe he obſerves the Eſſentials of it? *How then can* T. G. *eſcape Excommunication from his own Church, that denies the validity of the* Sacrament *of* Orders *in caſe of the ſin of the Givers of it? If the validity of the Sacrament doth not depend on the worth or quality of the Miniſters of it, but upon the Eſſentials and the Inſtitution of Chriſt, how can the fault of the Perſons hinder the conveyance of that Authority, which they are only the bare Inſtruments to convey? Doth* T. G. *think ſo in all other Sacraments? As in caſe of Baptiſm; that ſuppoſing the Miniſters of it have been guilty of* Hereſie *or* Idolatry, *the Sacrament loſes its Effect? Well fare then the* Donatiſts, *whoſe Opinion this was, and in whom it hath been condemned by the Church. If it be not ſo in other* Sacraments *how comes it to be thus in* Orders? *which he muſt acknowledge, to be as much a* Sacrament *as Baptiſm, or elſe he muſt renounce the* Council *of* Trent. *And it is obſervable, that the very Argument uſed by the* Donatiſts *and others, was the ſame which* T. G. *here produces*, viz. his common Maxim of Reaſon, and not denyable by any Man of common ſenſe that no Man can give to another, that which he hath not himſelf; *to which this Anſwer was given, that the* Inſtrument *was not the* giver, *but the firſt* Inſtitutor, *and in caſe the Miniſter keep to the Inſtitution, the Grace of the Sacrament may be conveyed by him though he hath it not himſelf.*

Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. 7. can. 9. ſeſſ. 23. can. 4.

V. Vaſquez. in 3. p. Thom. diſp. 137. c. 3. *n.* 20.

But, methinks, if T. G. *had forgotten the Doctrine of the* Council of Trent, *he might have looked into ſome one or other of their own Authors to have informed himſelf better of their Doctrine in this matter.* Vaſquez *hath a Chapter on purpoſe to prove, that* an Heretical, excommunicated, ſuſpended Biſhop is a ſufficient Miniſter of Ordination; *and ſaith*, that all the School-men and Summiſts are agreed in it, and that there can be no doubt at all made of it. *And did none of theſe Men underſtand the Principle that is undenyable by any Man of common ſenſe? What a back-blow is this to thoſe of his own Church? For* Vaſquez *ſaith* this is determined as a matter of Faith among them, that the validity of a Sacrament doth not depend on the Probity or Faith of the Miniſter. And he denies it to be in the power of the Church to hinder the effect of ordination in an excommunicated Biſhop, becauſe it cannot blot out his Character, or take away his Power. Eſtius *ſaith*, that no Crime how great ſoever, whether Hereſie, Schiſm, or Apoſtaſie, no cenſure how heavy ſoever, as Excommunication, can hinder the validity of Ordination by a Biſhop, although it be of thoſe who are not ſubject to his Juriſdiction, in caſe he obſerves the lawful Rites of Ordination as to the eſſence of

Vaſquez. in 3. p. Th. diſp. 243. c. 1.

Eſt. in ſentent. l. 4. diſt. 25. ſect. 3.

the Sacrament; *for this reaſon*, becauſe Ordination belongs to the power of Order, which being once received can never be loſt; but thoſe things which belong to Juriſdiction, as Abſolution and Excommunication, have no effect, where that Juriſdiction is taken away. *And this Doctrine they all ground upon St.* Auguſtin's *Diſcourſe againſt the* Donatiſts; *and upon the Practice of the* Church *at that time, which did receive thoſe who were ordained among the* Donatiſts, *without ſcrupling their Orders; as not only appears by the teſtimony of St.* Auguſtin, *but by the Decree of an* African Council *to that purpoſe; and that not only at firſt, but when the Schiſm was grown inveterate. And yet* Francis Hallier *a late Doctor of the* Sorbon, *tells us,* that the *Donatiſts* were not barely Schiſmaticks, but they were adjudged Hereticks, for aſſerting that the efficacy of Sacraments did depend upon the quality of the Perſons, and not upon the merits of Chriſt. *The ſame Author vehemently Diſputes againſt thoſe,* who aſſert that the power of Order can be loſt by the Sin of the Perſon, *and ſhews that Doctrine hath been condemned by ſeveral* Councils *before that of* Trent; *as of* Arles, *of* Orleans *and* Conſtance: *and undertakes to anſwer all the inſtances brought from Antiquity to the contrary; as either underſtood of ſuch Hereticks, which did not retain the eſſentials of the Sacrament, or only implying the fault committed in giving or receiving them at the hands of ſuch Perſons, but not any invalidity in the Sacrament it ſelf. And afterwards he proves that* Hereticks are capable of Ordination. *But if theſe, and many others of their later Writers will not ſatisfie him, I deſire him to conſult their more antient Authors,* Thomas Aquinas *determines* that Hereticks and thoſe who are cut off from the Church, may give Orders as well as adminiſter other Sacraments, *the reaſon he gives is,* that a power in Conſecration is given to a Biſhop, which can never be taken from him, *although he will not allow it to be called a* Character. *For ſeveral, eſpecially of the antient* School-men *would not have Conſecration to imprint* a new Character; *but they were never able to give an intelligible account of what they meant by the* Character *as diſtinct from that Sacramental power which was conveyed by* Conſecration, *and they granted to* be indelible *as the other was, ſome making it an* extenſion *of the* Character *of Prieſthood, others a bare* extrinſecal denomination *added to it; but however they held it ſuch as could no more be taken away than the* Character of Prieſthood. Cardinal Bonaventure *ſaith,* that the validity of Sacraments among Hereticks, was a Queſtion much in Diſpute among the antient Doctors, but that it hath been determined by St. *Auguſtin*, that they are valid if they preſerve the eſſentials of them: *And in the* matter of Ordination *he ſaith,* that the power of Orders, although it be not a diſtinct Character, yet becauſe it is built upon, it can no more be taken away than the Character it ſelf: But whatever is founded upon Juriſdiction as the power of Excommunication and Abſolution may be taken away. *But I need not mention any more particular Writers, ſince* Morinus *acknowledges,* that for Four Hundred Years the opinion of the validity of Orders conferred by Hereticks, hath only obtained in the *Roman* Church. *Before that time, he proves at large that it was more diſputable, as appears by the* Maſter *of the* Sentences, *who accounts it a* perplexed and almoſt inſoluble difficulty, becauſe of the different Opinions of Doctors about it; *but afterwards St.* Auguſtin's opinion *was generally*

Aug. l. 2. c. Epiſt. Parmen. c. 13. 17. c. Donat. l. 1. c 1. l. 3. c. 10. Aug. Epiſt. 50. Epiſt. c. Criſc. l. 2. c. 11, 12. Codex Can. Eccleſ. Afric. c. 68. Apud Balſamon. Et Zonar. p. 71. Hallier. de ordin. ſacris p. 2. Sect. 4 c. 5. ſ. 1 *n*. 4. P. 2. ſect. 3 c 2. ſect. 5, 6, 7. Sect. 4. c. 5. ſect. 1. Th. Aquin. ſup. q 38. art. 2.

Bonav. ſent. 4. diſt. 25. q. 2.

Morin. de Sacris Ordinat. par. 3. Exercit. 5. c. 1. *n*. 12.

ly received both among the School-men *and* Canoniſts ; *and is now become a matter of Faith in the* Roman *Church, at leaſt by conſequence, ſince the* Decrees *of* Councils. *And although* Morinus *will not allow* that any Decree of their Church hath paſſed in this matter, *yet he ſaith,* there hath been ſo long and ſo univerſal a conſent of Doctors in this point, that it ought to be inſtead of a Law, which they ought not to violate. *By this we may judge of the learning and skill of* T. G. *in the Doctrine of his own Church.*

Exercit. 5. c. 8. n. 7.

But if he would not look into the Controverſal Writers of their Church, yet if he had but ſearched into the Practice of the Church *either in antient or modern times, he would have been aſhamed to have made Uſe of ſuch an Argument to overthrow all Eccleſiaſtical Authority among us. I grant that in ſome tumultuous Ages of the Church Ordinations have been adjudged null through the defaults of the Perſons, but then it was meerly for breaking the* Canons *of the Church* ; *ſo it was in the caſe of* Formoſus, *for breaking the* Canons *againſt the* Tranſlations of Biſhops ; *in the caſe of* Ebbo Archbiſhop of *Rhemes,* whoſe Ordinations were nulled by *Hincmarus* and the Council of *Soiſſons,* for not being canonically *reſtored after Depoſition, but upon appeal to the* Pope *they were pronounced valid :* In *the Caſe of* Pope Conſtantine *for precipitating* Orders *to ſecure the Popedom ; in the famous caſe of* Photius, *whoſe Ordination was declared null by the oppoſite Faction on the ſame grounds ; but all theſe Things were done in troubleſome times, when one Party ſought a pretence againſt the other. But if we regard the more general Practice of the Church, we ſhall find when far greater Objections than theſe were made, yet Ordinations have been allowed ; although made by* Hereticks. *I ſhall offer him the faireſt Terms he can deſire, and for the Practice of the* Church *referr him to his own dear ſecond* Council *of* Nice, *and the modern Practice of the* Roman Church. *The Queſtion of the Validity of Ordination by* Hereticks *was at large debated in the firſt Action of the ſecond* Council *of* Nice, *upon the Submiſſion of* Baſilius, Theodorus, *and* Theodoſius, Hypatius, *and others who had been Biſhops of the oppoſite Party, which* John *the* Vicar *of the* Orient *there declared* to be worſe than any former Hereſie *: Upon which the Queſtion was propoſed, whether upon renouncing their Hereſie they might be received as Biſhops, and the Orders be allowed of thoſe who were ordained by them during their Hereſie ?* Hypatius *appealed* to the Cuſtom of the Church ; *then the Canons of Councils and Writings of the Fathers were brought into Council :* Taraſius *produced the* Canon *of the* Council *of* Nice, *allowing the* Ordinations *of the* Cathari, *and* the Impoſition of Hands *there mentioned he underſtands only for* Benediction, *and not for* Ordination : *and the* Council *of* Epheſus *making no Diſtinction between thoſe ordained by* Neſtorians *and others* ; (*for therein the Force of that third* Canon *muſt lye which* Taraſius *thought ſo plain*) *from St.* Baſil, *allowing thoſe Biſhops which communicated with* Iſoes *or* Zoius *and* Saturninus ; *from the* Council *of* Epheſus *allowing the* orders *of the* Meſſaliani *or* Euchitæ ; *from the* Council *of* Chalcedon, *allowing the* Biſhops *upon their Repentance, which had joyned with* Dioſcorus : *and more particularly, for thoſe* which had been ordained by Heretical Biſhops, *it was there ſhewed, that* Anatolius *the Preſident of the fourth* Council *was ordained by* Dioſcorus *in the Preſence of* Eutiches ;

that John Biſhop *of Hieruſalem after he had renounced the* Acephaliſts *by whom he was ordained, was received and ſubmitted to as* Biſhop *by the* Orthodox; *that many of thoſe who ſat in the ſixth* Council *were ordained by* Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, *and* Petrus; *who were in that* Council *declared to be* Hereticks; *and* for fifty years together Taraſius *ſaith*, they had no other Ordinations: *Upon theſe Evidences of the Practice of the Church, this* Council *of* Nice *declared likewiſe, that* the Ordination of Heretical Biſhops was valid.

For the modern Practice of the Church *of* Rome, *I appeal to the Allowance therein given to the* Ordinations *of the* Greek Church, *although the* Greek Church *be charged with Hereſie; and that ever ſince the notorious* Schiſm *in the time of* Michael Cerularius *A.D.* 1053. *In the time of* Innocent *the third ſome* Greek Clergymen *living in the* Dioceſes *of* Latin Biſhops, *yet received Ordination from* Greek Biſhops, *which made the* Latin Biſhops *ſuſpend them from the Execution of their Office, the Pope, hearing of it, ſends to his Legate, wherein he conſents to the Suſpenſion in Caſe it were done without leave from the* Latin Biſhop; *but if leave were obtained, he takes off the Suſpenſion; becauſe* this Cuſtom is allowed in the Church. *I need not produce more particular Inſtances in this kind which may be ſeen at large in* Morinus; *becauſe in all the Attempts of Reconciliation in the ſeveral* Councils *held to that purpoſe, as at* Lyons, *and* Florence, *where all the matters in difference were moſt fully handled, there was never any objection made to the* Greek Ordinations. *But moſt remarkable to this purpoſe is the* Bull *of* Clement *the ſeventh containing in it a former* Bull *of* Leo the tenth, *publiſhed by* Leo Allatius, *by* Iſaacius Habertus, *and by* Morinus, *wherein their* Ordinations *and other Rites and Cuſtoms are expreſly allowed. And to this day ſaith* Morinus they are allowed in *Rome*, not only to perform other Parts of divine Service according to their cuſtoms in the Church of St. *Athanaſius*, but to ordain Prieſts after their own manner; *for which they had a* Bull *of* Urban *the eighth.*

Extrav. de temp. Ordin. C. quod Tranſl. Morin. de ſacris ordinat. part 1. c. 5. 4. 5.

Leo Allatius de ætat. Et intereſt. in collat. Ordin. p. 5. 14. Iſaac. Habert Pontifical. Græc. in præf. Morin. de Sacris Ordin. p. 1. c. 4.

And now I deſire T. G. *to conſider a little* his undenyable Maxim that no Man can give to another that which he hath not himſelf, *whether he doth in earneſt think that his own Church is ſo bereft of all* common Senſe, *as not to underſtand the Force of this Maxim? and if it thought it of any weight in this matter, how it could ever approve the* Ordinations *of* Hereticks, *or decree that the* Sacraments *retain their Efficacy, where the eſſentials of them are obſerved, whatever the Faith or Manners of the Inſtruments be?*

And this was all I intended in this Preface; of the reſt of his Book, the Reader may expect an account as God *gives Health and Opportunity.*

THE

THE

PREFACE.

§. 1. *Of the Nature of theſe Anſwers.*

WHen I publiſhed the late *Book*, which hath ſo much ingraged thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* againſt me, I thought I had reaſon to expect that a juſt Anſwer ſhould be made to it; but they have taken an effectual courſe to undeceive me; for by this *new way* I perceive, their utmoſt Ambition is to have ſomething abroad, which among themſelves may paſs for an *Anſwer*. Which put me in mind of what I have heard a great Perſon ſaid, when he had undertaken to manage an ill cauſe before a publick Audience, and one of his Friends asked him what he meant by it, *Trouble not your ſelf*, ſaid he, *our own ſide will be ſure to believe me*. It was ſurely ſome ſuch Preſumption as this, which made the learned Authors of theſe two elaborate *Pamphlets* to appear in ſuch a manner in Print, as if it were no great matter what they ſaid, ſo their People might have this to ſay, and (if they can) believe it too, *that my Book is anſwered*. If this be all their cauſe will afford, it deſerves rather to be pittied than confuted; if it will bear more, they are as bad Managers of it as their Enemies could wiſh. For however I was threatned before-hand that ſuch Anſwers were coming abroad, *every Line of which would fetch Blood*; yet as cruel as they are when we are under their laſh, I found that which they deſigned for my Puniſhment to give me no ſmall Pleaſure: and I never had ſo good an opinion of the Mercifulneſs of their Church as when I ſaw with what feeble Hands they chaſtiſed me. I had heard ſo much of their Rage that I expected their greateſt Strength would be employed upon me; and I could not tell what *Zamzummims* they might hitherto keep in the dark, whoſe Arms were not to be made uſe of, but upon ſome ſpecial occaſion when an Adverſary was to be diſpatch'd all at once, and ſo perfectly ſubdued as never to appear more. While I was preparing my ſelf for this kind of Martyrdom, out come theſe mighty Men of Valour, who have beaten nothing that I know of, but the air and themſelves; for they have neither *tyed my Tongue*, nor *broke my Heart*, nor *fetched one drop of Blood* that I can yet find; all which were things I was told would be done, when theſe Anſwers came abroad; which Threatnings made ſo loud a Noiſe, that I heard the Report of them not only nearer home, but from very diſtant Perſons and Places.

§. 2. *Of their common way of anſwering our Books.*

But leſt I ſhould be thought only to deſpiſe my Adverſaries (which I confeſs they have given me no ſmall occaſion to do) I ſhall beſtow a particular Examination upon what they have offered by way of Anſwer to my Book. Only I think it reaſonable in the firſt place to take notice of their preſent way and method of anſwering, wherein they make uſe of as many Artifices, as they do in gaining Proſelytes. When we ſet ourſelves to anſwer their

Books, we endeavour to ſtate the Controverſie plainly, to examine their Proofs, to apply diſtinct Anſwers to their Arguments fairly repreſented in their own Words, and to render the whole Diſcourſe as clear and perſpicuous as may be, that all Perſons may be capable of judging on which ſide the greateſt ſtrength and evidence lyes. This is the mighty advantage which a good Cauſe gives us; we make uſe of no Tricks to deceive Men, nor Sophiſtical cavils to confound and perplex things; we dare appeal to the Judgment of any impartial Perſon, who will take the Pains to examine the matters in difference between us. But in their late dealings with us, they ſeek to avoid the main things in diſpute, and abhor any methodical Proceeding; one Man picks out a Sentence here and there to anſwer, another a Page or two together, a third leaps from one thing to another, as if reſolv'd to paſs by the greateſt Difficulties; but he is a Man of Courage indeed, that dares fall upon the reer, and begin to confute a Book at the end of it, ſo that if he lives long enough, and get heart, he may in time come to the beginning: And if we obſerve them all, they look for nothing ſo much as ſome cleanly way of eſcape, and if they can but raiſe ſuch a duſt as to fly away without being openly diſcerned to do ſo, this they hope thoſe of their own ſide will be ſo kind and partial as to call a Victory. Theſe are no general Accuſations, but ſuch as are eaſie to obſerve in their dealings with me as to my former Book, and that lately publiſhed. But to judicious Men, all theſe little Arts and Shifts are either plain Acknowledgments of a baffled Cauſe, or an Argument of a weak and unſkilful Management.

§. 3. *Of their Calumnies againſt me.*

If the Book it ſelf be a little too troubleſome to be medled with it is beſt to fall upon the Author, and it is a hard caſe if by falſe and ridiculous Stories, or open Calumnies, or at leaſt baſe and ugly Inſinuations, they cannot diminiſh his Reputation, and then they hope the Book will ſink with its Author. *But we are not Ignorant* whoſe Cauſe is wont to be managed by ſuch *devices* as theſe are, and from whom they have learnt this Method of confuting Adverſaries. As for all their *railing Accuſations* againſt me; I ſhall not ſo much as deſire God *to rebuke them*, but only pray that he would pardon them; and if I muſt thank them for any thing, it is for giving me the occaſion for exerciſing ſo great a Charity. I have learnt of him *who when he was reviled, reviled not again*, not only to forbear reproaching them in the ſame manner, but to return them *good for evil*, and to pray for them while they calumniate me. I have ſo much the leſs Reaſon to wonder that my Book ſhould be charged by them with no leſs than *Blaſphemy*, *Mat.* 26. 65. ſince the Author of our Religion himſelf was ſo, and ſuffered under that Accuſation. But wherein I pray doth this *Blaſphemy* lye? Have I uttered any thing that tends to the Reproach of *God* or true Religion? Have I the leaſt Word which Malice it ſelf can ſtretch to the Diſhonour of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, or the *Holy Scriptures* written by divine Inſpiration? no; I challenge the boldeſt of them, and moſt malicious, to produce any thing I ever ſaid or writ that doth but ſeem to look that way. Have I made the Practice of true Devotion ridiculous, and the real Expreſſions of Piety the Subject of Scorn and Deriſion? No, ſo far from it, that it was only a juſt zeal for the Honour and Practice of true Religion, made me willing to lay open the ridiculous *Fanaticiſms* of ſome pretended *Saints* in the *Roman* Church. And muſt they be allowed to charge *Fanaticiſm* on us, and think it far from *Blaſphemy* to repreſent the *Enthuſiaſtick* Follies of the *Sectaries* among us; and when they are guilty of the very ſame, or greater, may not we ſhew their Injuſtice and Partiality, without being accuſed of *Blaſphemy? But ſome of theſe are canonized Saints, as* S. *Brigitt*, S. *Catharine*, S. *Francis*, and S. *Ignatius*; which is ſo far from making the Cauſe of their Church better, that to my Underſtanding it makes it much worſe. For although *Fanaticiſm* be *diſowned* by our *Church*, it ſeems it is not barely countenanced and allowed in the *Church* of *Rome*, but *canonized and adored*. That which I inſiſt upon, is this; either we have no *Fanaticks*, or theirs are ſo; for by the very ſame rule that ours are ſo, theirs muſt be too; for our *Fanaticks* do pretend as high to the *Spirit* and *divine* R*evelation* as any of theirs; only there is this remarkable difference between their *Fanaticks* and ours, that ours are *among us* but not *of us*, but theirs are both. Now if any one who pretends to *Inſpiration* and *Enthuſiaſm* cannot be changed with *Fanaticiſm* without *Blaſphemy*, we muſt be expoſed to all Follies and Contradictions imaginable; and to what purpoſe are we bid *to try the Spirits whether they be of God or no, i. e.* whether their pretence to divine Revelation be true or falſe? (1 Joh. 4.1.) If there may be falſe pretences to *Inſpiration*, we are to examine the grounds of them, and to judge accordingly; and all falſe Pretenders to *Inſpiration*, let them be *canonized* by whom they will, are the higheſt ſort of *Fanaticks*; and the greater honour is given them, the greater diſhonour it is to the *Chriſtian Religion*.

§. 4. *Expoſing Fanaticiſm no diſſervice to Chriſtianity.*

But theſe Things ſhall be more largely diſcuſſed in their proper Place: I now only take notice of the Injuſtice of their Calumny with which they have made ſo much Noiſe among injudicious People; and I ſhould not have been ſo much concerned about it, had I not found Suggeſtions to the ſame purpoſe in the Authors of the two Pamphlets. The one of them very kindly makes no Difference *between* Lucian, Porphyrius *and me*, but only *ſome Intereſt which doth byaſs me another way*; and *verily believes*, good Man, *that were it not for that, I could flurt with as much Piquancy and Railery at Chriſtian Religion, as I do at the* Roman. In which baſe Suggeſtion there is no Colour of Truth, but only that he very honeſtly diſtinguiſheth the *Chriſtian* Religion and the *Roman* from each other; as indeed they are in many things as different from each other as Truth from Falſhood, Wiſdom from Folly, and true Piety from groſs Superſtition. If he had called me an *Atheiſt* in plain terms, the groſsneſs of the Calumny might have abated the Force of it; but there is no ſuch way to do a Man miſchief, as by ſly Inſinuations and ſhrewd Suggeſtions introduced with *I verily believe*, and expreſſed with ſome Gravity and Zeal. But you who are ſo good at reſolving Faith, what is this *verily believe* of yours founded upon? Have you the Authority of your *Church* for it? Have you any Evidence of Reaſon, or rather, have you it by ſome Viſion or Revelation made by ſome of thoſe Saints, whoſe *Fanaticiſm* is expoſed? Or do you *verily believe it*, as you *verily believe* many other things, for no reaſon in the World?

Dr. Stillingfleet *againſt Dr.* Stillingfleet. p. 11.

World? If I ſhould tell you I have made it my Buſineſs to aſſert the Truth of the *Scriptures* and *Chriſtian Religion* therein contained, in a large Diſcourſe ſeveral years ſince publiſhed; ſuch is your Charity, that you would tell me, ſo did *Vaninus* write for *Providence*, when he denyed a *Deity*. If I ſhould make large *Apologies* for my Innocency, and publiſh a Confeſſion of my Faith, with Proteſtations that no *Intereſt* in the World could remove me from it; you might tell me, where there is no guilt what need ſo much a do? In plain terms, I know but one way to ſatisfie ſuch as you are, but I will keep from it as long as I can, and that is to go to *Rome* and be burnt for my Faith; for that is the kindneſs there ſhewed to thoſe who contend for the Purity of the *Chriſtian Religion* againſt the Corruptions of the *Roman*. But ſuch Calumnies as theſe, as they are not fit to be paſſed by, ſo are they too groſs to need any further Anſwer. I ſhall however declare my Mind freely to you; if I had no other Notion of the Chriſtian Doctrine, than what I have from the Doctrines of your Church as contrary to ours; no other Meaſures of *Chriſtian* Piety than from your myſtical *Theology*; no better Way to worſhip *God* than what is practiſed among you; no greater Certainty of *Inſpiration* from *God* than of the *Viſions* and *Revelations* of your late *Saints*; no other *Miracles* to confirm the *Chriſtian* Doctrine than what are wrought by your *Images* and *Saints*, I ſhould ſooner chooſe to be a *Philoſopher*, than a *Chriſtian* upon thoſe Terms. And *I verily believe* (to anſwer yours with another) that the Frauds and Impoſtures of the *Roman* Church have made more *Atheiſts* in *Chriſtendom*, than any one Cauſe whatſoever beſides: For when Men reſolve all their Faith into the Teſtimony of a *Church* whoſe Frauds are ſo manifeſt, and confeſſed by your beſt Writers, ſuch as *Melchior Canus*, and *Ludovicus Vives*; what can they who know no better, but ſuſpect the *Inſpirations* and *Miracles* of former Ages; who ſee ſuch falſe Pretences to them ſo much magnifyed, and the *Fanatick* Pretenders *Canonized* on that account? And I am ſo far from thinking it any Diſſervice to the Chriſtian Religion to expoſe theſe *Fanaticiſms*, that I again *verily believe* that *Chriſtianity* will never obtain as it ought to do among Men, till all thoſe hypocritical Cheats be yet more laid open to the View of the World; which if any one have but the Courage and Patience to undertake, it would be as great, and a much more uſeful Labour than the cleanſing of the *Augean Stable*. This is not *to make Sport and Recreation for the Atheiſt and debauched*, nor to give occaſion to ſuch Perſons *to turn the Inſpirations of holy Scripture into Matter of Drollery and Buffoonry*, as the Author of the *ſecond Pamphlet* tragically declaims; any more than our *Saviours* unmaſking the Hypocriſy of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* was the deſtroying the *Law* of *Moſes*; or the Diſcovery of Cheats and Impoſtors doth give Occaſions to ſuſpect the Honeſty of all Mankind: Nay ſo far is it from that, that we think the ſeparating of *Fanaticiſm* from true Inſpiration to be one of the beſt Services that can be done to the *Chriſtian Religion*, which otherwiſe is in Danger of being deſpiſed or rejected by the conſiderate Part of Mankind. But I would fain know of theſe Men, whether they do in earneſt make no Difference between the Writings of ſuch as Mother *Juliana* and the Books of *Scripture*; between the Reve-

Melch. Can. loc. Theol. l. 11. p. 534. Lud. Viv. de trad. diſcipl. l. 5

Dr. Stillingfleet's Princip. conſid. *Preface.*

Revelations of St. *Brigitt*, St. *Catherine*, &c. and thoſe of the *Prophets*; between the actions of St. *Francis* and *Ignatius Loyola* and thoſe of the *Apoſtles*? if they do not, I know who they are that expoſe our *Religion* to purpoſe; if they do make a difference, how can the repreſenting their Viſions and Practices reflect diſhonour upon the other, ſo infinitely above them, ſo much more certainly conveyed down to us with the conſent of the whole Chriſtian World? Thus much may here ſuffice to repreſent the arts our *Adverſaries* are driven to, to defend themſelves; I cannot blame them that they would engage *Religion* on their ſide, but ſo have all *Fanaticks* in the World as well as they; and I cannot for my heart ſee, but this heavy charge of *Blaſphemy* and undermining Religion does as juſtly lie on them, who deride the *Fanaticks* among us, as on thoſe who have diſcovered the *Fanaticiſm* of the *Church* of *Rome*.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PAMPHLET, ENTITULED,

Dr. *Stillingfleet* againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet*.

§. 1. *The Inſufficiency of his way of anſwering.*

HAving thus far laid open their preſent way of dealing with their *Adverſaries*, I now come to a particular Conſideration of theſe two *Pamphlets*; and begin with that called Dr. *Stillingfleet* againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet*, &c. The Author of which is to be commended for ſo noble an Enterpriſe (which few of the *Champions* of former Ages could accompliſh) *viz.* to make his Adverſary fall by his own Sword. But the miſchief of it is, theſe *Romantick Knights* do hurt no where but in Paper and their own Imagination. But I forget his grave Admonition, *that I would treat theſe Matters ſeriouſly, and lay aſide Drollery.* P. 14. To be then as grave as he can deſire, there are theſe two things which I deſign to prove againſt him. 1. That on ſuppoſition I did contradict my ſelf, in the way he inſiſts upon it, that were no ſufficient anſwer to my Book. 2. That I am far enough from contradicting my ſelf in any one of the things which he inſiſts upon.

1. Suppoſing what he contends for were true, yet my Book remains unanſwered; the deſign of which was to ſhew that no Man can joyn in the Communion of the *Roman* Church without great hazard of his Salvation. If I had any where ſaid the contrary, this

indeed would have made it evident that I had contradicted my ſelf. But what then? Doth the force of all the Arguments uſed by me in this laſt Diſcourſe fall to the ground, becauſe I was formerly of another opinion? Let me ask theſe Revolters from the *Church* of *England* one Queſtion; whether they do not now more plainly contradict themſelves as to their former Opinions, than they can pretend that I have ever done? I deſire to know, whether this makes all their preſent Arguments for the *Roman Church* of no force? If they think their preſent Reaſons ought to be anſwered, whatever contrary Opinion they had before; why, on ſuppoſition I had contradicted in a former Book what I ſay in this, muſt this render all that I have ſaid, or can hereafter ſay in this matter, invalid? Doth the ſtrength of all lye upon my bare affirming or denying? Was it ever *true* becauſe I ſaid it? If not, how comes it to be *untrue* now, becauſe I deny it? I do not remember I was ever ſo vain, to make uſe of my own Authority to prove a thing to be true, becauſe I believed it; and if I had, the World is not ſo vain to believe a Man one jot the ſooner for it. If my Authority in ſaying or denying be of no importance to the Truth of the thing, then he may prove that I contradict my ſelf, and yet all the arguments of my Book be as ſtrong as ever. I do not deſire any one to follow my opinion becauſe it is mine, but I offer Reaſon and Authority for the proof of what I ſay; if thoſe be good in themſelves, they do not therefore ceaſe to be ſo, becauſe they are, or ſeem to be inconſiſtent with what I have ſaid elſewhere. So that Self-contradiction being proved, overthrows not the reaſon of the thing, but the Authority of the Perſon; and where things depend meerly upon Authority, it is a good Argument, and no where elſe. If a *Witneſs* in a *Court* contradicts himſelf, his Teſtimony ſignifies nothing; becauſe there is nothing elſe but his Authority that makes his Teſtimony valid; but if a *Lawyer* at the *Bar* chance to ſpeak inconſiſtently, if afterwards he ſpeaks plain and evident Reaſon, does that take off the force of it, becauſe he ſaid ſomething before which contradicted that plain Reaſon? If the *Pope*, or thoſe who pretend to be infallible, contradict themſelves, that ſufficiently overthrows their pretence of Infallibility; for he that changeth his Mind, muſt be deceived once; but for us fallible Mortals, if we once hit upon Reaſon and Truth, and manage the Evidence of it clearly, that Reaſon doth not loſe its former Evidence, becauſe the ſame Perſons may afterwards oppoſe it. Suppoſe I ſhould be able to prove that *Bellarmin* in his *Recognitions* contradicts what he had ſaid in his former Books; doth this preſently make all his Arguments uſeleſs, and him uncapable of ever appearing in Controverſy more? Doth this make all his Authorities falſe, and his Reaſons unconcluding? Doth it hence follow, that he ſpake no where conſiſtently, becauſe once or twice, or perhaps as often as his Neighbours, he contradicted himſelf? But my grave *Adverſary*, *J. W.* imagines that we Writers of Controverſies are like *Witneſſes* in *Chancery*, and are bound to make *Affidavits* before the *Maſters* of this *Court* of *Controverſie*; and that whatever we ſay is to be taken as upon our Oath; this indeed would be an excellent way of bringing Controverſies to an Iſſue, if we were to be ſworn whether ſuch a thing as *Tranſubſtantiation* were true or falſe; and I cannot tell whether this, or laying wagers, or the *Popes* Infallibility be the beſt way to end ſuch Controverſies; for any one of them would do it, if People could but agree about it. But now my *Adverſary* ſays, that if a Man once contradict himſelf he is to be looked on as a *perjured Perſon*, and whatever he ſaith, his word is not to be taken. This he not only begins with, but very triumphantly concludes with it in theſe words, *and this alone may ſuffice to annull whatever he has hitherto, or ſhall hereafter object againſt us; for a witneſs, who has been once palpably convinced to have forſworn or contradicted himſelf in matters of moment, beſides the condign Puniſhment he is lyable unto, he does vacate all Evidences produced by him, againſt his Adverſary, and deſerves never more to be heard againſt him in any Tribunal.* I ſee now what it is they would be at, no leſs than perpetual Silence, and being ſet in the *Pillory* with that *Pamphlet* on my Forehead Dr. *Still.* *againſt* Dr. *Still.* for being guilty of contradicting my ſelf, would ſatisfy *J. W.* and his Friends; This I ſuppoſe was the meaning of *ſtopping my mouth for ever*, when this Anſwer was to come out. But now I perceive it is ſo dangerous a thing, I had beſt ſtand upon my defence, and utterly deny that I have contradicted my ſelf in any thing, in which *J. W.* hath charged me. *Still. againſt. Still. p. 14.*

2. To make it then out that this is a groundleſs Charge I muſt go through the ſeveral Particulars inſiſted on. §. 2.

No contradiction about the charge of Idolatry.

The *firſt* is in the *charge of Idolatry*; but how do I contradict my ſelf about this? Had I vindicated the *Church* of *Rome* from *Idolatry* in my *Defence* of *Archbiſhop Laud*, this had been indeed to contradict my ſelf: But this is not ſo much as pretended; and if it were, nothing could be more eaſily confuted; for in that very Book, as it falls out very happily, there is a Diſcourſe to the ſame purpoſe, proving the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry*, in *Invocation of Saints* and the *worſhip of Images*, and that the *Heathen*, in the Worſhip of inferiour *Deities* and *Images*, might be excuſed on the ſame grounds that thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* do excuſe themſelves. Here is then no appearance of a contradiction in Terms; and it is only pretended to be by conſequence, *viz.* from yielding *that the Church of* Rome *and we do not differ in fundamental Points, and that the Church of* Rome *is therefore a true Church; from whence he inferrs, that it cannot be guilty of Idolatry: Becauſe to teach that, would be a fundamental Errour, and inconſiſtent with the Being of a true Church: And therefore to charge the Church of* Rome *with Idolatry, and to allow it to be a true Church is a Contradiction.* This is the ſubſtance of what he ſaith upon this Head: To which I ſhall anſwer by ſhewing, 1. That this way of anſwering is very diſingenuous. 2. That it is Sophiſtical, and proves not the thing which he intends. *Rational Account, p. 596, 606.*

1. That it is a diſingenuous way; becauſe he barely oppoſes a *judgment* of *Charity* concerning their *Church*, to a *judgment* of *Reaſon* concerning the *nature* of *Actions*, without at all examining the force of thoſe Reaſons which are produced in the *Book* he pretends to anſwer. Can *J. W.* imagine, that any one who enquires into the ſafeſt way for his Salvation, and hears the *Church* of *Rome* charged with *Idolatry* in her Worſhip, by Arguments drawn from the plain *Law* of *God*, the common ſenſe of Mankind, the repugnancy of their way of Worſhip to the conceptions we ought to have of the Divine Nature, the conſent of the ancient Chriſtian Church, the parity of the caſe in many Reſpects with the Heathen Idolaters, ſhould preſently

ſently conclude, that all theſe Arguments are of no force, meerly becauſe the Perſon who made uſe of them, had upon another occaſion judged ſo *charitably* of that *Church*, as to ſuppoſe it ſtill to retain the *Eſſentials* of a *true Church?* I will put a caſe parallel to this; ſuppoſe one of the *Church* of *Judah* ſhould have called the *Church* of *Iſrael* in the time of *Jeroboam* a *true Church*, becauſe they acknowledged the true *God*, and did believe an agreement in that common acknowledgment to be ſufficient to preſerve the *Eſſentials* of a *Church* among them; and afterwards the ſame Perſon ſhould go about to convince the *Ten Tribes* of their *Idolatry* in worſhipping *God*, by the *Calves of Dan and Bethel:* Would this be thought a ſufficient way of anſwering him, to ſay, that *he contradicted himſelf, by granting them a true Church, and yet charging them with Idolatry?* Whereas the only true conſequence would be, that he thought ſome kind of *Idolatry* conſiſtent with the Being of a *Church*. Might not ſuch a Perſon juſtly ſay, that they made a very ill uſe of his *Charity*, when he ſuppoſed only that kind of Idolatry which implies more Gods than one, to *unchurch* a People? But however, thoſe Perſons were more concerned to vindicate themſelves from *Idolatry* of any kind, than he was to defend his charitable opinion of them; and if they could prove to him, that this inferiour ſort of Idolatry does *unchurch* them as well as the groſſer, the conſequence of it would be, that his *Charity* muſt be ſo much the leſs, but their Danger would be the ſame. This is juſt our caſe with the *Church* of *Rome*; we acknowledge that they ſtill retain the Fundamental Articles of the *Chriſtian* Faith, that there is no Diſpute between them and us about the true *God* and his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*, as to his Death, Reſurrection, Glory, and being the proper object of Divine Worſhip; we yield that they have true *Baptiſm* among them, in the Name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*; and we looking upon theſe as the *Eſſentials* of a *true Church*, do upon that account own that Church to be ſo: But then we charge the *Roman Church*, with groſs corrupting that Worſhip which is proper to the Divine Nature, by her *worſhip of Images, Adoration of the Hoſt*, and *Invocation of Saints*; which being done, not in expreſs Terms againſt the Worſhip of the true God, but by conſequence, we do not think this doth deſtroy the *Being* of a *Church* among them; although it makes the ſalvation of Perſons in her Communion extreamly hazardous: And after we have gone about to prove this by many and weighty Arguments, is it reaſonable for any one to tell us that we contradict our ſelves, and therefore our Arguments do ſignify nothing? Whereas in truth, here is no appearance of a Contradiction to that which is our own ſenſe in this matter. For what ſhadow of a Contradiction is it to ſay, that the *Roman Church* is a *true Church*, and yet is guilty of *Idolatry*; ſuppoſing that we believe ſome ſort of *Idolatry* which is very ſinful, not to be yet of ſo high a Nature as to *unchurch* thoſe who practice it; and we chooſe the Inſtance of the *Ten Tribes* for the ground of this Charity. If they can prove that all ſorts of *Idolatry* do neceſſarily deſtroy the *Eſſentials* of a *Church*, the conſequence is, we muſt have leſs Charity for them, than we had before; and ſuch a conceſſion from us doth not ſhew their guilt to be leſs, but only our Charity to be greater. Suppoſe a Man ſhould exceed in his Charity towards a Perſon guilty of ſome grievous Faults, and ſay, he believes he may be a pious Man for all this; but withal ſeverely reproves him for his Faults, and tells him the danger he continually runs by ſuch Actions; would it be fair for ſuch a Man to anſwer him, that his Reproofs were not to be regarded, becauſe he contradicted himſelf, for he told him he believed him to be a pious Man, and yet upbraided him with thoſe Faults which were inconſiſtent with Piety? What would the conſequence of this be to the thing it ſelf? Would this make thoſe Faults ever the leſs, becauſe he judged ſo charitably of the Perſon notwithſtanding his committing them? But when we allow the *Church* of *Rome* to be *a true Church*, we are far from underſtanding by that a *ſound* or a *good* Church free from Corruptions, which would be the moſt proper ſenſe to found a Contradiction upon, in this matter of *Idolatry*; but we mean no more by it, than as a Man is a *true Man*, though he hath the *plague* upon him; thoſe which we account the *Eſſentials* of a *Church*, we deny not to it, but withal we contend that it is over-run with ſuch Corruptions in Worſhip, as do mightily endanger the Salvation of thoſe who live in the Communion of it.

§. 2. *The ſophiſtical Cavils in this argument.*

2. Having thus diſcovered the *diſingenuity* of making ſo bad a uſe of our *Charity* againſt us, I now come to ſhew how *Sophiſtical* this way of anſwering is, by a cloſer Examination of it.

Firſt, The ſtarting of a new Objection anſwers no argument, and all that this amounts to is only raiſing a new Difficulty; whereas he ought in the firſt place to have anſwered all the arguments I had brought to prove them guilty of Idolatry; and when he had done this fairly and plainly (which for ſome good Reaſons he had no mind to do) he might then have inſiſted on the inconſiſtency of it with Principles owned by me; but to do this without giving an anſwer, ſo much as to any one argument, is a clear evidence of a ſophiſtical and cavilling Humour, rather than of any Intention to ſatisfy an inquiſitive Mind.

2. The force of this Objection lyes in the different ſenſe and meaning of ſeveral Expreſſions made uſe of by him, which being explained, the Objection will ſignify nothing. For if we rightly underſtand the notion of Idolatry, the manner of teaching it, the ſenſe of Fundamental Errors and a true Church as it is owned by me, the very appearance of any Contradiction vaniſheth.

I agree in the general, that *the true notion of Idolatry is, giving the Honour due only to God to a meer Creature*; and I deſire no greater advantage againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, than from ſuch a conceſſion; but then we are to underſtand, that this may be done ſeveral ways. 1. When the Worſhip proper to the *true God* is given to a *falſe* God. 2. When the true *God* is acknowledged and worſhipped, but the *Unity* of the *Godhead* is denyed, and many *falſe Gods* are joined with him in the ſame Worſhip. In theſe two ſorts of *Idolatry*, I acknowledge that the *true God* is rejected, either wholly in the firſt way, or by conſequence in the ſecond. But withal I ſay, that the giving the Worſhip to a Creature which is due only to *God* may be conſiſtent with the acknowledgment of one *Supream God*, and that theſe ways 1. When one *Supream God* is acknowledged, but no difference is put between the external Worſhip of him and Creatures. This was the *Idolatry* of the wiſer *Heathen*, who did in their Conſciences acknowledge that there was but one true and ſupream *God*, but yet gave the ſame Worſhip to inferiour *Deities*, that they did to him. Theſe

Men might have pleaded for themſelves, for all that I know, as much to their Advantage, as thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* do againſt me. 2. When the Worſhip proper to the true God is given to an Image: Or the ſuppoſing of *God* to be truly honoured by us, by proſtrating our ſelves before any corporeal Repreſentation of him. This likewiſe the Heathen were guilty of. Titus 1. 16. St. *Paul* hath long ſince told us of ſome, *who profeſs that they know God, but in works they deny him*; ſo there may be ſome who may profeſs a Worſhip *due only to God*, but in their Actions may contradict it. As ſuppoſe a company of rebellious Men ſhould declare over and over that they acknowledge but *one Soveraign Power* of this Nation, inveſted in the Perſon of the *King*; but yet, ſhould take upon themſelves to raiſe Forces, to appoint great Officers of State, and require that the very ſame outward Reverence and Honour be given to them, which is given to the *King* himſelf; would any Man in his Senſes ſay, that becauſe theſe Men ſtill declared the ſupream Authority to be in the King, that there was no *Treaſon* in ſuch Actions? Or that thoſe Perſons contradicted themſelves, who allowed that their Profeſſion was ſuch as became good Subjects, but their Actions made them guilty of *Treaſon*. The ſame we ſay of the *Church* of *Rome*; we confeſs they own the ſupream Power of the World to be in one *true God*, and we have no Controverſy with them about the eſſential Doctrines of Religion (which is, that we mean by their being *a true Church*) but withal we ſay, they overthrow what they ſay in their own Practice, they rob *God* of the Honour due only to him, by giving it to *Angels*, and *Saints*, and *Images* and other Creatures. And what Contradiction now is there in all this, that a *Church* agreeing with us in the Object of worſhip in general, ſhould act contrary to its own Profeſſion, by requiring thoſe things to be done, which take away from *God* that Honour which is due only to him, aud giving it to Creatures? And this, If I underſtand it, is all that this firſt Contradiction in the charge of Idolatry doth amount to.

§. 3. *A diſtinct anſwer to his Propoſitions.*

To apply this now to his own *Propoſitions*, for the greater clearneſs and ſatisfaction of all indifferent Perſons.

His firſt Propoſition I agree to, viz. *That 'tis an article of Faith, and a Fundamental point of Religion, that the Honour which is due only to God is not to be given to a meer Creature.* But I deſire it may be taken notice of, that this *Propoſition* is *ſophiſtically* expreſſed; for although it be no Diſpute between us, whether that *Honour which is due only to God, may be given to a Creature*, yet it is a very great one, and the Foundation of the charge of Idolatry, *what that Honour is which is due only to God*: And in caſe we can prove that they do give to meer Creatures any part of that *Honour* which is *due to God*, it cannot at all excuſe them to ſay, *that they acknowledge it to be Idolatry to give that Honour, which they ſuppoſe to be due only to God, to a meer Creature.* This *Propoſition* therefore, though in it ſelf true, is captiouſly ſet down, and with an Intention only to deceive unwary Readers, as will appear by the next Propoſition.

2. *To teach Idolatry is to err againſt the forementioned Article of Faith and Fundamental point of Religion*; i. e. *to teach Idolatry, is to teach that the Honour which is due only to God is to be given to a meer Creature.* That this is to teach *Idolatry*, no one queſtions; but our queſtion is, whether they who do not teach this

Propo

Propoſition, may not teach Men to do thoſe things, whereby the Worſhip due only to *God* will be given to a meer Creature? If he can prove, that they who do not in terms declare that they do not diſhonour God cannot diſhonour him, if he can demonſtrate, that thoſe who do not teach *that the Honour which is due only to God is to be given to a Creature*, cannot poſſibly by any Actions of theirs rob him of that honour which is due to him: this will be much more to his purpoſe than any thing he hath yet ſaid. And this *Propoſition*, if he had proceeded as he ought to have done, ſhould not have been a particular *Affirmative* but an univerſal *Negative*: For it is not enough to ſay, that *to teach Idolatry, is to teach that the Honour which is due only to God is to be given to a Creature*, but that *no Church which doth not teach this can be guilty of Idolatry*, for his deſign being to clear the *Roman Church*, his *Propoſition* ought to be ſo framed, that all particulars may be comprehended under it. But becauſe he may ſay, *his immediate Intention was, not to clear their Church from Idolatry, but to accuſe me of a Contradiction*, I proceed to the next Propoſition.

3. *A Church that does not err againſt any Article of Faith, nor againſt any Fundamental point of Religion, does not teach Idolatry.* This Propoſition is likewiſe very *ſophiſtical* and *captious*; for by *Article of Faith and Fundamental point of Religion* is either underſtood, *the main fundamental points of Doctrine contained in the Apoſtles Creed*, and then I affirm, that a *Church* which doth own all the Fundamentals of Doctrine, may be guilty of *Idolatry*, and teach thoſe things wherein it lyes; but if by *not erring againſt any Article of Faith*, be meant, *that a Church which doth not err at all in matters of Religion* cannot teach *Idolatry*, the Propoſition is *true*, but *impertinent*.

4. *That the Church of* Rome *doth teach Veneration of Images, Adoration of the Hoſt, and Invocation of Saints*, is agreed on both ſides.

5. *That the* Roman *Church does not err againſt any Article of Faith or Fundamental point of Religion*; this being that Conceſſion of ours, from whence all the Force of his Argument is taken, muſt be explained according to our own Senſe of it, and not according to that which he puts upon it; which that it may be better underſtood, I ſhall both ſhew in what Senſe this Conceſſion is made by us, as to the *Church of Rome*, and of what force it is in this preſent debate.

For the clearer Underſtanding in what Senſe it is made by us, we are to conſider the occaſion of the Controverſie about *Fundamentals* between us and the *Church of Rome*: which ought to be taken from that *Book* to which he referrs. There we find the occaſion of it to be, the *Romaniſts* contending that all points defined by the *Church* are *Fundamental*, or *neceſſary to Salvation*, on the account of ſuch a *Definition*; upon this the Controverſie about *Fundamentals* was managed againſt them, with a deſign to prove that all things deſigned by the *Church* of *Rome* are not *Fundamental*, or *neceſſary to be believed* by all Perſons in order to their Salvation, becauſe they were ſo defined. To this purpoſe I enquired, 1. What the grounds are, on which any thing doth become neceſſary to Salvation? 2. Whether any thing whoſe matter is not neceſſary, and is not required by an abſolute Command in *Scripture*,

§. 4. *In what Senſe the Church of* Rome *is owned by us as a true Church.* *Rational Account*, p. 47.

can by any means whatſoever afterwards become neceſſary? 3. Whether the *Church* hath power, by any Propoſition or Definition, to make any thing become neceſſary to Salvation, and to be believed as ſuch, which was not ſo before? For the *firſt*, I propoſed two things. 1. What things are neceſſary to the Salvation of Men as ſuch, or conſidered in their ſingle or private Capacities? 2. What things are neceſſary to be owned in order to Salvation by *Chriſtian Societies*, or as the Bonds and Conditions of *Eccleſiaſtical Communion*? For the reſolving of this I laid down theſe Three Propoſitions.

1. That the very being of a *Church*, doth ſuppoſe the Neceſſity of what is required to be believed in order to Salvation.

2. Whatever Church owns thoſe things, which are antecedently neceſſary to the Being of a Church, cannot ſo long ceaſe to be a true Church. And here I expreſly diſtinguiſhed between the *Eſſentials* of a Church, and thoſe things which were required to the *Integrity* or Soundneſs of it, among which latter I reckoned the *Worſhip of God* in the way preſcribed by him.

3. That the Union of the *Catholick Church* depended upon the Agreement of it in things antecedently neceſſary to its Being. From hence I proceeded to ſhew, that nothing ought to be owned as neceſſary to Salvation by Chriſtian Societies, but ſuch things which by all thoſe Societies are acknowledged antecedently neceſſary to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*. And here I diſtinguiſhed between *neceſſary Articles of Faith*, and *particular Agreements for the Churches Peace*. I did not therefore deny, but that it was in the power of particular Churches, to require a *Subſcription* to *Articles of Religion*, oppoſite to the Errors and Abuſes which they reformed; but I denyed it to be in the power of any *Church* to make thoſe things neceſſary Articles of Faith, which were not ſo before. And here it was I ſhewed the Moderation of the Church of *England* above that of *Rome*; in that our *Church* makes *no Articles of Faith*, but ſuch as have the Teſtimony and Approbation of the whole Chriſtian World of all Ages, and are acknowledged to be ſuch by *Rome* it ſelf; but the Church of *Rome* impoſeth *new Articles of Faith*, to be believed as neceſſary to Salvation; as appears by the *Bull* of *Pius* IV. This is my plain meaning, which half-witted Men have ſtretched and abuſed to ſeveral ill purpoſes; but not to wander from my preſent Subject, what is it that *J. W.* can hence infer to his purpoſe? *viz.* that from hence it follows, that the *Church* of *Rome* does not err *againſt any Article of Faith, or any point neceſſary to Salvation*; which if it be only meant of thoſe *eſſential points of Faith*, which I ſuppoſe antecedently neceſſary to the *Being* of a *Church*, I deny it not, but do not ſee of what uſe this Conceſſion can be to them in the preſent debate: ſince in the following Diſcourſe I made the *antient Creeds of the Catholick Church* the beſt Meaſure of thoſe things, which were believed to be neceſſary to Salvation: ſo that the Force of the Argument comes to this, whatſoever *Church* does embrace the antient *Creeds* cannot be guilty of *Idolatry*; but the *Church* of *Rome* doth embrace all the antient *Creeds* by my own Conceſſion, therefore it is a Contradiction for me to grant that they hold the *antient Creeds*, and yet to charge them with *Idolatry*. And theſe matters being thus made plain, there is no great difficulty to anſwer, by denying the *major Propoſition*, and aſſerting that a *Church*

which does own all the Articles of Faith which are contained in them, may yet teach and practiſe thoſe things, which take away from that worſhip which is proper only to God, and give it to meer Creatures; as I have proved the Church of *Rome* doth in *the worſhip of Images*, *adoration of the Hoſt*, and *Invocation of Saints.* But to make this yet more plain, there are two things we conſider in a *Church*, the *Eſſence*, and the *Soundneſs* of it; as in a Man, we conſider his *being* a Man and his *Health*: When we diſcourſe of his meer Being, we enquire into no more than thoſe things which make him a Man, whether he be ſound or not: So in a *Church*, when we enquire into the *Eſſentials* of it, we think it not neceſſary to go any farther than the doctrinal points of Faith; the Reaſon is, becauſe *Baptiſm* admits Men into the *Church* upon the Profeſſion of the true *Faith* in the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*; and whatever is ſufficient to make a Member of the *Church*, that is in it ſelf ſufficient, being embraced to make a *Church*; but when we enquire farther into the *moral Integrity*, or *Soundneſs* of a *Church*, then we think our ſelves bound, not barely to know what is acknowledged and received, but how far it is ſo; and whether that *Church* which owns the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith, doth not by groſs and damnable Errours corrupt the Worſhip of God, and debauch thoſe very Principles which they profeſs to own. And in this Reſpect none of us ever ſaid, *That the Church of* Rome *did not err*; nay, we do ſay and have manifeſtly proved, that ſhe hath erred againſt the Chriſtian Faith, by introducing palpable Errours in Doctrine, and manifold Superſtitions and Idolatries in Practice. From hence it plainly appears, that the Conceſſion *J. W.* urges me with of the *Church* of *Rome* being *a true Church*, ſignifies nothing, in the Senſe by me intended, which contradicts the charge of *Idolatry*; unleſs they can prove that none who own the *Apoſtles Creed*, or their *Baptiſm*, can ſo long as they do ſo, teach Idolatry, or be guilty of giving the Honour due only to God to meer Creatures. Theſe things being thus explained, I hope the *Sophiſtry* of this way of arguing is made ſo evident, that no Man of Underſtanding that reſolves not before-hand what to believe, is capable of being deceived by it.

§. 5. *His Appendix conſidered.*

Before I come to the next Contradiction charged upon me, I ſhall for the diverſion of the Reader, and the ſuitableneſs of the matter, take notice of his *Appendix*, wherein *J. W.* goes about ſo pleaſantly to prove me an Idolater, by a notable trick, which it ſeems came into his Head a little too late, after he had finiſht this worthy Treatiſe. I ſhould have ſuſpected it had been intended only for a piece of *Drollery*, but that the Man ſo ſeverely rebukes me for it, and withal talks of nothing leſs than *Demonſtration* in the caſe. What? (thought I) is it come to this at laſt? And am I become an Idolater too, who was never apt to think my ſelf enclined ſo much as to Superſtition? But what cannot the controverting Wit of Man do, upon ſecond and ſerious Thoughts? All the Comfort I found left was towards the Concluſion, wherein he confeſſes *that the ſame Argument proves the Prophets, Evangeliſts and Holy Ghoſt himſelf to be Idolaters*; nay then, I hoped there was no great harm to be feared in ſo good Company; and by that conſideration armed my ſelf againſt this terrible Aſſault. But at laſt as he made nearer Approaches to me, I found no miſchief

Dr. Stil. *againſt Dr.* Stil. *p.* 21.

was like to come, but what I brought upon my ſelf; for he charged me with nothing but my own Artillery, and the Train that was laid to blow me up was fetched from my own Stores; only he had diſpoſed it in a way fitteſt for this deep Deſign. But the beſt of it was, his Plot went no farther than *my* Idolatry, and both lay only in *Imagination.* For there he makes the ſeat of my *Idolatry*, which he demonſtratively proves muſt be ſo by my own Argument. I ſhall therefore conſider what that was, and with what great Art he imploys it againſt me. Among other Arguments to ſhew that the Prohibition of worſhipping *Images* was not peculiar to the *Jews*, but of an unalterable Nature, I inſiſted upon *Gods* declaring the unſuitableneſs of it to his own infinite and incomprehenſible Nature, which could not be repreſented to Men, but in a way which muſt be an infinite Diſparagement to it. *To whom will ye liken God? Or what likeneſs will ye compare to him? It is he that ſitteth upon the circle of the Earth*, &c. And the reaſon given of the Law it ſelf was, becauſe *they ſaw no ſimilitude of God*; from whence I ſhewed, that the wiſeſt Nations and Perſons among the Heathen looked on the Worſhip of *God* by *Images*, as unſuitable to a Divine and Infinite Being, and that the *Goſpel* ſtill more diſcovered *Gods* Spiritual Nature and the agreeableneſs of ſpiritual Worſhip to him; that the *Apoſtles* urged this Argument againſt the Heathen Idolatry; and the *Fathers* of the *Church* thought the reaſon of this Law did equally oblige us with the *Jews*; now by what Art doth he from hence prove me neceſſarily to be an Idolater, as well as they of the *Church* of *Rome*, who worſhip God by Images againſt the very words and reaſon of this Law? The Argument is briefly ſummed up by himſelf thus: *Whoever worſhips God repreſented in a way far inferior to his Greatneſs is an Idolater; but whoſoever worſhips God repreſented to him without the Beatifical Viſion, either by words or by Imaginations as well as Images, he worſhips God in a way far inferiour to his Greatneſs*; Ergo, *whoever worſhips God repreſented unto him without the Beatifical Viſion is an Idolater: But Dr. St. worſhips God without the Beatifical Viſion* (no doubt of it) Ergo *Dr. St. is an Idolater:* there is no help for it. Nay, from hence he proves, *that I cannot ſo much as think of God without Idolatry my ſelf; nor preach of him without provoking others to it.* O the inſuperable force of Reaſon, and the dint of Demonſtration! But the miſchief is, all this Subtilty is uſed againſt the *Law-maker*, and not againſt me. Did I not cite the words of God himſelf, who therefore did forbid the making any likeneſs of him, becauſe nothing could be like him? Is there no difference between having *imperfect Conceptions* of *God* in our Minds, and making *unworthy Repreſentations* of him to our Senſes, with a deſign to worſhip them? Why did not *God* as well forbid the one, as he did the other? Were the *Iſraelites* then *in the Beatifical Viſion?* Were their Conceptions of *God* ſuitable to his incomprehenſible Nature? If not, why were they not forbidden as well to think of *God* as to make any *Images* of him? Is *God* as much diſparaged by the neceſſary weakneſs of our Underſtandings, as by voluntary falſe and corporeal *Images* of him? Nay, doth not *God* deſign to prevent the errour of our *Imaginations* by ſuch Prohibitions as thoſe are? And thereby commands us to think worthily of him, and when we pray to him, to conſider him only as an Infinite Being in his Nature and Attributes? I do not know what *Imaginations* others have of *God*; it may be thoſe in the

Roman Idolatry, p. 55. 2. *edit.*

Iſa.40.19, 22.

Deut. 4. 15, 16.

P. 20.

the *Church* of Rome meaſure all by themſelves, and *God* by their *Images* of him, and thence conclude, that no Men can think of *God*, but as they picture him, like an *old Man ſitting in Heaven*; but I aſſure them, I never had ſuch an *Imagination* of him, and if I had, ſhould think it very unworthy of him. I know no other conception of *God*, but of a Being infinitely perfect; and this is rather an intellectual Apprehenſion, than a material Imagination of him. I am aſſured that he is, by mighty and convincing Arguments; but to bring him down to my *Imagination*, is to contradict the evidence that I have of his *Being*; for the ſame Reaſons which convince me that he is, do likewiſe convince me that he is infinite in Power, and Wiſdom, and Goodneſs. If I thought otherwiſe of him, I ſhould know no reaſon to give him the worſhip of my Mind and Soul. Although my Conceptions cannot reach his Greatneſs, yet they do not confine it, nor wilfully debaſe it; they do not bring him down to the meanneſs of a corporeal Image. But becauſe we cannot think highly enough of *God*, muſt we therefore deviſe ways to expoſe him to Contempt and Scorn? And we cannot but deſpiſe a *Deity* to whom any Image can be like. But ſuch abſurd and ſilly Arguments deſerve no farther Confutation. *They* indeed may take more Liberty, who write to thoſe who are bound not to judge of what is writ, but only to cry it up. As for us, who think it not fit to have our People in ſuch ſlavery, we dare not venture ſuch idle ſtuff among them.

§. 6.
The ſecond Contradiction examined.

I come therefore to the ſecond Contradiction he charges me with, which is, concerning the danger of Salvation which they are liable to who communicate with the *Roman Church*, when yet I acknowledge *that Church to be a true Church, and therefore to be a true way to Salvation:* And withal *Archbiſhop* Laud, *whom I defend, doth grant a poſſibility of Salvation to thoſe in the Church of* Rome. The force of this Contradiction depending on theſe Conceſſions, I ſhall, 1. Shew in what ſenſe they are granted by us. 2. Examine the ſtrength of the *Propoſitions* he draws from hence, towards the making this a Contradiction.

Rational Account p. 293.

1. Concerning the *Roman Church being a true Church*: The *Archbiſhops* Adverſary having falſly charged him with granting the *Roman* Church to be a *right Church*, he complains of his Injuſtice in it; and ſaith, *that it is a Church and a true Church be granted, but not a right Church; for Truth only imports the Being; right, perfection in Conditions; thus a Thief is a true Man, though not an upright Man. So a corrupt Church may be true, as a Church is a company of Men which profeſs the Faith of Chriſt, and are baptized into his Name; but it is not therefore a right Church in Doctrine or Manners;* and again ſaith, *it is true in that Senſe, as* ens *and* verum, *being and true, are convertible one with another; and every thing that hath a Being is truly that Being which it is in truth of ſubſtance.* The Replyer to him, ſaith, *that the notion of a Church implyes Integrity and Perfection of conditions*; upon which I gave him this Anſwer, that he did herein betray his weak or wilful Miſtakes of a Church *morally* for *metaphyſically true.* If he could prove it impoſſible for a *Church* to retain its *Being* that hath any Errors in Doctrine, or Corruptions in Practice, he would therein do ſomething to the purpoſe; but when he had done it, all that he would get by it was, that then we ſhould not ſo much as acknowledge the *Roman Church*

P. 295.

to be *Metaphyſically* a *true Church*; and therefore the Reader is left to judge, whether his Lordſhips Charity for, or his Teſtimony againſt their Church was built upon better grounds. But this it is evident in what ſenſe it was granted, that the *Roman Church* was a *true Church.*

Archbiſhop Lauds *Conference*, p. 280.
P. 282.
P. 285.
P. 299.
Rational Account, p. 622.

2. *Concerning poſſibility of Salvation in that Church*; To the Queſtion that was asked my *Lord* of *Canterbury*, *whether a Perſon might be ſaved in the* Roman *Faith?* he gives this Anſwer, *That the Ignorant that could not diſcern the Errors of that Church, ſo they held the Foundation, and conformed themſelves to a Religious Life might be ſaved:* and after explains himſelf more fully, *that* might be ſaved, *grants but a poſſibility, no ſure or ſafe way of Salvation; the poſſibility, I think,* ſaith he, *cannot be denyed to the Ignorants, eſpecially becauſe they hold the Foundation and cannot ſurvey the Building. And the Foundation can deceive no Man that reſts upon it: But a ſecure way they cannot go, that hold with ſuch corruptions when they know them.* And again, *many Proteſtants indeed confeſs, there is Salvation poſſible to be attained in the* Roman *Church; but yet they ſay withal, that the Errors of that Church are ſo many, (and ſome ſo great, as weaken the Foundation) that it is very hard to go that way to Heaven, eſpecially to them that have had the truth manifeſted.* And in another place, *I do indeed for my part (leaving other Men free to their own judgment) acknowledge a poſſibility of Salvation in the* Roman *Church: But ſo as that which I grant to* Romaniſts, *is not as they are* Romaniſts, *but as they are Chriſtians, that is, as they believe the Creed, and hold the Foundation Chriſt himſelf, not as they aſſociate themſelves wittingly and knowingly to the groſs Superſtitions of the* Roman *Church. And I am willing to hope there are many among them, which keep within that Church, and yet wiſh the Superſtitions aboliſhed which they know, and which pray to God to forgive their Errors in what they know not, and which hold the Foundation firm, and live accordingly, and would have all thing amended that are amiſs, were it in their Power. And to ſuch I dare not deny a poſſibility of Salvation, for that which is Chriſts in them, though they hazard themſelves extremely, by keeping ſo cloſe to that which is Superſtition, and in the Caſe of Images comes too near Idolatry.* Theſe are my *Lord of Canterbury*'s own Words, and laid together in my *Defence* of him, which *J. W.* ought to have repreſented, if he had deſigned any thing but *Sophiſtry* and Trifling. But his game had been then quite ſpoiled; the fine Sport of making Contradictions had been loſt, and his croſs purpoſes had come to nothing.

I now come to ſee what *Contradictions* he wire-draws from hence by the Help of his *Propoſitions.*

1. *Whoever is in a Condition, wherein he is certainly ſaved, is in no Danger or Probability of being damned.* If by *he is certainly ſaved*, he ſpeaks of the *Event*, then he were a hard hearted Man that would not grant that he that is actually ſaved *is in no Danger or Probability of being damned*; *if* he means it *of a certain Way to Salvation*, then it is yet capable of ſeveral Meanings. For *to be in a certain Way* may imply one of theſe three things. 1. That the way it ſelf is ſo plain that a Man cannot miſs of it. 2. Or that the Way is in it ſelf certain, but there are ſo many by-paths and turnings lying hard by it, that it is a very hard Matter for any

Man to keep in it. 3. *To be in a certain way*, is, when not only the Way it ſelf is certain, but a Man keeps conſtantly in that Way. According to theſe ſeveral Senſes this Propoſition may be underſtood; if by it be meant. 1. *He that is in a certain Way to Salvation, is in no Danger or Probability of being damned, i. e.* he that keeps conſtantly in that Way which will certainly lead him to Heaven, the Propoſition is true, but impertinent; but if by it be meant no more but this, *that he is in a Way which in it ſelf leads to Heaven, but there are ſo many croſs and by-paths near it, that though it be poſſible for him to hit it, yet it is extremely hazardous*, no one can imagine that ſuch a one is in no Probability of miſcarrying, for we ſay he is in very great Danger of it, notwithſtanding the Tendency of the Way it ſelf.

2. Prop. *Whoever lives and dyes in a true way to Salvation, having conformed to its Directions, or whoever has done all that was neceſſary to attain unto Salvation is in a condition, wherein he is certainly ſaved.* The *Sophiſtry* of this is ſo palpable, that the weakeſt eye may diſcern it, for it ſuppoſes that *true way* to Salvation wherein he lives to be a *very ſafe* and *ſecure way, i. e.* that it be not only true in it ſelf, but free from ſuch Errors and Corruptions which may endanger Salvation; and in that ſenſe it is *true*, but very far from the purpoſe. For none of us did ever yield that the *Roman Church* is a *ſafe way* to Salvation; nay, it is expreſly denyed by my *Lord* of *Canterbury*, as well as by me. But here lies ſtill another piece of *Sophiſtry* to be taken notice of, *whoever hath done all that was neceſſary to attain Salvation, is in a condition wherein he is certainly ſaved*; no doubt of it; but the doing all that is neceſſary to Salvation is not bare believing the neceſſary Articles of Faith, contained in the Creed, but obeying the *Will* of *God*; which cannot be done by thoſe who wilfully adhere to groſs and open Violations of it; as I have charged the *Church* of *Rome* to do, in her ſolemn Acts of Worſhip. Their cauſe certainly is at a very low ebb, when ſuch pittiful *Sophiſtry*, muſt paſs for Reaſoning and Demonſtration among them. Never Men had more need of a *ſelf-evidencing Cauſe*, as well as *Propoſitions*, than they; ſo little help do they contribute to it by their Writings.

3. Prop. *The* Roman Church *is a true way to Salvation, and teaches all that is neceſſary to attain unto it. This is granted*, he ſaith, *by me and other Proteſtants, when we acknowledge the* Roman Church *to be a true Church*; but in what ſenſe, I have already explained, ſo far as to leave no colour of arguing from hence to any contradiction in me. For this *true way to Salvation* in our ſenſe is no more, but that the *Church* of *Rome* doth acknowledge ſo much of Chriſtian Faith, as is ſufficient to ſave Men, on condition they live accordingly, and do not by groſs corruptions in Doctrine or Practice render that Faith ineffectual to them: But withal we aſſert and maintain, that to theſe neceſſary Articles of Chriſtian Faith, the *Church* of *Rome* hath added ſuch Errors and Corruptions, as make the Salvation of any Perſon extremely hazardous, who lives in the Communion of it. And let them have all the comfort from hence which they can, I am ſure they have not this, that they have brought me to contradict my ſelf by ſuch conceſſions as theſe.

By this, his laſt Propoſition comes to nothing; *whoever lives and dyes in the Communion of the* Roman *Church, having conformed to her Doctrine, lives and dyes in a true way to Salvation having conformed to its Directions, and has done all that was neceſſary to attain to it.* Which evidently ſuppoſes that we yield that the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, is *a ſafe way* to Salvation, which we utterly deny; all that we aſſert is, that ſo much of the common Principles of Chriſtianity, as is retained in the *Roman Church*, is ſufficient for the Salvation of thoſe, who do not wilfully corrupt them by bad Opinions and Practices, or if they have, do repent ſincerely. But for thoſe who conform themſelves to the Doctrine and Directions of the *Roman Church* as ſuch, we are far from ever ſaying that *ſuch live and dye in a true Way to Salvation*; for this were to make thoſe Doctrines and Directions to be as holy and innocent as we believe them to be falſe and pernicious. See now what a Contradiction here is; for me to aſſert the *Church* of *Rome* to be a *true Church*, becauſe it retains the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity; and yet to make the Condition of thoſe who live in it ſo hazardous in point of Salvation, by reaſon of the groſs Errors which Men are bound to believe as neceſſary Points of Faith; and horrible Superſtitions which they muſt conform to, if they follow her Directions. Surely he could not but know this to be our meaning, and conſequently to have no ſhadow of Contradiction in it, no more than is in this plain *Propoſition, that a poſſible Way to Salvation may yet be very dangerous.* But though *Jugglers* know their own Cheats, they would loſe their Trade if they made them known to the People. Something muſt be ſaid to amuſe *them*, and this ſeemed the prettieſt way to confound them, by dazeling their Eyes with ſuch Appearances of Contradictions: And thereby to perſwade their own Party, that they need not fear the Attack of ſuch an Enemy who falls foul upon himſelf. But it is nothing but the miſts he caſts before their Eyes, can make any have ſuch an Imagination; it is but making things clear, and then nothing but Order and Agreement appears.

St. *againſt* St. *p.* 7. But yet he quarrels with me, for *making the Caſe of living in wilful Sin, and in the Corruptions of the Roman Church, parallel with each other*; 1. *Becauſe I will not grant that a wilful Sin ſuch as Adultery, to be a true way to Heaven*; and doth he think that I ever imagined *Idolatry* and groſs Superſtition to be ſo; If I grant that, in the *Church* of *Rome* they have *a true way to Heaven*, it is as other debauched Chriſtians have, who own Faith enough to ſave them, but their Deſtruction comes from not living agreeably to it. 2. *Becauſe I grant more to them than to Jews or Pagans, yet they may be ſaved if they do repent.* True, but they are not in ſo great likelihood of *repenting*, as thoſe who own the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, and have a ſincere Deſire in general to ſerve God according to his Will; the Grace of God being more plentiful, where the Chriſtian Faith is owned, than where it is rejected; upon which account *Jews* and *Heathens* are in more danger of not repenting, and conſequently of Salvation than thoſe that live in the *Roman Church*. 3. *Becauſe I grant a greater Capacity of Salvation to* Roman *Catholicks than they do to Proteſtants; but they do not deny it to Proteſtants if they repent.* But the Difference lyes in the Nature and Acts of the Repentance required; we ſay a general Repentance, and a vertuous ſincere Mind, which deſires to know and do the will of God may be ſufficient, together with a particular Repentance of all known Miſcarriages; but they ſay ſuch a Repentance is neceſſary for us, as does imply a diſowning our *Church*, as ſuch wherein no Salvation is to be had, and a joyning with the Communion of the *Church* of *Rome*: therefore the queſtion about their Charity and ours, is about the Poſſibility of the Salvation of Perſons living and dying in the *Communion* of either *Church*; We ſay on the Conditions before-mentioned, Men may be ſaved, though they do not in terms renounce their Communion, but they ſay that none who do not return to their Communion can be ſaved; and in this we juſtly charge them with horrible Uncharitableneſs, when many of their Writers allow a greater Poſſibility of Salvation to meer Heathens. 4. *Becauſe Archbiſhop* Laud *grants a greater Capacity of Salvation than other Proteſtants*; but in what Senſe I have already ſhewed. 5. *That this is in effect to ſay, that it is a true way to Heaven if they go out of it.* Not if they go out of it ſo far as it is true, but ſo far only as it is falſe and dangerous. If a Man were going the right way from *London* to *York*, as far as *Stamford*, and there went quite out of his way into the *Fens*, where his Life is in danger; if I ſhould tell this Man that the way from *London* to *York* was a *certain way*, that the way he went in as far as *Stamford* was a *true way*, and if he had kept in it, would have brought him to *York*, but the *way* he is now in is very *dangerous*, and if he does not return, his Life is in perpetual Hazard; is this all one as if I ſhould tell him, *while you were in the true way, you muſt go out of it?* No ſuch Senſe can be put upon ſuch Words, by any Man that hath Senſe; and for others, we give them leave to cry *Nonſenſe* and *Contradiction*.

P. 8.

All his other pretty Objections run upon the ſame palpable miſtake, and it would be but repeating the ſame thing to anſwer the other remaining Cavils upon this Argument.

§. 7. The charge of Fanaticiſm defended.

I come therefore to the ſore place indeed, the touching whereof hath made them to kick and wince ſo much at me; and that is the F*anaticiſm* of the *Roman Church*. Which made them complain to *Cæſar*, that *it was a new Crime, and never heard of before.* What? they; the ſober, the judicious, the wiſe People of the *Church* of *Rome* turned F*anaticks!* it is falſe, it is impoſſible; nay, it is abſolutely and utterly impoſſible to be true; and none but *Atheiſts* can charge them with it. This hath been their common way of anſwering to this new charge; but not one wiſe Word hath been ſaid in a juſt Vindication of themſelves, by giving anſwer to thoſe many plain, and undenyable Inſtances I have produced. I wiſhed for no other Tryal than to be bound to bring forth their own Authors, and to make good the Authorities I had cited, and my Fidelity therein; but they have fairly declined this way of Tryal. But how then can they free themſelves from this Imputation? We have Men of Art to deal with, and it is ſome Pleaſure to obſerve the Skill they uſe in warding off a blow they did not look for. But if they have nothing more to ſay than *J. W.* can help them to, the charge will ſtick the faſter, for his Attempt to clear them of it.

P. 8. He begins with a Deſcription of *Fanaticiſm, which*, he ſaith, *doth neceſſarily contain a Reſiſtance of Authority*; and for this, very unhappily quotes my own Words. *By Fanaticiſm we underſtand either an Enthuſiaſtick way of Religion, or reſiſting Authority under pretence of Religion*; juſt as if one ſhould ſay, the true Notion of *Idolatry* implyes the renouncing the true God, and to prove it ſhould quote Words of mine to this purpoſe, That Idolatry is either renouncing the true God, or worſhipping the true God by an Image: for as in that caſe, it is evident, I make two ſorts of *Idolatry*; ſo it is as plain in this, that I make two Branches of *Fanaticiſm*, whereof the one is, *an Enthuſiaſtick way of Religion*, the other *Reſiſtance of Authority under the pretence of Religion.* But if this be the true Notion of *Fanaticiſm*, why doth he not ſpeak one Word in vindication of them, from that very kind of *Fanaticiſm*, Fanaticiſm of Rom. Church. ſ. 16. p. 299. 2. ed. which I had charged them to be ſo deeply guilty of? Had I not proved by plain Teſtimonies, that the moſt *Fanatick* Principles of Rebellion were owned by the Jeſuitical Party among them; viz. *The Kings deriving his Power from the People, and the Peoples Authority to call the King to an account, and if they ſee Good to take away his Power and change the Government; and not only ſo, but to take away his Life too?* Had I not proved by clear and late Inſtances, that the Party which owns theſe Principles is to this day the moſt countenanced and encouraged at *Rome*? and any honeſt Men among them, as to theſe Principles, are on that account hated and perſecuted, as *P. W.* and his *Brethren.* But why no anſwer to this charge? Theſe are Things they cannot deny, and yet dare not confeſs them to be true. If *J. W.* anſwer again, let him ſpeak out like a Man, and either confeſs and deteſt theſe Principles, or we ſhall charge them farther with this worſt and moſt dangerous ſort of *Fanaticiſm.* My Duty and juſt Zeal for his *Majeſties* Intereſt and Security, will not ſuffer me to let go this part of the charge againſt them, although they would fain have it paſſed over in Silence, as though never a Word had been ſaid concerning it. This is one of the beſt Arts I have met with in this Pamphlet; for unwary Readers will not remember the charge, when they find no Anſwer; but if *J. W.* had attempted to anſwer it, his ſhuffling and Tricks might have made the deeper Impreſſion in the Readers Minds. Remember then this charge ſtands good againſt them, without ſo much as their pretending to anſwer it.

To come now to the other part of *Fanaticiſm*, viz. *an Enthuſiaſtick way of Religion:* and here to proceed clearly, I ſhall lay down the Method of his *Defence*, and then examine it. The Strength of his *Defence* lyes in theſe *Propoſitions.*

1. *That* Fanaticiſm *does neceſſarily contain a Reſiſtance againſt Authority.*

2. *No particular ways of Religion, countenanced by a competent Authority, are* Fanaticiſm.

3. *Thoſe Things which concern religious Orders and Method of Devotion, which I charge them with, are countenanced by a competent Authority*, viz. *The Authority of that Church.*

4. *That Church cannot countenance* F*anaticiſm which obligeth all Perſons to ſubmit to her Judgment.*

So that here are two Principles by which *J. W.* thinks to vindicate their *Church* from F*anaticiſm*, viz. *competent Authority*, and *Submiſſion of Judgment to the Church.* To ſhew the Invalidity of this Anſwer, I ſhall do theſe things.

1. Shew the Inſufficiency of it.

2. The monſtrous Abſurdities conſequent upon it.

1. If this Anſwer were *ſufficient*, he muſt make it appear, that there have been none charged by me as F*anaticks* in their *Church*, but ſuch as have ſubmitted themſelves and their Judgment to the Authority of their *Church*. For let us conſider the occaſion of this charge, and we ſhall preſently diſcern the Inſufficiency of this way of anſwering it. The Occaſion was, that my Adverſary made all the *Sects* and F*anaticiſms* among us to be the effect of the *Reformation*; what Anſwer could be more proper in this caſe, than to ſhew, that there were as wild and extravagant F*anaticiſms* before, as have been ſince? Which is a plain evidence *that* cannot be the cauſe of them, to which they imputed them. To make this out, I ſearched into the ſeveral ſorts of F*anaticiſm*, and gave inſtances very clear of as great F*anaticks* in the times before the Reformation, as have been ſince; from the many Pretenders to immediate Revelations among them, who were Perſons allowed and approved by their Church, and ſome of them *canonized* for *Saints*; but beſides theſe, I gave ſuch other Inſtances of F*anaticiſm* among the F*riers*, and others of their *Church*, as were never heard of in the World before; as the Broachers and Maintainers of the F*riers Goſpel*, which was to put out of doors the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*; the *Spiritual Brethren* of the order of St. F*rancis* called by ſeveral names, but eſpecially that of F*ratricelli*, who continued long, ſpread far, and more diſturbed the *Church*, than any ſince have done, the *Dulciniſtæ* in *Italy*, the *Alumbrado*'s in *Spain*, &c. What doth he now ſay concerning all theſe? Were theſe countenanced by a *competent Authority* among them? *Did they ſubmit their Judgment to the Church?* if neither of theſe be pretended in reference to them, then this Anſwer muſt be very inſufficient, becauſe it doth not reach to the matter in charge.

2. For thoſe who were as he ſaith, *countenanced by Authority, and did ſubmit themſelves to the Church*, yet this doth not clear them from F*anaticiſm*; but draws after it theſe monſtrous Abſurdities.

1. That prevailing F*anaticiſm* ceaſes to be *Fanaticiſm*; like Treaſon, which when it proſpers none dare call it Treaſon; an excellent way, this, to vindicate the F*anaticiſm* of the *late times*, which becauſe *countenanced* by an *Authority*, ſuppoſed *competent* enough by ſome who then writ of *Obedience* and *Government*, it ceaſed to be F*anaticiſm*; and all the wild and extravagant heats of Mens Brains, their *Enthuſiaſms* and *Revelations* were Regular and orderly things, becauſe *countenanced* by ſuch *Authority* as was then over them.

2. By this Rule the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, nay, our *Lord* himſelf, were unavoidably *Fanaticks*; for what *competent Authority* had they to countenance them? The *Jewiſh Church* was not yet caſt off while our

Saviour lived, but utterly oppoſed his Doctrine and Revelation, as coming from a private Spirit of his own; according therefore to theſe excellent Principles, *our Bleſſed Saviour* is made a meer *Fanatick*, becauſe he wanted a *competent Authority* of the *preſent Church* to *countenance* him; the ſame was generally the caſe of the *Prophets*, and of all the *Apoſtles*. But what Rocks and Precipices will a bad cauſe drive Men upon? If that which makes *Fanaticiſm* or not *Fanaticiſm*, be the being *countenanced* or *not countenanced* by this *competent Authority*, theſe horrible Abſurdities are unavoidable; and all Religion muſt be reſolved into the will and pleaſure of this *competent Authority*. But I need not take ſuch pains to prove this, for my brave Anſwerer *J. W.* ſets it down in his own words. *Moreover, otherwiſe all the* *Stil.* against *Stil.* p. 9. *particular manners of Preaching or Praying practiſed by the Prophets, and all their extraordinary Viſions and Revelations would be flat Fanaticiſm; but becauſe they were countenanced by a competent Authority, they could not deſerve that Character.* Excellent Doctrine for a *Popiſh Leviathan*! Are you in earneſt Sir? Do you think the *Prophets* had been *Fanaticks*, in caſe of *no competent Authority to countenance* them? What *competent Authority* had the *Prophet Elijah* to 1 Kings 19. 18. Rom. 11 3. *countenance* him, when all the *Authority* that then was, not only oppoſed him, but ſought his life? What *competent Authority* had any of the *Prophets* who were ſent to the Ten Tribes? What had *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, and the reſt of them? It ſeems then, all theſe excellent and inſpired Perſons are caſt into the common herd of *Fanaticks*, for want of this *competent Authority* to *countenance* them. And yet this is the Man (meerly becauſe I lay open the *Fanaticiſm* of ſome their pretended *Saints*, ſuch as *Ignatius Loyola* and St. *Francis*) who ranks me with *Lucian* and *Porphyrie*: Hath he not himſelf a great Zeal for *Religion* the mean while, reſolving all Revelation into his *competent Authority*? And not only ſo, but paralleling Ib. *the Expreſſions and Practices of St.* Brigitt, and *Mother* Juliana, (than which ſcarce any thing was ever printed more ridiculous in the way of *Revelations*) *with thoſe of the holy Prophets and Apoſtles?* If a Man deſigned to ſpeak miſchievouſly againſt the *Scriptures* and *Divine Revelation*, he could not do it more to purpoſe than *J. W.* hath done in theſe words? When he compares things whoſe Folly is ſo manifeſt at the firſt view, with that divine Wiſdom, which inſpired thoſe holy Perſons, whom *God* ſent upon particular meſſages to his People, and gave ſo great aſſurance that he ſent them; and who delivered matters of great weight and moment, and not ſuch tittle tattle as thoſe two Womens Books are fraught withal. But if this be the way they have to vindicate them from being *Fanaticks*, it is abſolutely the worſt that could be thought of; for it cannot diſcover ſo high an opinion of them, as it doth a very mean one of the *Books of Scripture*, and the *Divine Revelations* therein contained. I could here earneſtly intreat the wiſer Men of that *Church*, for the honour of *God*, and the *Chriſtian Religion*, not to ſuffer ſuch inconſiderate Perſons to vindicate their cauſe, who to defend the extravagant Infirmities of ſome *Enthuſiaſtical* Women among them, are ſo forward to caſt dirt and reproach upon our common Religion, and thoſe Revelations from whence we derive it. But I forbear; only it is a ſhrewd ſign, if this way be allowed, of a wretched cauſe, that cannot be maintained without plunging thoſe, who rely upon their word, into to the depths of *Atheiſm.* But theſe are not things to be ſo ſlightly paſſed over, they deſerve a fuller and ſeverer Chaſtiſement. For the preſent, this is enough to ſhew, what monſtrous Abſurdities this way of vindicating their *Church* from *Fanaticiſm* hath brought *J. W.* to. Yet in one reſpect he deſerves ſome pardon, for they are wont to write their anſwers upon the common Themes out of ſome ſtaunch Authors, who conſidered a little better what they writ; but this was a new charge, and neither *Bellarmin*, *Becanus*, nor any of their old beaten Soldiers, could give them any Aſſiſtance; they found not the Title of the *Fanaticiſm* of the *Roman Church* in any of their *common place-books*; therefore plain Mother-wit muſt help them, and ſo it hath bravely. But before they again attempt this matter, I deſire them to conſider theſe things, leſt they ſhould in a deſperate humour utterly give up the cauſe of *Religion*, finding themſelves unable to defend that of their *Church*.

1. Whether there can be any greater *Fanaticiſm*, than a falſe pretence to immediate divine Revelation? For what can more expoſe Men to all the Follies and Deluſions imaginable, than this will do? what Actions can be ſo wild and extravagant but Men may do, under ſuch a pretence of *immediate Revelation* from *God?* what bounds of Order and Government can be preſerved? Some may pretend a Revelation to take up Arms againſt their Prince, or to deſtroy all they meet (which is no unheard of thing) others may not go ſo far, but may have Revelations of the unlawfulneſs of Kingly Government; others may pretend Revelations of a *new Goſpel*, and a more *ſpiritual Diſpenſation* than hath been yet in the World, as the *mendicant Friers* did.

2. Whether we are bound to believe all ſuch who ſay, they have divine Revelations? Or whether Perſons may not be deceived in thinking they have Revelations, when they are only deluſions of their own Fancies or the Devil? If not; then every one is to be believed who pretends to theſe things, and then all Follies and Contradictions muſt be ſwallowed which Men ſay they have by immediate Revelation; and every *Fanatick* muſt be believed, to have divine Revelation who believes himſelf, though he be only deluded by his own Imagination, or become *Enthuſiaſtical* by the power of a diſeaſe in his Head, or ſome great heat in his Blood.

3. Whether there muſt not be ſome *certain Rules* eſtabliſhed whereby all Perſons, and even *competent Authority* it ſelf muſt proceed in judging theſe pretences to Revelation, whether they be true or falſe? For if they proceed without rule, they muſt be either inſpired too, or elſe, muſt receive all who pretend to divine Revelations: If there be any certain rules, whereby the Revelation is to be judged; then if Perſons receive any Revelation againſt thoſe Rules, whether are other Perſons bound to follow their judgment againſt thoſe Rules?

4. Whether there can be any more certain Rule of judging, than that two things evidently contradictory to each other, cannot both come from divine Revelation? For then God muſt contradict himſelf, which is impoſſible to be ſuppoſed, and would overthrow the Faith of any divine Revelation. And this is the plain caſe of the Revelations made to two famous *Saints* in the *Roman Church*, St. *Brigitt* and St. *Catharine*; to one it was revealed, that the *Bleſſed*

ſed Virgin was conceived with Original ſin; to the other, *that ſhe was not:* Both theſe have *competent Authority*; for they were both *canonized* for *Saints* by the *Roman Church*, and their *Revelations* approved, and therefore (according to *J. W.*) neither of them were *Fanaticks*, though it is certain that one of their Revelations was falſe. For, either God muſt contradict himſelf, or one of theſe muſt be deceived, or go about to deceive, and what greater F*anaticiſm* can there be, than that is? If one of theſe had only ſome F*anatick Enthuſiaſm*, and the other *divine Revelation*, then *competent Authority* and *Submiſſion to the judgment of the Church*, is not a Rule to judge F*anaticiſm* by; for thoſe were equal in both of them.

5. Whether there be an equal reaſon to look for Revelations now, as in the time of the *Prophets*, and our *Saviour*, and his *Apoſtles?* Or whether God communicates Revelations to no other end, but to pleaſe and gratify ſome *Enthuſiaſtical* Tempers? And what ſhould be the reaſon he ſhould do it more now, than in the Age wherein Revelations were more neceſſary? In thoſe times God revealed his mind to Men, but it was for the benefit of others; when he ſent them upon particular Meſſages, as the *Prophets*, or made known ſome future Events to them of great importance to the Church, as the coming of the *Meſſias*, &c. Or inſpired them to deliver weighty Doctrines to the World, as he did both the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles:* Why ſhould we think, that God now, when the Revelations of theſe holy and inſpired Perſons are upon record, and all things neceſſary to his Church are contained therein, ſhould vary this method of his, and entertain ſome melancholy and retired Women, or other Enthuſiaſtical Perſons with Viſions and Revelations of no uſe to his Church?

6. Whether God doth ever inſpire Perſons with immediate Revelations without giving ſufficient evidence of ſuch Inſpiration? For if he did, it were to leave Men under a Temptation to Infidelity without means to withſtand it; if he doth not, then we have reaſon to examine the evidence, before we believe the Revelation. The evidence God gave of old was either the Prophecy of a ſucceſſion of *Prophets*, by one whoſe Commiſſion was atteſted by great *Miracles*, as *Moſes*, who told the *Iſraelites*, they were to expect *Prophets*, and laid down *Rules* to judge of them by; or elſe by *Miracles* wrought by themſelves as by the *Apoſtles* whom our *Lord* ſent abroad to declare his will to the World. And where theſe are not, what reaſon is there to receive any new Revelations as from *God*, eſpecially when the main Predictions of the New Teſtament are of *falſe Prophets*, and *falſe Miracles?*

7. Whether the *Revelations* of their pretended *Saints* being *countenanced* by the *Authority* of their *Church*, be equally received among them, with the Revelations contained in *Scripture?* If they be, then they ought to have equal Reverence paid to them, and they ought to read them as *Scripture*, to cite their Authority as divine, and to believe them as infallible as *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*; if they be not, then what ever they pretend, they are not looked on as divine Revelations by them, as manifeſtly appears, becauſe they are wholly rejected by ſome of the wiſeſt of them, doubted of, and diſputed by others, as it were eaſie to prove, were it not too large a ſubject for this Diſcourſe, but by none received as Writings of divine Authority, and equal

with the *Scriptures*, which they muſt be if they came from the ſame Spirit. And ſince they are not, it is evident that they are no otherwiſe eſteemed among themſelves, than as the *Fanatick* heats of ſome devout Perſons of diſturbed and deluded Fancies; whom notwithſtanding they are willing to cheriſh, partly becauſe they are loth to diſcountenance any pretence to an *infallible Spirit* in their Church, and partly that there may never be wanting matter to make *Saints* of, when the *Pope* thinks fit, and good Conſideration is offered. This may ſuffice to make good this charge of *Fanaticiſm* againſt the *Roman Church*; and to ſhew that I am as far from the appearance of any Contradiction therein (altho' their Revelations are not from a real one) as *J. W*'s vain and ſophiſtical Talk is from any appearance of Reaſon.

§. 8. *No contradiction in the charge of Diviſions.*

The laſt Contradiction charged upon me, is, *about the Diviſions of the Roman Church*. The occaſion of which Diſcourſe was, that *Diviſions* were objected to me as another conſequent of the *Reformation*; upon which I thought my ſelf obliged to enquire into the *Unity* of their *Church*, and I have at large proved from undenyable Inſtances, atteſted by their own Authors, that they have no reaſon to inſult over other *Churches* on account of their Diviſions, nor to boaſt of their own Unity and Peace. For I have there proved that there have never been greater Diſturbances in the Chriſtian World, than what they call the means of Unity, *viz.* the *Popes Authority*, hath procured, no where greater or more laſting *Schiſms*, no where fiercer Diſputes about matters of Order and Doctrine, than among them. I conſidered all their *ſalvo's* and from them ſhewed, that if they have no Diviſions among themſelves, neither have we; nay the ſame Arguments which prove they do not differ in matters of Faith from each other, do likewiſe prove that they and we do not differ from each other in thoſe things. And what ſaith *J. W.* to all this? Inſtead of healing their own Diviſions, he only deſigns to prove me to be divided againſt my ſelf, that he might make up the full Tale of his Contradictions.

But *J. W.* had ſo much forgot himſelf as to make good the very thing I deſigned; and by that very Argument he uſes to prove that I contradict my ſelf, he manifeſtly proves that there are no more Diviſions in matters of Faith, between the *Roman Church* and *us* than there are among themſelves. This I ſhall make very evident, but I muſt proceed as he doth with his Propoſitions.

1. *No Diviſions from the* Roman *Church are Diviſions of the* Roman *Church.* This is a very ſubtile principle of Unity among them, and by this rule there would be an admirable Unity in the *Roman* Church, if the *Pope* himſelf were left alone in it. For all others would only be *divided from* it, and I would allow the *Pope* to be at a very good Agreement with himſelf, which is more than *J. W.* will allow me: In this caſe indeed there would be *Unity*, but where would be their *Church?* Suppoſe a Shepherd ſhould boaſt of the excellent Government of a great Flock he had under his command, and the Unity and Peace they lived in; and a By-ſtander ſhould tell him that he ſaw others pretend to the ſame Authority over that Flock that he did, and part followed one and part another, he ſaw ſome of the chief of the Leaders ſet themſelves againſt him diſputing his Authority, he ſaw many of the Sheep continually fighting with each other, and ſome had wholly forſaken him; would it not be a pleaſant thing for this Shepherd to ſay, that notwithſtanding

ding all this they had great Peace and Unity, becauſe as many as did not quarrel were very quiet, and thoſe that were divided from his Government were not under it? But our queſtion is, whether ſuch Authority be the means to preſerve the whole flock under Government, when we ſee it prevents no Diviſions, but cauſes many? He might have ſpoken more to the purpoſe if he had framed his Propoſition thus, *There can be no Diviſions in the* Roman *Church, but ſuch as divide Men from it*; and in that caſe the Roman *Church* would have been reduced to a very ſmall number. But if there may be ſuch *Diviſions* which are as contrary to Unity and Peace, as Diviſions *in matters of faith* are, to what purpoſe is it to ſhew that they have none in one kind, if they have very great in all others? But although this be not ſufficient to demonſtrate their *Unity*, yet it is enough for his purpoſe, if it doth ſhew that I contradict my ſelf. But where lies the contradiction? The force of it lies here. *I charge them with Diviſions in matters of faith, when Diviſions in matters of faith make them not to be Members of the* Roman *Church; therefore there can be no Diviſions in the* Roman *Church in matters of faith.* Again (for in theſe two Arguments the ſubſtance of his own Propoſitions is couched by himſelf.) *All thoſe who aſſent unto the antient Creeds are undivided in matters of faith; but all* Roman *Catholicks aſſent unto the antient Creeds*; Ergo, *all* Roman *Catholicks are undivided in matters of faith, and conſequently it is a calumny in me to ſay they are divided in theſe matters.* Now, what an eaſie matter is it to diſpoſſeſs me of this *Spirit of contradiction*, which he imagines me *poſſeſſed with*? I need no holy Water, or ſacred charms and exorciſms to do it with. There needs no more but underſtanding what is meant *by matters of faith*; *when matters of faith* are ſpoken of by me in the place he refers to, it is evident to every one that reads it, and by his own words I ſpeak only of *the Fundamental and neceſſary Articles of faith, which are neceſſary to the Salvation of all and to the very being of a Church*; of which kind I ſay none ought to be eſteemed, that were not admitted into the antient *Creeds*. But when I charge them with Diviſions *in matters of faith*, I do not mean that they reject the antient Creeds, but I take *matters of faith* in their own ſenſe for *things defined by the Church*; and if *J. W.* had ſought for any thing but Words to raiſe Cavils upon, he might have found it ſo explained in the very place where I ſpeak of this. For that Diſcourſe is to anſwer an objection of theirs, *That they do not differ in thoſe things which they eſteem matters of faith*; and particularly I inſiſted upon that, that they cannot be ſure whether they differ *in matters of faith* or no, becauſe they are not agreed what makes things to become *matters of faith*. Can this be underſtood any other way than of their *own ſenſe* of matters of faith? And is not this fair dealing to make me contradict my ſelf, becauſe where I argue againſt them I take *matters of faith in their ſenſe*, and where I deliver my own Opinion, I take them in *another ſenſe*? And this being the ſenſe of matters of faith, the trifling of his arguing appears; for do all theſe ceaſe to be Members of their *Church* who diſpute any thing which others account *matter of faith* among them? Are the *Jeſuits* all out of the *Church* of *Rome*, becauſe they deny the efficacy of *Grace* which the *Dominicans* account *a matter of faith*? Are the *Janſeniſts* and *oral Traditioniſts* divided from the *Church* of *Rome*, becauſe they deny the *Popes Infallibility*, which the *Jeſuits* account a matter of faith? If not, then *all Diviſions in matters and articles of faith, are not Diviſions from the true Church and from all her Members*;

Rational Account. p 56.

*Diviſ. of the Rom. Church. ſ.*15 *p.*397. 2. *ed.*

Members; and ſo his ſecond Propoſition comes to nothing: And ſo likewiſe the third, *that all Diviſions in matters of faith, ſo eſteemed by them, are Diviſions from the* Roman *Church.*

But the fourth and fifth Propoſitions are the moſt healing Principles that have yet been thought on. Fie for ſhame! why ſhould we and they of the *Church* of *Rome* quarrel thus long? We are very well agreed in all *matters of faith*, and I ſhall demonſtratively prove it from the Argument of *J. W.* drawn from his two laſt *Propoſitions. All who aſſent unto the antient Creeds are undivided in matters of faith, by* Prop. 4. but both *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants* do *aſſent unto the antient Creeds*; ergo, *they are undivided in matters of faith.* And hath not *J. W.* now done his buſineſs, and very ſubſtantially proved the thing he intended? But I hope we may enjoy the benefit of it, as well as thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*; and that they will not henceforward charge us with *dividing from their Church* in any matters of faith, ſince we are all agreed in owning the *antient Creeds*; and ſeeing, we cannot be *divided from the Church* but by differing *in matters of faith* according to his *Propoſ.* it follows that we are ſtill Members of the *true Church*, and therefore neither guilty of *Hereſie* nor *Schiſm*. But if thoſe who do own and aſſent to the antient *Creeds* may yet be divided *in matters of faith*, as they charge us by rejecting the *Definitions* of the Roman *Church*, then there is no ſhadow of a Contradiction left in my charging them with *Differences* in matters of faith among themſelves, though, I ſay they own the *antient Creeds.*

§ 9. *The Concluſion. p.* 14.

And now, Reader, thou ſeeſt what all theſe pitiful Cavils are come to; and what ground there hath been for them to glory in this *Puſionello*, that *with a ſheet and a half hath compelled me*, as he ſaith, *to be my own Executioner.* But theſe great *Heroes* muſt be allowed to relate their famous adventures, with ſome advantage to themſelves: It might have been enough to have reſcued the *Lady*, but not only to deſtroy the *Giant* (as any Man muſt be accounted whom ſuch *Knights* encounter) but to leave him grovelling in the ground and gaſping for breath, and that by Wounds he forced him to give himſelf, this is beyond meaſure glorious. Go thy way then for the *Eighth Champion* of *Chriſtendom*, enjoy the benefit of thy illuſtrious Fame, ſit down at eaſe, and relate to thy immortal honour thy mighty exploits; only when thou haſt done, remember thou haſt encountred nothing but the *Wind-mills* of thy own imagination, and the Man whom thou thought'ſt to have executed by his own hands, ſtands by and laughs at thy ridiculous attempts. But I forget, that I am ſo near his Concluſion, wherein he doth ſo gravely adviſe me *that I would be pleaſed for once to write Controverſies, not Play-books*: his meaning I ſuppoſe, is, that I would return to the old beaten road, where they know how to find a Man, and have ſomething to ſay, becauſe others have ſaid ſomething before them; and not repreſent the ridiculous paſſages of their *Fanaticks*; for the defence of which they are furniſht with no Diſtinctions out of their uſual Magazines, their preſent *Manuals of Controverſie.* I ſhall be contented to wait their leiſure, if they have any thing material to ſay; as *J. W.* gives me ſome hopes, when he ſaith, *that other more learned Pens* (I ſhall be glad to ſee them) *will give me a more particular and complete anſwer.* I hope, not in the way of cavilling; If they do, I ſhall hereafter only contemn them, but I am afraid of their good Intentions by the Books he mentions as ſuch conſiderable

things in anſwer to my Vindication of *Archbiſhop Laud*, viz. *the Guide in Controverſies*, and *Proteſtancy without Principles*; if others write as they have done, I ſhall take as little notice of them, as I have done of thoſe. Cannot a dull Book come out with *my Name in the Title*, but I muſt be obliged to anſwer it? No, I aſſure them I know better how to ſpend my time. I ſay ſtill, let a juſt anſwer come forth, that deals by me as I did by the Book I anſwered, and then let them blame me, if I neglect it. But at laſt he gives one general reaſon why no great matter is to be expected to come abroad in Print: *not, but that they have Men of learning among them:* No doubt of it: but alas for them! they are ſo perſecuted in the Printing-houſes, that nothing of theirs is ſuffered to come abroad, only by great good fortune this complaint is in Print and comes abroad openly enough. How long I pray have theſe Days of Perſecution been? For, whatever you imagine I was ſo far *from having any hand in it*, that the firſt time I ever heard of it, was from your complaints. Have you not formerly complained thus, when Books too many have been Printed and Publiſhed in *England*? And what aſſurance can you give us that you do not ſtill complain without cauſe? But, not to ſuffer you to deceive the People any longer in this kind (by pretending that this is the reaſon why you do not anſwer our Books, becauſe you have no liberty of the Preſs) I have at this time a Catalogue by me of above Two Hundred *Popiſh Books* Printed in our own Language (which I ſhall produce on a juſt occaſion) a conſiderable part whereof have been Publiſhed within the compaſs of not
P. 14. many Years. And yet *all poſſible efforts are uſed by us* (ſaith *J. W.*) *to hinder their Doctors from ſhewing their learning*; this of late we muſt needs ſay, they have very ſparingly done; but all the arts we have, cannot hinder ſome of them from ſhewing their *weakneſs*, as this *J. W.* hath very prodigally done in this *Pamphlet*.

AN
ANSWER
TO THE
BOOK,
Entituled,
Dr. *Stillingfleet's Principles Conſider'd.*

§. 1. *The occaſion of annexing the Principles.*

ALthough I write no *Plays*, yet I hope I may have leave to ſay the *Scene* is *changed*; for inſtead of the former *Sophiſter*, one now comes forth in the Habit of a grave *Divine*, whom I ſhall treat with the reſpect due to his appearance of Modeſty and Civility. I paſs by therefore all thoſe unhandſome reflections in his Preface, which I have not already anſwered in mine, and come immediately to the main Controverſie between us, which I acknowledge to be of ſo great importance as to deſerve a ſober debate. And the Controverſie in ſhort is this, Whether Proteſtants who reject the *Roman* Churches Authority and Infallibility, can have any ſufficient Foundation to build their Faith upon ? This we affirm, and thoſe of the Church of *Rome* confidently deny ; and on this account do charge us with the want of Principles, *i. e.* ſufficient grounds for our Faith. But this may be underſtood two ways. 1. That we can have no Certainty of our Faith *as Chriſtians* without their Infallibility. 2. Or that we can have no Certainty of our Faith *as Proteſtants*, *i. e.* in the matters in debate between their Church and ours. Theſe two ought carefully to be diſtinguiſhed from each other: and although the *Principles* I laid down, do reach to both theſe, yet that they were chiefly intended for the former, will appear by the occaſion of adding them to the end of the Anſwer there given. The occaſion was, my Adverſaries calling for *Grounds* and *Principles* ; upon which I there ſay, that I would give an account of the Faith of Proteſtants in the way P.483. 2. ed. of Principles, and of the Reaſon of our rejecting their Impoſitions. The firſt I undertook on two accounts. 1. To ſhew that the *Roman* Churches Authority and Infallibility cannot be the Foundation of Chriſtian Faith, and ſo we may be very good Chriſtians without having any thing to do with the Church of *Rome*. 2. That this might ſerve as a ſufficient Anſwer to a Book intituled *Proteſtants without Principles.* Which being in ſome part of it directed againſt me, I had reaſon, not only to lay down thoſe *Principles*, but to do it in ſuch a manner as did moſt directly overthrow the Principles of that Book.

Which being only intimated there, I muſt now to make my Proceeding more clear and evident, produce thoſe Aſſertions of *E. W.* *Proteſtants without Principles.* Chap. 1. for which mine were intended. In the firſt Chapter he deſigns to prove, *That all Men muſt be infallible in the aſſent they give to matters of* Faith. For, ſaith he, *if they diſown ſuch infallible Believers, they muſt joyntly deny all infallible* Faith *:* and a little after, *an in-* P. 17. *fallible Verity revealed to us forcibly requires an anſwerable and correſpondent infallible* Faith *in us:* and therefore he aſſerts *a ſubjective Infallibility in true Believers.* And from hence he proves *the Neceſſity of infallible Teachers* ; for *infallible Believers and infallible* P. 18. *Teachers*, he ſaith, *ſeem near Correlatives.* In the ſecond Chapter P. 19. he ſaith, *he that hears an infallible Teacher hath the Spirit of Truth, and he that hears not an infallible Teacher wants this Spi-* P. 20. *rit of Truth* ; by which he does not mean an infallible Revealer of the Doctrine at firſt ; but the immediate Teachers of the revealed P. 21. Doctrine, for ſaith he, *no Man can be a Heretick that denies the objective Verities revealed in God's Word, unleſs he be ſure that his Teacher reveals thoſe Verities infallibly.* He propoſes the objection P. 22. of *a Simplician*, as he calls him, *that he builds his Faith and Religion, not on any Preachers Talk, but on the objective Verities revealed in Scripture :* to which he anſwers, *that unleſs he firſt learn of ſome infallible Oracle, the Senſe of Scripture in controverted Places, he can never arrive to the depth of God's true meaning, or derive infallible Faith from thoſe objective revealed Verities.* He yet farther aſſerts, *that every Catechiſt, or Preacher that hath a* P. 23. *lawful Miſſion, and is ſent by the infallible Church to teach Chriſt's ſacred Doctrine, if he preach that Doctrine which Chriſt and his*

Church approves of, is then under that Notion of a Member conjoyned with an infallible Church, infallible in his teaching: and thence P. 24. concludes, *that Infallibility doth accompany both Teachers and Hearers:* P. 25. *and from denying this Infallibility,* he ſaith, *follows an utter Ruine of Chriſtian Religion, yea, and of Scripture too.* And afterwards he goes about to prove, that no Man can have any divine P. 42. 43. Faith without Infallibility in the proponent; for, ſaith he, *as long as the Infallibility of a Revelation ſtands remote from me for want of an undoubted Application made by an infallible Proponent, it can no more transfuſe Certainty into Faith, than Fire at a great diſtance, warmth.* This is the Sum of the *Principles* of that *Metaphyſical Wit*; but ſure a Man muſt have his Brains well confounded by *School Divinity* and hard Words, before he can have common Senſe little enough to think he underſtands them. But becauſe I never loved to ſpend time in confuting a Man, who thinks himſelf the wiſer for ſpeaking things, which neither he nor any one elſe can underſtand; I rather choſe in as ſhort a way as I could, to put together ſuch Propoſitions, as might give an account of *Chriſtian Faith* without all this *Jargon* about Infallibility. In order to this, I firſt laid down the *Principles* wherein all Parties are agreed; and then ſuch Propoſitions as I ſuppoſed would ſufficiently give an account of our Faith, without any neceſſity of ſuch an Infallibility as he makes neceſſary for the Foundation of it.

§. 2. *Of the Notion of Infallibility.*

But for our clearer Proceeding in an Argument of this importance, it will be neceſſary to ſtate and fix the Notion of *Infallibility* before I come to particulars. For as it is uſed it ſeems to be a rare Word for *Jugglers* in *Divinity* to play Tricks with; for ſometimes they apply it to the *Object* that is believed, and call that *infallibly true*; ſometimes to the *Subject* capable of believing, and ſay Perſons ought to be *infallibly certain* that what they believe is *infallibly true*; and ſometimes to the *means* of conveying that infallible Truth to the Faculties of Men, and theſe they ſay muſt be *infallible*, or elſe there can be no *infallible Certainty* of any thing as *infallibly true*. But the Subtilty of theſe things lyes only in their Obſcurity, and the School-man is ſpoiled when his Talk is brought down out of the Clouds to common Senſe: I will therefore try to bring theſe things out of their terms to a plain meaning; and ſurely we may ſpeak and underſtand each other in theſe matters without this doubtful Term of *Infallibility*. For if it ſignifies any thing, we may make uſe of the thing it ſignifies inſtead of the Word, and by applying the thing ſignified by it, to that which it is ſpoken of, we ſhall ſoon diſcern how juſtly it is attributed to it. *Infallible* is that which cannot be deceived; now if no one will ſay, That a *Propoſition cannot be deceived*, it is abſurd to ſay *that it is infallibly true*; therefore the matters revealed conſidered *as objective Verities*, as our *School-man* ſpeaks, are not capable of *Infallibility*; which cannot belong to the *Truth* propoſed, but to him that propounds or believes it. For *to be deceived* or *not to be deceived*, are proper only to *Perſons*; and the Impoſſibility of being deceived does in truth belong only to an infinitely perfect Underſtanding; for whatever Underſtanding is imperfect, is of it ſelf lyable to Error and Miſtake. And yet an Underſtanding lyable to be deceived may not be deceived, and be ſure it is not. The higheſt

eſt Aſſurance of not being deceived, is from Gods revealing any thing to Men; for we know it impoſſible that God ſhould be deceived, or go about to deceive Mankind in what he obliges them to believe as true. This then is granted, that whatever any Perſon ſpeaks immediately from God, he cannot be deceived in it; but Men may be deceived in thinking they ſpeak from God when they do not. There is then no difficulty in the firſt, that whatever Perſons are inſpired by God are *infallible* in what they ſpeak; but the main difficulty is about the Aſſurance which *God* gives to *Men* that they are inſpired. Two ways it may be conceived that Men cannot be deceived in this matter. 1. If God inſpires every particular Perſon with the Belief of this, and gives him ſuch evidence thereof as cannot be falſe. 2. Or if God ſhall inſpire ſome Perſons in every Age to aſſure the World, that thoſe before them were inſpired: but notwithſtanding this, particular Perſons may be deceived, in believing thoſe inſpired who are not; and to prevent this, nothing can be ſufficient but divine Revelation to every particular Perſon that he hath appointed thoſe *infallible Guides* in his *Church*, to aſſure Men that he had at firſt ſettled his *Church* by Perſons that were *infallible*; but then, why might not ſuch a particular Revelation aſſure Men as well immediately that Chriſt and his holy Apoſtles were *infallible*, as that the *Guides* of the preſent *Church* are *infallible*? For it is unconceivable that Perſons ſhould be more infallible in judging the Inſpiration of the preſent Guides, than of the firſt Founders of the Church. And ſuppoſing Men not inſpired, they may be deceived in believing this *Infallibility* of the preſent Church, and if they may be deceived, how can their Faith be *infallible*? So that nothing can make the Faith of particular Perſons infallible, but private Inſpiration which muſt reſolve all Faith into *Enthuſiaſm* and immediate Revelation. And nothing can be more abſurd than to ſay, *That there are infallible Believers without infallible Inſpiration; or that an infallible Proponent can tranſfuſe Infallibility into* Faith, unleſs the Infallibility of that Proponent be firſt made known to the Believer in ſuch a way as he cannot be deceived in. For in matters of divine Revelation, the main thing we are to enquire after, is the *Infallibility* of thoſe who delivered this Doctrine to the World. And although the reaſon of believing what God ſaith, be his own Infallibility, which is natural and eſſential to him; yet the reaſon of my aſſenting to this or that Doctrine, as coming from God, muſt be an Aſſurance that God hath ſecured thoſe Perſons from Miſtake whom he hath imployed to make known the Doctrine to the World. Thoſe Perſons then whom God inſpired, are the *Proponents of matters of* Faith *to us*: and if they give us ſufficient Reaſon to believe that they were inſpired, we are bound to believe them, otherwiſe not. But to ſuppoſe that we cannot believe the firſt infallible *Proponents*, unleſs there be ſuch in every Age, is to make more Difficulties, and to anſwer none. For then all my Belief of the *Infallibility* of the *firſt Proponents*, muſt depend on the evidence which the *preſent Guides* of the Church give of their *Infallibility*, who yet cannot pretend to the ſame evidence which they had: and here is no difficulty anſwered, for we are certainly bound as much to enquire into the reaſon of our believing the preſent Guides of the Church *infallible*, as the Apoſtles: and if Men cannot be infallible

lible in believing the *Apoſtles*, unleſs there be other infallible *Proponents* in every Age, to aſſure them that the Apoſtles were inſpired, why muſt not the Infallibility of theſe preſent *Proponents* be likewiſe ſo atteſted as well as of the Apoſtles? and what undoubted Application can be made of the Churches *Infallibility*, unleſs there be ſome other *infallible Proponent* ſtill to *transfuſe Certainty into my Belief* of that, by vertue of which, I muſt believe all other matters of Faith, which is the *Churches Infallibility?* So that the *laſt Proponent* muſt either be believed for himſelf without any further evidence, and then the ſhorter way would be to believe the firſt ſo, or elſe there will be an *endleſs Infallibility*; or at laſt all muſt be reſolved into the *Enthuſiaſm* of every particular Perſon, if we do not reſt ſatisfied with the *rational evidence* which thoſe Perſons, who were inſpired by God, did give to the World that they were ſent by him; and then let the World judge whether *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* did not give ſtronger evidence that they were ſent from God, than the *Pope* or the *Guides* of the preſent *Church* do? and if ſo, whether it be poſſible Men to do greater Diſſervice to Chriſtianity, than to ſuſpend our Belief of the *Inſpiration* of the *Founders* of the *Chriſtian Church*, on a thing at leaſt, far leſs evident than the thing to be believed by it is? but in plain Engliſh, on a thing notoriouſly falſe; and only the arrogant pretence of an uſurping Faction, which thinks it eaſier boldly to ſay that *it cannot be deceived*, than to defend it ſelf againſt the juſt Accuſations both *of deceiving, and being deceived.*

§. 3. *N.O's conceſſions.* These Things being premiſed, I now come to conſider how far *N. O.* hath ſhewed the Invalidity of the *Principles* laid down by me, for the end for which I intended them. The Deſign of them was to ſhew, that we may have ſufficient *Certainty* of our Faith, without the *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church*; the Anſwerer hath yielded ſome things and denyed others. I ſhall therefore firſt lay down his *Conceſſions*, and ſee of what Force they are to the Iſſue of this Controverſie, and then come fairly to debate the matter in difference between us.

I. For his Conceſſions.

1. He yields, *That there is no neceſſity at all of Infallibility under natural Religion:* which was implyed in the ſecond and third *Propoſitions* which are granted by him.

Prop. 2. For in the ſecond Propoſition I aſſert, That Man being framed a rational Creature capable of reflecting upon himſelf, may antecedently to any external Revelation certainly know the being of God, and his dependence upon him; elſe there could be no ſuch thing as a Law of Nature, or any Principles of natural Religion: *which*, he ſaith, *may be granted.*

Prop. 3. All ſupernatural and external Revelation, muſt ſuppoſe the Truth of natural Religion; for unleſs we be antecedently certain that there is a God, and that we are capable of knowing him, it is impoſſible to be certain, that God hath revealed his Will to us by any ſupernatural means. *Let this be granted*, ſaith he. From whence it follows, that we have ſufficient Certainty of the Principles of natural Religion, without any ſuch thing as *Infallibility*.

2. He yields, *That Reaſon is to be Judge concerning divine Revelation*; which appears by the next Propoſition.

Nothing ought to be admitted for divine Revelation, which overthrows the Certainty of thoſe Principles which muſt be antecedently ſuppoſed to all Divine Revelation: For that were to overthrow the means whereby we are to judge concerning the truth of any divine Revelation. Of which, he ſaith, *let this alſo be granted.* Prop. 4.

3. He yields, *that the Will of God may be ſufficiently declared to Men by writing*, for *he grants* the tenth Propoſition, which is this.

If the Will of God cannot be ſufficiently declared to Men by writing, it muſt either be, becauſe no writing can be intelligible enough for that end, or that it can never be known to be written by Men infallibly aſſiſted; the former is repugnant to common ſenſe, for words are equally capable of being underſtood, ſpoken or written; the latter overthrows the poſſibility of the Scriptures being known to be the Word of God. *This*, ſaith he, *is granted.* Prop. 10.

4. He yields, *that the written will of God doth contain all things ſimply neceſſary to Salvation.* For in his conſideration of the fourteenth Propoſition, theſe are his words: *Mean while as touching the perfection of holy Scriptures, Catholicks now, as the holy Fathers anciently do grant that they contain all points, which are ſimply neceſſary to be of all Perſons believed for attaining Salvation.* P.22.S.15.

5. He yields, *That no Perſon is infallibly certain of or in his Faith, becauſe the Proponent thereof is infallible, unleſs he alſo certainly know, or have infallible evidence that he is infallible*; only he adds, *that for begetting an infallible aſſent to the thing propoſed, it is ſufficient if we have an infallible evidence either of the thing propoſed, or of the Proponent only.* Which is all I deſire as to this matter. But he quarrels with me for ſaying, Propoſition twenty firſt. It is neceſſary therefore in order to an infallible Aſſent, that every particular Perſon be infallibly aſſiſted, in judging of the matters propoſed to be believed: *Becauſe* ſaith he, *it is not neceſſary to have an infallible evidence of the truth of the things propoſed*, i. e. *from the internal Principles that prove or demonſtrate them; but it is enough that he have an infallible or ſufficiently certain evidence only of the Infallibility of the external Proponent.* Where there are two thins to be taken notice of. 1. That by the *matters propoſed to be believed*, he would ſeem to underſtand me only of the things that are to be believed by vertue of any Proponent ſuppoſed infallible; whereas I meant it of all ſuch things to which *an infallible Aſſent* is required, and chiefly of that by which we are to believe the things revealed; as for inſtance, *that the Church is infallible*, is in the firſt place to be believed upon their Principles, and either an *infallible Aſſent* is required to this or not; if not, then *Infallibility is not neceſſary to Faith*; if it be, then this infallible Aſſent muſt be built on an Infallibility antecedent to that of the Church; and then my conſequence neceſſarily follows, that the ground on which a neceſſity of ſome external Infallible Proponent is aſſerted, muſt rather make every particular Perſon infallible, if no divine Faith can be without an infallible Aſſent, and ſo renders any other Infallibility uſeleſs. P. 52.

2. That he explains *infallible Evidence* by that which is *ſufficiently certain*, which is meer ſhuffling: For he knows well enough that we contend for *ſufficiently certain evidence* as much as they; our only Queſtion is about *Infallibility*, whether that be neceſſary or no? If *ſufficiently certain Evidence* will ſerve for the Churches Infallibility,

lity, why may it not for the *Scriptures*, or any matters of Faith contained therein? If they mean no more by *Infallibility* but *ſufficient Certainty*, why do they make ſo great a noiſe about it, as though there could be no Faith and we no Chriſtians without Infallibility? When we all ſay that the matters of Faith have *ſufficient Certainty*, nay, the higheſt which ſuch things are capable of. Is *infallible Faith* come to be *ſufficiently certain* only? For all that I know an *infallible* Pope may by ſuch another Explication become like one of us.

P. 54. 6. He yields, *that a right and ſaving Faith may be without an infallible Aſſurance concerning the Churches Infallibility. Which*, he ſaith, *is abundantly declared by Catholick Writers.* I only deſire to know, why a like right and ſaving Faith may not be had concerning the *Scriptures*, without their *Churches* Infallibility? For from hence it follows, that an *infallible Aſſent* is not requiſite to ſaving Faith; directly contrary to my former Adverſary *E. W.* for one ſaith, *it is neceſſary to Faith*, and the other, *that it is not.* But above all, how will he ever anſwer this to Mr. *J. S.* who hath written a whole Book purpoſely againſt this Principle, as impious and atheiſtical? Methinks this way of defending the main foundation of their Faith by Principles ſo directly contradicting one another looks a little ſcandalouſly, and brings an odd ſuſpicion upon their Cauſe, as if it were very hard to be made good, when our Adverſaries cannot agree by which of two quite contrary Principles it was beſt be maintained.

P. 56. 7. He yields, *that the utmoſt Aſſurance a Man can have of the Churches Infallibility, is only moral*; but to make it up, he calls it a *moral Infallibility*; which, how ſtrangely ſoever it ſounds, yet his meaning is good; for it is ſuch an Infallibility, as is not Infallibility. Hath the Diſpute been thus long among us, whether *Infallibility* be neceſſary or no to Faith, and now at laſt one comes and tells us, yes ſurely, a *moral Infallibility* is neceſſary. I have heard of a hot Diſpute between two Gentlemen about *Tranſubſtantiation*, very earneſt they were on both ſides; at laſt another falls into their Company and asked them what it was they were about; they told him *Tranſubſtantiation*: Very well, ſaid he, but I pray tell me what you mean by it; one ſaid it was *ſtanding* at the Euchariſt, and the other *kneeling*. Much ſuch another Explication is this here of *Infallibility*, only this is ſomewhat worſe, for it is joyning two words together which deſtroy each other; for if it be only *moral Certainty*, it is not *infallible*; if it be *infallible*, it cannot be barely *moral*. I expect to hear ſhortly of an accidental Tranſubſtantiation, a co-ordinate Supremacy, as well as a *moral Infallibility*. But we are to ſuppoſe that by *Infallibility* he means no more than *Certainty*, becauſe he explains it *by the Certainty of univerſal Tradition*: This were well enough, if in the precedent Page he had not ſaid, *that a particular*
P. 55. *Perſon may be infallible in the Aſſent he gives to ſome matter propoſed*, viz. *to this, that the Church is infallible*; I would fain underſtand what this *infallible Aſſent* is grounded upon, and if the Evidence be only *ſufficiently or morally infallible*, which are his own Terms, how the *Aſſent* which is built upon it, comes to be more than ſo. It is very pleaſant to obſerve how Mr. *Creſſy*, and ſome other late *Writers* of their Church are perplexed about this word *Infallibility*, as if they had a Woolf by the ears, they cannot tell how to hold it, and they are afraid to let it go. And very loth is our *N. O.* to part with the

ſound of *Infallibility*, although his own Conceſſions perfectly overthrow it, as will yet further appear by this laſt, *viz.*

8. *That moral certainty is a ſufficient foundation for Faith.* This will appear by my 27. Propoſition, which is this: The nature of Certainty doth receive ſeveral names either according to the nature Pr. p. 27. of the proof, or the degrees of the Aſſent. Thus moral Certainty may be ſo called, either as it is oppoſed to mathematical Evidence, but implying a firm aſſent upon the higheſt evidence that moral things can receive: Or as it is oppoſed to a higher degree of Certainty in the ſame kind, ſo moral Certainty implies only greater Probabilities of one ſide than the other. In the former ſenſe we aſſert the certainty of Chriſtian Faith to be Moral, but not only in the latter. To which he ſaith, *this Principle is granted, if im-* P. 67. *porting only that Chriſtians have or may have a ſufficiently certain and infallible evidence of the truth of their Chriſtianity.* Whereby it is plain that though he uſeth the term *infallible*, yet he means no more than I do, or elſe he ought not to have brought that as an explication of my Principle which is contrary to it, as in this Controverſie, *moral Certainty* is oppoſed to ſtrict Demonſtration and Infallibility. But if he by *Infallibility* means only *ſufficient Certainty*, I ſhall be content for quietneſs ſake, that he ſhall call it *Infallibility*, if he pleaſes. And that he can mean no more by it, appears not only by what he hath ſaid before, but by what he ſaith afterwards in theſe words. *A natural or moral Certainty (though not ſuch a* P. 94. *one as cannot poſſibly be falſe, but which according to the Laws of Nature and the common manners and experiences of Men is not falſe) is ſufficient on which to ground ſuch a Faith as God requires of us; in reſpect of that Certainty which can be derived from humane ſenſe or reaſon, and which ſerves for an introductive to the reliance of this our Faith upon ſuch Revelation as is believed by us divine; and which if divine, we know is not poſſibly fallible; in reſpect of its relying on which Revelation, an infallible Object, and not for an infallible Certainty as to the Subject, it is that this our Faith is denominated a Divine Faith. Now this natural or moral Certainty is thought ſufficient for the firſt rational Introductive and Security of our Faith, not only by the Doctor in his twenty ſeventh Principle, but alſo by Catholick Divines in their Diſcourſes of the prudential Motives.* Very well ſaid, and I were a very diſingenuous Man, if I ſhould not heartily thank him for ſo free a Confeſſion, by which, if I underſtand any thing, he very fairly gives up the Cauſe of *Infallibility*, as to the neceſſity of it in order to Faith: As will eaſily appear by the managing of it, ſo far as I have been concerned in it. It is evident to any one that will caſt an eye on the Controverſy of *Infallibility*, between the Archbiſhop and his Adverſaries, that it was raiſed on this account, becauſe thoſe of the Church of *Rome* aſſerted, that the infallible Teſtimony of the Church was neceſſary in order to the believing the Scriptures to be the word of God: And ſo much is endeavoured to be defended by him who pretended to anſwer my Lord of *Canterburies* Book, who goes upon this Principle, *that this is to be believed with a divine Faith, and a divine Faith muſt be built upon an infallible Teſtimony*; the falſhood of which, I at large ſhewed in the diſcourſe of the Reſolution of Faith. Since the publiſhing whereof, the Metaphyſical Gentleman before

Prot. without Princip. Chap. 6.

Guide in Controv. diſc. 5. chap. 10. S. 134.

Sect. 135.

mentioned, pretended to anſwer that part of it which concerns *Infallibility* and *moral Certainty*. Some of his Aſſertions I have laid down already, as contrary to this of *N. O.* as may be; for he not only aſſerts the neceſſity of *Infallibility for a foundation of Chriſtian Faith*, but ſpends ſome Chapters in rambling Talk againſt *moral Certainty*. The Title of one of which is, *Faith only morally certain is no Faith.* I deſire *N. O.* and *E. W.* to agree better before they go about to confute me; and to what purpoſe ſhould I trouble my ſelf with anſwering a Man whoſe Principles the more ingenuous of their own Party diſown, as well as we? For not only *N. O.* here makes *moral Certainty a ſufficient ground for divine Faith*, but the *Guide in Controverſies*, another of my Adverſaries, aſſerts the ſame, when he ſaith, *and indeed from what is ſaid formerly, that a divine Faith may be had by thoſe who have had no extrinſecal even morally infallible* (I ſee now from whom *N. O.* learnt theſe terms) *Motive thereof, it follows that divine Faith doth not reſolve into ſuch Motives either as the formal Cauſe, or always as the applicative Introductive, or condition of this divine Faith.* And a little after, *that it is not neceſſary that ſuch Faith always ſhould have an external rational infallible ground or motive thereto (whether Church Authority or any other) on his part that ſo believes.* By theſe Conceſſions it appears that the cauſe of *Infallibility*, as far as it concerns the neceſſity of it in order to Faith, is clearly given up by theſe Perſons; and if others be ſtill of another mind among them, I leave them to diſpute it among themſelves.

§ 4. *N. O's Principles laid down.*

Thus far then we are agreed; I now come to conſider where the Controverſy ſtill remains, and why the reſt of my *Principles* may not paſs as well as theſe. In order to this, I muſt, by taking a view of his ſeveral Exceptions and Anſwers, draw together a *Scheme* of thoſe *Principles* which he ſets up in oppoſition to mine; and if I do not very much miſtake, they may be reduced to theſe three.

1. That God hath given an infallible aſſiſtance to the Guides of the Church in all Ages of it, for the direction of thoſe who live in it.

2. That without this infallible aſſiſtance there can be no certainty of the ſenſe of Scriptures.

3. That all the Arguments which overthrow the Churches Infallibility, do deſtroy the Churches Authority.

Theſe, as far as I can perceive, contain the whole force of his *Conſiderations*; and in the examination of theſe the remaining Diſcourſe muſt be ſpent; in which I ſhall have occaſion to take notice of whatever is material in his Book.

1. The main Controverſie is, whether God hath given an infallible Aſſiſtance to the Guides of the Church in all Ages, for the conduct of thoſe who live in it? For if he hath not, my Adverſary cannot deny, but the *Principles* laid down by me muſt hold. For in caſe there be no Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, every one muſt be left to the uſe of his own Underſtanding, proceeding in the beſt manner, to find out what the Will of God is in order to Salvation. We do not now diſpute concerning the beſt helps for a Perſon to make uſe of in a matter of this nature; but the Queſtion is, whether a Man ought to reſign his own judgment to that of the Church, which pretends to be infallible as to all neceſſaries for Salvation? Or ſuppoſing no ſuch Infallibility, whether a Perſon uſing his Faculties in the beſt

manner about the ſenſe of *Scriptures*, with the helps of divine Grace, may not have ſufficient Certainty thereby what things are required of him in order to Happineſs? Hereby I exclude nothing that may tend to the right uſe of a Mans underſtanding in theſe things, whether it be the direction of Paſtors, the Decrees of Councils, the ſenſe of the Primitive Church, or the care, induſtry, and ſincerity of the Enquirer; but ſuppoſing all theſe, whether by not believing the Guides of the Church to be infallible, *the foundation of this Perſons Faith can be nothing elſe but a trembling Quickſand*, as *N. O.* ſpeaks in his Preface; only from the ſuppoſing *an errability in the Guides of Gods Church.* And a little after he lays down that as his fundamental Principle, *that the only certain way not to be miſled will be the ſubmitting our internal aſſent and belief to Church Authority*; or as he elſewhere ſpeaks *to the infallible Guidſhip of Church Governors.* Here then two Queſtions neceſſarily ariſe: 1. Whether there can be no certainty of Faith without this Infallibility? 2. What certainty there is of this Infallibility? P. 17.

1. Whether there can be no certainty of Faith without *Infallibility* in the Guides of the Church, and ſubmitting our internal aſſent and belief to them? For the clearing of this we muſt conſider, what things are agreed upon between us, that by them we may proceed to the reſolution of this Queſtion.

1. It is I ſuppoſe agreed, that every Man hath in him a faculty of diſcerning of Truth and Falſhood.

2. That this Faculty muſt be uſed at leaſt in the choice of the Infallible Guide; for otherwiſe a Man muſt be abuſed with every pretence of Infallibility, and *George Fox* may as well be followed as the Pope of *Rome*; and to what purpoſe are all prudential motives and arguments for Infallibility, if a Man muſt not judge whether they be good or no, *i. e.* ſufficient to prove the thing.

3. That God is not wanting in neceſſaries to the Salvation of Mankind.

4. That the Books of Scripture received on both ſides do contain in them the Will of God in order to Salvation.

5. That all things ſimply neceſſary to Salvation are contained therein, which is a Conceſſion mentioned before.

§. 5. N. O's *exceptions anſwered.*

Theſe things being ſuppoſed, the Queſtion now is, whether a Perſon not relying on the Infallibility of a Church, may not be certain of thoſe things which are contained in thoſe Books in order to Salvation? For of thoſe our preſent enquiry is, and not about the ſenſe of the more difficult and controverted Places; and if we can make it appear that Men may be certain as to matters of Salvation without Infallibility, let them prove (if they can) the neceſſity of Infallibility for things which are not neceſſary to Salvation. But of the ſenſe of *Scripture* in thoſe things afterwards; I now enquire into the certainty Men may attain to, of *the neceſſaries to Salvation in Scripture:* And concerning this, I laid down this Propoſition.

Prop. 13.

Altho we cannot argue againſt any particular way of Revelation from the neceſſary Attributes of God, yet ſuch a way as writing being made choice of by him, we may juſtly ſay, that it is repugnant to the nature of the deſign and the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God to give infallible aſſiſtance to Perſons in writing his Will for the benefit of Mankind, if thoſe Writings may not be underſtood by all

Perſons who ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their Salvation.

This Principle, he ſaith, *is unſound*; which if he can prove, P. 13. I may have more reaſon to queſtion it than I yet have. And I aſſure him I expect no mean proofs to ſhake my belief of a Principle of ſo great importance to the Chriſtian Religion. For it being granted by him, *that all things ſimply neceſſary to Salvation, are contained in the Books of Scripture*, I deſire to know whether *things ſimply neceſſary* ought not to be delivered with greater plainneſs than things which are not ſo? Whether God appointing the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles to write theſe things, did not intend that they ſhould be ſo expreſſed as they might moſt eaſily be underſtood? Whether our Saviours own Sermons were capable of being underſtood by thoſe who heard them, without ſome infallible Interpreter? Whether the Evangeliſts did not faithfully deliver our Saviours Doctrine? If they did, how that comes to be obſcure now, which was plain then? So that either Chriſt himſelf muſt be charged with not ſpeaking the Will of God plainly, or the Evangeliſts cannot be charged with not expreſſing it ſo. There are no other Books in the World that I know of, that need an infallible Interpreter: And we can tell certainly enough what any other Religion requires, ſuppoſing it to be written in the ſame way that the Chriſtian is: Is it not poſſible for a Man to be certain what the Law of *Moſes* required of the People of *Iſrael*, by reading the Books of that Law, without ſome infallible Guides? Do the Ten Commandments need an *infallible Comment?* Or can we now have no certainty of the meaning of the *Levitical Law*, becauſe there is no High-Prieſt or Sanhedrin to explain it? And if it be poſſible to underſtand the neceſſaries of that dark Diſpenſation in compariſon with the Goſpel, are our Eyes now blinded with too much Light? Is not Chriſtianity therefore highly recommended to us in the New Teſtament, becauſe of the clearneſs and perſpicuity wherein the Doctrines and Precepts thereof are delivered? And yet after all this, cannot the moſt neceſſary parts of it, be underſtood by thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to underſtand them? By which ſincere Endeavour we are ſo far from excluding any uſeful helps, that we always ſuppoſe them. The ſum then of what he is to confute, is this, that although the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts did deliver the Mind of God to the World in their Writings, in order to the Salvation of Mankind, although they were inſpired by an infinite Wiſdom for this end, although all things ſimply neceſſary to Salvation are contained in their Writings, although a Perſon uſeth his ſincere Endeavour by all moral Helps, and the divine Grace, aſſiſting him to find out in theſe Writings the things neceſſary to Salvation, yet after all he cannot certainly underſtand the meaning of them. Which to me appears ſo abſurd and monſtrous a Doctrine, ſo contrary to the honour of the Scriptures and the deſign of Chriſtianity, that if I had a mind to diſparage it, I would begin with this, and end with Tranſubſtantiation. For in earneſt Sir, did not our Saviour ſpeak intelligibly in matters of ſo great importance to the Salvation of Mankind? Did he not declare all that was neceſſary for that end, in his many admirable Diſcourſes? Did not the Evangeliſts record his Words and Actions in writing, and that as one of them ſaith Joh. 20.31. expreſly, *that we might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God,* *and that believing we might have Life through his name?* And after all this, cannot we underſtand ſo much as the common neceſſaries to Salvation by the greateſt and moſt ſincere endeavour for that end? But it is time now to conſider his Exceptions againſt this Principle: which are theſe.

1. *That God may reveal his mind ſo in Scripture, as that in many* P. 13. *things it may be clear only to ſome Perſons more verſed in the Scriptures, and in the Churches Traditional Senſe of them, and more aſſiſted from above according to their Imployment; which Perſons he hath appointed to inſtruct the reſt.* But what is all this to our purpoſe? Our Queſtion is not about *may be's*, and Poſſibilities of things, but it is taken for granted on both ſides, that God hath revealed his mind in Writing; therefore he need not make the Suppoſition of *no Writings at all*, as he P. 14. doth afterwards: The Queſtion is, whether theſe Writings being allowed for divine Revelations of the Will of God, he hath expreſſed the neceſſaries to Salvation clearly therein or not? That God may deliver his mind obſcurely in many things, is no queſtion; nor that he may inſpire Perſons to unfold his mind, where it is obſcure; but our queſtion is, whether or no theſe Writings being acknowledged to contain the Will of God, it be agreeable with the nature of the deſign, and the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God for ſuch Writings not to be capable of being underſtood in all things neceſſary to Salvation, by thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to underſtand them? But when I had expreſly ſaid, *things neceſſary for Salvation*, why doth he avoid that which the diſpute was about, and only ſay *many things* inſtead of it? I do not doubt but there are many difficult Places of Scripture, as there muſt be in any antient Writings penned in an Idiom ſo very different from ours. But I never yet ſaw one difficulty removed by the pretended infallible Guides of the Church; all the Help we have had, hath been from meer fallible Men of excellent skill in Languages, Hiſtory, and Chronology, and of a clear Underſtanding; and we ſhould be very unthankful not to acknowledge the great Helps we have had from them, for underſtanding the difficult Places of Scripture: But for the *infallible Guides*, they have dealt by the Obſcurities of Scripture, *as the Prieſt and the Levite* in our Saviour's Parable, did by the *wounded Man*, they *have fairly paſſed them by*, and taken no care of them. Luke 10. 31. 32. If theſe Guides did believe themſelves infallible, they have made the leaſt uſe of their Talent that ever Men did; they have laid it up in a Napkin, and buried it in the Earth, for nothing of it ever appeared above ground. How could they have obliged the World more, (nay, it had been neceſſary to have done it for the uſe of their Gift) than to have given an infallible Senſe of all controverted Places; and then there had been but one diſpute left, whether they were infallible or not? but now, ſuppoſing we believe their Infallibility, we are ſtill as far to ſeek, for the meaning of many difficult Places. And ſuppoſing God had once beſtowed this Gift of Infallibility upon the Guides of the Church, he might moſt juſtly deprive them of it, becauſe of the no uſe they have made of it; and we might have great reaſon to believe ſo from our Saviour's Words, *To him that hath ſhall* Mat. 25. 29. *be given, but from him that hath not, ſhall be taken away even that which he hath.* So that not making uſe of this Talent of Infallibility, gives us juſt reaſon to queſtion, whether God continues it,

ſuppoſing he had once given it to the Guides of the Church, ſince the Apoſtles days: which I ſee no reaſon to believe.

P. 14. 2. His next Exception is from a ſaying of Dr. *Fields, who* he ſaith, *ſeems to advance a contrary Principle in his Preface to his Books of the Church.* But O the miſchief of Common-place-Books! Which make Men write what they find, and not what is to their purpoſe. For after all, Dr. *Field* doth but ſeem to advance another Principle in his Opinion, and doth not ſo much as ſeem to do it in mine. For that learned and judicious Writer ſets himſelf purpoſely to diſprove the Infallibility of the Church in the beginning of his fourth Book; and is it probable that any Man of common Underſtanding would aſſert that in his Preface, which he had diſproved in his Book? It is a known Diſtinction in the *Church* of *Rome* of the Church Virtual, repreſentative and eſſential; by the two firſt are meant Popes and Councils; and of theſe two, Field of the Church l. 4. ch. 5. p. 350. Dr. *Field* ſaith, *that they may err in matters of greateſt Conſequence*; yet theſe are *N.* O's. infallible Guides, whoſe Conduct he ſuppoſeth Men obliged to follow, and to yield their internal Ch. 2. Aſſent to. Concerning the eſſential Church, he ſaith, *That it either comprehends all the faithful that are and have been ſince Chriſt appeared in the Fleſh; and then,* he ſaith, *it is abſolutely free from all Error and Ignorance of divine things, that are to be known by Revelation; or as it comprehends only all thoſe Believers that are and have been ſince the Apoſtles times; and in this Senſe,* he ſaith, *the whole Church may be ignorant in ſundry things, which are not neceſſary to Salvation; but he thinks it impoſſible for the whole Church to err in any thing of this nature. But in things that cannot be clearly deduced from the Rule of Faith, and Word of divine and heavenly Truth, we think it poſſible, that all that have written of ſuch things might err and be deceived. But if the Church be taken only as it comprehends the Believers that now are, and preſently live in the World,* he ſaith, *it is certain and agreed upon, that in things neceſſary to be known and believed expreſly and diſtinctly, it never is ignorant, much leſs doth err. Yea, in things that are not abſolutely neceſſary to be known and believed expreſly and diſtinctly, we conſtantly believe that this Church can never err, nor doubt pertinaciouſly, but that there ſhall ever be ſome found ready to embrace the truth, if it be manifeſted to them, and ſuch as ſhall not wholly neglect the ſearch and enquiry after it, as times and means give leave.* But if we mean by a Church, any Ch. 5. particular *Church*, he determines, *That particular Men and Churches may err damnably, becauſe notwithſtanding others may worſhip God aright; but that the whole Church at one time cannot ſo err, for that then the Church ſhould ceaſe utterly for a time, and ſo not be Catholick being not at all times; and Chriſt ſhould ſometimes be without a Church; yet, that Errors not prejudicing the Salvation of them that err may be found in the Church, that is at one time in the World, we make no doubt; only the Symbolical and Catholick which is and was being wholly free from Error.* Which ſeveral Expreſſions amount to no more than this, that there will be always ſome true Chriſtians in the World; but what is this to infallible Teachers and Guides, in a Church that pretends to be Catholick againſt all the Senſe and Reaſon in the World? And is it now imaginable after all this, that

Dr. *Field* ſhould make any particular Church infallible? No, all that he means in his Preface, is this, that *among all the Societies of Men, Perſons who have not leiſure or capacity to examine particular Controverſies, ought diligently to ſearch which is the true Church, and having done this, to embrace her Communion, follow her Directions, and reſt in her Judgment*, *i. e.* Suppoſe a Man by that very Book of Dr. *Fields* ſhould be convinced that the Church of *Rome* is a very corrupt and tyrannical Church, and the *Church* of *England* is a ſound and good Church (which was the Deſign of his writing it,) he being thus far ſatisfied, ought *to embrace the Communion of this Church, and ſo follow her Directions, and reſt in her Judgment*, ſo, as not to forſake her Communion for any Cavils that are raiſed about particular Controverſies of which he is not a capable Judge. And doth this make the *Church* of *England* infallible? If we ſay that a Man being firſt ſatisfied of the Skill and Integrity of a Lawyer, ought to follow his Directions, and *reſt in his Judgment*; doth this make that Lawyer *infallible?* ſo we ſay here, the *reſting in the Judgment of a Church*, of whoſe Integrity we have aſſurance before-hand, implies only the Suppoſition of ſo much Honeſty and Skill in a Church, as may over-rule the Judgments of Perſons who either have not leiſure or capacity to underſtand particular Controverſies which require Skill in Languages, ſearch into the Fathers and later Writers on both ſides. If we ſay, that unlearned Perſons ought in ſuch things to truſt the learned, whoſe Integrity they have no ground to ſuſpect, this doth not certainly make the more learned infallible? But we may reſt in the Judgment of thoſe whom we have no reaſon to ſuſpect, though we believe them not to be infallible: and it was the former Dr. *Field* meant, and by no means any Infallibility, unleſs he plainly contradict himſelf.

3. He excepts, *That this brings in an Inerrability of every particular Chriſtian in all points neceſſary, if ſuch Chriſtians will, that is, if only they ſhall ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them.* P. 15. The Force of this Argument will be eaſily diſcerned if we put another parallel to it, *viz.* That they who aſſert from Scripture the Aſſiſtance of divine Grace to the ſincere Endeavours of Men, do make all Men impeccable *if they will*; as well as thoſe who aſſert, that God will not be wanting in neceſſaries to Salvation to thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to know them, make all ſuch Men ſo far infallible, if they will. If any one thing be plain in Scripture, the Goodneſs of God is; and who can believe that, and yet think that he will ſuffer thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to know what is neceſſary to their Salvation, not to underſtand it? But beſides, how often doth the Scripture promiſe a greater degree of knowledge *to the meek and humble, to the diligent and induſtrious; to thoſe that ask and ſeek Wiſdom from him, to thoſe that do the Will of God*; to whom our Saviour hath expreſly promiſed, *that they ſhall know of his Doctrine, whether it be of God or no?* Pſal 25.9. James 1.5. Luke 11. 13. And if this be the *Inerrability* he means, he ſees what grounds we have to aſſert it. John. 7.17 But we underſtand not by it, that ſuch Perſons cannot err in their Judgments about what things are neceſſary, and what not; nor that they cannot err in other things which are not ſo neceſſary to Salvation; but that God's Goodneſs is ſo great, and his Promiſes ſo plain, and his Word ſo clear in neceſſary things, that no one who ſincerely endeavours to know them, ſhall ever miſs of Salvation. And if ſuch an Infallibility will ſatisfie them, we do not deny

it to Popes themſelves, or other Guides of the Church, on condition they do not think themſelves infallible beyond theſe bounds; for they are only the *meek* and *humble* whom God hath promiſed *to teach his way*, and not ſuch who will be infallible whether God will or no.

His other exceptions from *this Principle deſtroying Church Authority, from the Parity of Reaſon for Church Governors, and the controverted Places of Scripture* ſhall be conſidered afterwards.

§ 6. N. O's *Proofs of Infallibility examined.*

2. I now come to examine what Certainty there is for this Infallibility? Here I ſhall lay down ſome Principles of common Reaſon, by which we may better underſtand the Force of his Arguments.

1. That the Proof ought always to be more evident than the thing that is to be proved by it. For otherwiſe it is of no advantage to the proof of it, if it have but the ſame degree of evidence; but is a great Prejudice to it, if it have leſs: ſo that if the Proofs of Infallibility be equally obſcure and difficult with thoſe things which are to be believed by virtue of it, this Infallibility is of no uſe; but if they be leſs evident, the Pretence of it is both very ridiculous and prejudicial to the Chriſtian Faith.

2. The greater concernment any Law is of, and the greater danger in miſtaking the Meaning of it, the more plain and diſtinct ought the Terms of that Law to be. As a Law about the Succeſſion of the Crown ought to be framed with all the Clearneſs and Diſtinctneſs imaginable, becauſe the Peace and Security of a Nation depends upon it. So in caſe Chriſt hath appointed any Succeſſor in the Government of his Church, or entailed Infallibility upon the Guides of it: this being a mattter of ſuch infinite Concernment to the whole Church; it is moſt unreaſonable to conceive that whatever other Parts of his Will were obſcure, thoſe which relate to the matter of Succeſſion and Infallibility, ſhould be ſo; but rather ſo plain, that no one can miſs of underſtanding them, becauſe the Weight of all the reſt depends upon theſe two; and it is ſo horrible a Preſumption in any to pretend to them, in caſe they have no right to them, and the danger ſo great in relying upon them if there be no ſuch thing.

3. A Law of ſuch univerſal Concernment to the Faith and Peace of the Chriſtian Church being ſuppoſed, the Practice of the beſt and pureſt Ages of the Church muſt be ſuppoſed agreeable thereto, *i. e.* that in all matters of difference they did conſtantly own theſe infallible Judges, by appealing to them for a final Iſſue of all debates, and reſting ſatisfied with their deciſions. But if on the contrary, when great differences have happened in and neareſt the firſt times, no ſuch Authority was made uſe of, but other ways put in Practice to make an end of them; if when it was pretended, it was ſlighted and rejected; nay, if the Perſons pretending it, were proceeded againſt and condemned, and this not by a popular Faction, but by juſt and legal Authority; we may thence conclude, that ſuch Judges have arrogated that Power to themſelves, which was not given them by the ſupream Legiſlator. Theſe things being premiſed, I come to his particular Arguments, which lie ſcattered up and down; but to give them the greater Strength, I ſhall bring them nearer together. And they are drawn either from *Scripture*, or *Tradition*, or *Parity of Reaſon.*

1. *From Scripture.* And in truth the only ſatisfactory Argument in a matter of ſo great Concernment to the Chriſtian Church, ought only to be drawn from thence, unleſs we will ſuppoſe the Scripture defective in the moſt important things. For this being pleaded as a thing neceſſary for the Peace of the Church by ſome, and for the Faith of Chriſtians by others; ſo much greater the Neceſſity of it is, ſo much clearer ought the evidence of it to be in Scripture, ſuppoſing that to be intended to reveal the Will of God to us in matters of the greateſt Neceſſity. But it cannot be denyed by our Adverſaries, that the Places produced by them for a conſtant Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, do not neceſſarily prove it; becauſe they are very capable of being underſtood, as to the Infallibility only of the Apoſtles in the firſt Age and Foundation of the Chriſtian Church: is it then to be imagined, that if Chriſt had intended ſuch an Infallibility as the Foundation of the Faith and Peace of his Church, he would not have delivered his mind more plainly and clearly than he is pretended to do in this matter? How eaſily might all the Contentions of the Chriſtian World have been prevented, if Chriſt had cauſed it to be delivered in terms ſo clear, as the Nature of the thing doth require? If he had ſaid, *I do promiſe my infallible Spirit to the Guides of the Church in all Ages, to give the true Senſe of Scripture in all Controverſies which ſhall ariſe among Chriſtians, and I expect an Obedience ſuitably to all their Determinations:* or, more particularly, *I appoint the Biſhops of* Rome *in all Ages for my Succeſſors in the Government of the Church, who ſhall be the ſtanding and infallible Judges of all Controverſies among Chriſtians*; this Diſpute might never have happened among us. For we aſſure them that we account the Peace of the Church ſo valuable a thing, and Obedience to Chriſt's Commands ſo neceſſary a duty, that we are well enough inclined to embrace the Doctrine of Infallibility, if we could ſee any ground in Scripture for it. But we cannot make Perſons infallible by believing them to be ſo, but we may eaſily make our ſelves Fools, as others have done, by believing it without reaſon. The Controverſie then is not, whether Infallibility in the Guides of the Church be a deſirable thing or not, for ſo we ſay Impeccability is too; but the queſtion is, whether there be any ſuch thing promiſed by Chriſt to the Guides of his Church, and whether all Chriſtians on that account are bound to yield their internal aſſent, as well as external Obedience to all their decrees? which we deny, and deſire to ſee it clearly proved from his Words who alone could grant this Infallibility.

For if an infallible Judge be therefore neceſſary, becauſe the Scripture is not ſufficiently clear for the ending of Controverſies, and that God hath actually conſtituted ſuch a Judge, cannot be proved but by Scripture, ſurely we have all the reaſon in the World to expect that the Scripture ſhould be abundantly, and beyond all Contradiction clear in this point, to make amends for it's Obſcurity in the reſt: For if this Point be not clearly proved, we are never the nearer an end of Controverſies: becauſe the buſineſs ſtops at the very head, and they may beg their Hearts out, before we ſhall ever be ſo good natured as to grant it them without proof. And they who have been ſo bold (ſhall I ſay? or blaſphemous) as to charge our Lord with *want of Diſcretion*, in caſe he have not provided his Church with ſuch an infallible Judge, do certainly render him much more obnoxious to this

imputation,

imputation, in ſuppoſing him to have conſtituted ſuch a Judge, if he have no where plainly declared that he hath done ſo. And let them, if they can, produce one clear Text of Scripture to this purpoſe, which by the unanimous Conſent of the Fathers is ſo interpreted; and which, to the common Senſe of Mankind, is more ſufficiently clear for the ending this Controverſie, than the Scripture is ſaid by them to be in other neceſſary Points of Faith. And till they have done this, according to their own way of arguing, we have as much reaſon to deny their Infallibility, as they have to demand our aſſent to it, upon the preſumed Obſcurity and Inſufficiency of Scripture.

§. 7. *Of the Arguments from Scripture for Infallibility.*

When I came thus prepared to find what the Conſiderator would produce in a matter of ſuch Conſequence, I ſoon diſcerned how little mind he had to inſiſt upon any Proofs of that, which is his only Engine to overthrow my Principles. For after the moſt diligent ſearch I could make, the only Argument from *Scripture* I found produced, was from the Old Teſtament, (where I confeſs I leaſt looked for it) P. 11. 25. 26. but however, this is thought ſo conſiderable as to be twice produced; and yet is ſo unlucky, that if I underſtand any thing of the force of it, it proves the Judges in *Weſtminſter-Hall* to be infallible, rather than the Pope, or any Guide of the Chriſtian Church. For the force Deut. 17. 10, 11.12. 2 Chron. 19. 10. of the Argument lyes in *God's appointing Judges under the Law, according to whoſe Sentence matters were to be determined, upon Penalty of Death in caſe of Diſobedience.* But what then? doth this imply Infallibility? no, that he dares not ſtand to, but abſolute Obedience; which we are ready to yield when we ſee the like abſolute Command for Eccleſiaſtical Judges of Controverſies of Religion, as there was among the *Jews* for their ſupream *Judges* in matters of Law. But *Rational Account.* p. 1. ch 8. Sect. 2. p. 259. of this place I have already ſpoken at large, and ſhewed how impertinently it is produced for Infallibility in the Book, he often referrs to, and might, if he had thought fit, have anſwered what is there ſaid, before he had urged it again, without any new Strength added to it.

But ſince he produces no other proof for it, I muſt conſider how he goes about to weaken mine againſt it. Two Things I inſiſted upon againſt ſuch a pretence of Infallibility, *viz.* That ſuch a pretence implying an infallible Aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God, there were but two ways of proving it, either, 1. By ſuch Miracles as the Apoſtles wrought to atteſt their Infallibility, or 2. By thoſe *Scriptures* from whence this Infallibility is derived. Concerning both theſe I laid down two Propoſitions.

1. Concerning the Proof by *Miracles.* The Propoſition was this,

Prop. 16. There can be no more intolerable Uſurpation on the Faith of Chriſtians, than for any Perſon or Society of Men to pretend to an Aſſiſtance as infallible in what they propoſe, as was in Chriſt or his Apoſtles, without giving an equal degree of evidence that they are ſo aſſiſted as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did, *viz.* by Miracles as great, publick, and convincing as theirs were; by which I mean ſuch as are wrought by thoſe very Perſons who challenge this Infallibility, and with a deſign for the Conviction of thoſe who do not believe it.

P. 27. To this he anſwers: 1. *That I am equally obliged to produce Miracles for the Churches Infallibility in Fundamentals, which I had aſſerted in the Defence of the Archbiſhop.* But this admits a very eaſie

Anſwer; for when I ſpeak of Infallibility in Fundamentals, I there declare that I mean no more by it, than that there ſhall be always a number of true Chriſtians in the World. And what Neceſſity is there now of Miracles for Men to believe, ſince they receive the Doctrine of the Goſpel upon thoſe Miracles by which it was at firſt atteſted. Neither is there any need of Miracles to ſhew that any number of Men are not guilty of an actual Error in what they believe, ſuppoſing they declare to believe only on the account of that divine Revelation which is owned by Chriſtians; for in this caſe the Tryal of Doctrine is to be by Scripture. But in caſe any Perſons challenge an Infallibility to themſelves antecedently to the Belief of Scriptures, and by vertue of which, they ſay, Men muſt believe the Scriptures, then I ſay ſuch Perſons are equally bound to prove their Infallibility by Miracles as the Apoſtles were.

2. Not reſting in this, he proceeds to another Anſwer, the Sum of which is, *That the Infallibility of the Church not being ſo large or ſo* P. 28. 29. *high as the Apoſtles, but conſiſting only in the infallible Delivery of the ſame Doctrine, there is no neceſſity of Miracles in the preſent Church.* To this I anſwer, that the Doctrine of the Goſpel may be ſaid to be new two ways; 1. In reſpect of the matter contained in it, and ſo it was new only when it was firſt revealed. 2. In reſpect of the Perſon who is to believe it: ſo it is new in every Age to thoſe who are firſt brought to believe it. Now the Apoſtles had their Infallibility atteſted by Miracles, not barely with a Reſpect to the Revelation of new matter, for then none would have needed Miracles but Chriſt himſelf, or the Apoſtles that made the firſt Sermons; for afterwards the matter was not new, but the neceſſity of Miracles was to give a ſufficient Motive to believe, to all thoſe to whom the Goſpel was propoſed; and therefore Miracles are ſaid to be a *Sign to Unbelievers.* For, by theſe, Unbelievers were convinced that there was ſufficient 1 Cor. 14. ground for receiving the Doctrine of the Goſpel on the Authority of thoſe who deliver'd it; *God himſelf bearing them witneſs with divers* Heb. 2. 4 *Miracles and Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.* Suppoſe then, any of the Apoſtles after their firſt preaching continued only to inculcate the ſame Doctrine for the Converſion of more Unbelievers; in this caſe the evidence of Miracles was the reaſon of relying on the Authority of thoſe Perſons for the Truth of the Doctrine delivered by them. From whence it follows, that where the Chriſtian Faith is to be received on the Authority of any Perſons in any Age, thoſe Perſons ought to confirm that Authority by Miracles, as the Apoſtles did. For without this, there can be no ſuch Authority whereon to rely, antecedently to the embracing the Chriſtian Faith. Now, this is the caſe of the Church of *Rome*; they pretend not to deliver any Doctrine wholly new, but what was one way or another delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; (although we therein charge them with Fraud and Falſhood) but yielding this, yet they contend that no Man can have ſufficient ground for believing the Word of God, but from their Churches Infallibility; in this caſe it is plain that they make their Churches Infallibility to be as much the reaſon of Perſons believing, as the Infallibility of the Apoſtles in their time was; and therefore I ſay, they ought to prove this Infallibility in the ſame way, and by Miracles, as great, publick, and convincing, as the Apoſtles did. 3. Yet he is very loth to let go the Miracles of their

Church,

P. 29. Church, done in later times as well as formerly. It would be too large a Task in this place to examine the Miracles of the *Roman* Church, (that may be better done on another occaſion,) all that I have here to ſay is, that all the Miracles pretended among them, ſignifie nothing to our preſent purpoſe, unleſs thoſe Miracles give evidence of the Authority and Infallibility of thoſe by whom they were done; and they would do well to ſhew, where ever in Scripture God did beſtow a Gift of Miracles upon any but for this end: and what reaſon there is that God ſhould alter the Method and Courſe of his Providence, in a matter of ſo great Concernment to the Faith of Mankind. Such Miracles as were wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles we defie all other Religions in the World to produce any like them to confirm their Doctrine; but ſuch as the Church of *Rome* pretends, ſcarce any Religion in the World but hath pretended to the ſame. And *for his moſt credible Hiſtories* he vouches for them, I hope he doth not mean *the Church Hiſtory written by S. C.* Nor any other ſuch *Legends* among them; if he doth, I aſſure him they have a very eaſie Faith that think them credible. And if *all Miracles* that are ſo called by thoſe among whom they are done, *be an Argument*, as he P. 30. ſaith, *of the Security of Salvation in the Communion and Faith of that Church wherein they are done*, I hope he will be ſo juſt, to allow the ſame to the *Arrians*, *Novatians*, *Donatiſts*, and others, who all pretend to *Miracles* as well as the *Church* of *Rome*, as any one that is verſed in *Church Hiſtory* may eaſily ſee. But of this more at large elſewhere.

2. Concerning the Proof of *Infallibility* from *Scripture*, I laid down this Propoſition.

Prop. 17. Nothing can be more abſurd, than to pretend the neceſſity of ſuch an infallible Commiſſion and Aſſiſtance to aſſure us of the Truth of thoſe Writings, and to interpret them; and at the ſame time to prove that Commiſſion from thoſe Writings from which we are told, nothing can be certainly deduced, ſuch an Aſſiſtance not being ſuppoſed; or to pretend that Infallibility in a Body of Men, is not as liable to Doubts and Diſputes, as in thoſe Books from whence only they derive their Infallibility.

P. 37. He grants the former Part of this, *if by it he intended to prove ſuch Commiſſion only, or in the firſt Place from theſe Writings.* But, he ſaith, *a Chriſtians Faith may begin either at the infallible Authority of Scriptures, or of the Church:* It ſeems then, there may be ſufficient ground for a Chriſtians Faith, as to the Scriptures, without believing any thing of the Churches Infallibility; and for this we have reaſon to thank him, whatever they of his own Church think of it. For, by this Conceſſion we may believe the Scriptures Authority, without ever believing a Word of the Churches Infallibility; and let them afterwards prove it from *Scripture* if they can. Nay he goes yet farther, and ſaith, *That the Infallibility of Scriptures as well as the Church may be proved from it's own Teſtimony:* but he firſt ſuppoſes, that the Infallibility of one of theſe, be firſt learnt from *Tradition.* And therefore in the Remainder of his Diſcourſe on this Subject, he ſhews *how the Infallibility of the Church may be proved from Tradition,* not ſhewing at all how the *Infallibility* of the *Church* can be proved from *Scripture.*

Scripture

§. 8. *Of the Argument from Tradition for Infallibility.* P. 38, 39.

Scripture being thus deſerted, as to the proof of the Churches Infallibility, I muſt purſue him to his other Hold of Tradition. The method of this Diſcourſe is this; *That the Infallibility of the Guides of the Church was antecedent to the Scriptures; that the Apoſtles did not loſe their Infallibility by committing what they preached to writing; that their Succeſſors were to have this Infallibility preſerved in them, if there had been no Writings; and cannot be imagined to have loſt it becauſe of them, becauſe theſe give Teſtimony to it; that this Infallibility is preſerved by Tradition deſcending from Age to Age, as we ſay the Canon of Scripture is delivered to us; and laſtly, that the Governours of the Church always held and reputed themſelves infallible, appears by their anathematizing Diſſenters.* In this Diſcourſe there are ſome things ſuppoſed without reaſon, and other things aſſerted without proof. The Foundation of all this Diſcourſe proceeds upon the ſuppoſition that the ſame Infallibility which was in the Apoſtles, muſt be continued in their Succeſſors through all Ages of the Church, for which I ſee not the leaſt ſhadow of reaſon produced. *Yes*, ſaith he, *ſuppoſing there had been no Writings, and no Infallibility, Chriſtian Religion would have been no rational and well-grounded, no ſtable and certain Religion.* Two things in anſwer to this, I deſire to be informed of: 1. What he thinks of the Religion of the *Patriarchs*, who received their Religion by Tradition, without any ſuch Infallibility? 2. What he thinks of thoſe Chriſtians who receive the Scriptures or Churches Infallibility by vertue of common and univerſal Tradition (which is certainly the ground of the one, and ſuppoſed by him to be of the other) whether the Faith of ſuch Perſons be rational and well-grounded, ſtable, and certain, or not; if it be, then there is no ſuch neceſſity of Infallibility for that purpoſe; if it be not, then he doth hereby declare that the Faith of Chriſtians is *irrational* and ill-grounded. For whatſoever is received on the account of Tradition antecedent to the belief of Infallibility, cannot be received on the account of it; but the belief of either Scriptures or Churches Infallibility, muſt be firſt received by vertue of a Principle antecedent to the Scriptures or Churches Infallibility, *viz.* Tradition. By this it appears, that his very way of proving, deſtroys the thing he would prove by it: For if the Tradition may be a ſufficient ground of Faith, how comes Infallibility to be neceſſary? But if this Infallibility be not neceſſary without the Scriptures, much leſs certainly is it now, ſince it is acknowledged on both ſides, that the Apoſtles were infallible in their Writings, and that therein the Will of God is contained as to all things ſimply neceſſary to Salvation. *But theſe Succeſſors of the Apoſtles were not deprived of their Infallibility by the Apoſtles Writings*; No certainly, for none can be deprived of what they never had; but where are the Reaſons all this while, to ſhew that there was the ſame neceſſity of Infallibility in the Apoſtles Succeſſors, as was in them? Two I find rather intimated than inſiſted upon, 1. *That the Church would otherwiſe have failed, if there had been neither Writings nor Infallibility*; But if this Argument hold for any thing, it is for the neceſſity of the Scriptures, and not of Infallibility; for we ſee God did furniſh the Church with one, and left no Footſteps of the other. We do not diſpute how far the Church might have been preſerved without the Scriptutes, we find it hath been hard enough to preſerve it pure with them: But we always acknowledge the Infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God, that hath not left us in matters of Faith and Salvation to the determinations of Men liable to be corrupted by Intereſt and Ambition, but hath appointed Men inſpired by himſelf to ſet down whatever is neceſſary for us to believe and practiſe. And upon theſe Writings we fix our Faith, as on a firm and unmoveable Rock; and on the veracity of God therein contained and expreſſed, we build all our hopes of a bleſſed Eternity. And one great benefit more we have by theſe divine Books, that by them we can ſo eaſily diſcover the fraud and impoſture of the confident Pretenders to Infallibility. Which is the true reaſon why the Patrons of the Church of *Romes* Infallibility have ſo little kindneſs for the Scriptures, and take all occaſions to diſparage them, by inſinuating that they are good for nothing but to breed Hereſies in the Heads of the People; upon pretence of which danger, they hide this Candle under a Buſhel, leſt it ſhould give too much light to them that are in the Houſe, and diſcover ſome things which it is more convenient to keep in the dark.

2. He ſaith, *The Infallibility of the Apoſtles Succeſſors, receives a ſecond evidence from the Teſtimony thereof found alſo in theſe Writings.* I confeſs I have ſeen nothing like the *firſt* evidence yet, to which this ſhould be a *ſecond*; but if by the *firſt* be meant that which I mentioned before, this is a proper *ſecond* for it. Neither of them, I dare ſay, intend any miſchief to any Body; both firſt and ſecond are forced into the Field, where they ſtand only for dumb ſhews, and wonder what they are brought for. But whereabouts I pray doth this *ſecond Teſtimony* ſtand? What are its Weapons? I hope not *Dic Eccleſiæ*, nor *Dabo tibi Claves*, nor any of the old ruſty Armour which our modern Combatants begin to be aſhamed to appear with in the Field. And to ſpeak truth, *N. O.* ſeems to underſtand his Art better, than to meddle with ſuch heavy and antique Armour, which every one hath been foiled with that hath undertaken to combate with them; only it ſeems a little for the credit of their Cauſe to point to ſuch a Magazine, which in the days of Ignorance and Credulity, the Romantick Age of the Church, was in great requeſt. But we muſt now buckle our ſelves to a new manner of Combat, which is from the Tradition of the Church, and that of the very ſame nature with what we have for the *Canon* of *Scripture*. This I confeſs is bright ſhining Armour, and may do great Service if it will hold; but that muſt be judged upon tryal, which I now ſet my ſelf to. But we ſhall find that no weapons formed againſt Truth can proſper: And it hath been long obſerved of *Rome*, that it could never endure a cloſe Siege.

The Queſtion now is, whether they of the *Roman* Church have the ſame univerſal Tradition for the Infallibility of the Guides of it, which we have for the Canon of Scripture? Which he aſſerts. It is I ſuppoſe agreed on both ſides, that the Tradition on which we receive and believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God was univerſal as to all Ages and Times of the Church; that from the beginning all Diſputes in Religion among true Chriſtians, were built upon the ſuppoſition of it; that in no Age any Perſons were allowed to be good Chriſtians who made doubt of it; that every Age doth afford plentiful Teſtimonies of the belief of it. This is that univerſal Tradition we receive the Scriptures upon; and let any thing like this be produce duced for the Infallibility of the Guides of their Church, and we yield up the Cauſe to them. Can any fairer Terms than theſe be deſired? But we expect proofs, and ſo I perceive we may do to the Worlds end. I commend the Ingenuity of *N. O.* for endeavouring to eſcape out of the Circle any way; but I believe they think themſelves as wiſe, who ſtill dance within it, knowing the impoſſibility of doing any good in this other way. The only Argument he inſiſts upon is ſo weak, that I wonder he had not conſidered how often it had been anſwered by their own Writers. For it is certain that Provincial Councils as well as General, have *anathematized Diſſenters, and pronounced them Hereticks*, which is his only Argument to prove this Tradition of the Churches Infallibility; and they had no way to anſwer it, but by ſaying, this doth not imply their Infallibility. And if it doth not in the caſe of Provincial Councils; Why ſhould he think it doth in the caſe of General? For the *Anathema's* of *Provincial Councils* did not relate to the acceptation of their Decrees, either by the Pope, or the whole Church, as *N. O.* ſuppoſes, but did proceed upon their own aſſurance of the Truth of what they decreed; otherwiſe their *Anathema's* would have been only conditional, and not abſolute and peremptory as we ſee they were. But I need give no other anſwer to this Argument, than in the words of Dr. *Field* whom *N. O.* appealed to before, *viz. that Councils denounce Anathema, not becauſe they think every one that diſobeyeth the Decree of the Council to be accurſed, but becauſe they are perſwaded in particular, that this is the eternal Truth of God which they propoſe, therefore they accurſe them that obſtinately ſhall reſiſt, as* St. Paul *willeth every Chriſtian Man to anathematize an Angel coming from Heaven, if he ſhall teach him any other Doctrine than he hath already learned: Yet is not every particular Chriſtian free from poſſibility of erring.* If the Argument then were good from anathematizing Diſſenters, and calling them Hereticks, every particular Perſon muſt by it be proved infallible; who are bound to anathematize even Angels from Heaven in caſe of delivering any other Doctrine from the Goſpel; ſo that this, which is his only Argument inſtead of proving an univerſal Tradition would prove an univerſal Infallibility.

Bell. de Concil. l. 2. *c.* 10.

Field of the Church, l. 4. *c.* 4.

Let the Reader now judge in his Conſcience, whether here be any thing offered in the way of Tradition for the Churches Infallibility, that may bear the leaſt proportion with the Tradition on which we receive the Scriptures? And yet if this had been true, it had been almoſt impoſſible that any one Age ſhould have paſſed without remarkable Teſtimonies of it. For no Age of the Church hath been ſo happy as not to have occaſion for an infallible Judge of Controverſies, if any ſuch had been appointed by Chriſt: And therefore it cannot be imagined, but that Chriſtians muſt in all Controverſies ariſing have appealed to him, and ſtood to his Determinations; which muſt have been as well known in the practice of the Church, as Judges trying Cauſes in *Weſtminſter-Hall.* But I challenge him to produce any one Age ſince the Apoſtles times to this Day, wherein the Infallibility of a ſtanding Judge of Controverſies appointed by Chriſt, hath been received by as univerſal a conſent as the Authority of Scripture hath been in that very Age. Nay, I except not that Age which hath been ſince the Council of *Trent*; for the Scriptures of the New Teſtament have been received of all ſides, but the Infallibility of a ſtanding Judge is utterly denyed by one ſide, and vehemently diſputed between ſeveral Parties on the other. Some making only the Eſſential Church infallible, others the repreſentative in Councils, others again the virtual, *viz.* the Pope. And ſuppoſing any infallible Judge neceſſary; it ſtands to reaſon it ſhould be rather in one than in a multitude, and rather in a conſtant ſucceſſion of Biſhops in one See, than in an uncertain number who cannot be convened together as often as the neceſſities of the Church may require. But this is ſo far from being received as an Univerſal Tradition in that very Age wherein we live, that only one buſie Party in the *Roman* Church do maintain it, many others eagerly oppoſing it, and all the Princes and States in *Chriſtendom* do in their actions, if not in words, deny it. And is not this now an Univerſal Tradition fit to be matched with that of the Scriptures? I had once thought to have brought teſtimonies out of every Age of the Chriſtian Church manifeſtly diſproving any ſuch Tradition of Infallibility; and that not only of private Perſons when there were no Councils, but from the moſt ſolemn Acts of Councils, and the confeſſion of their own Writers; but that would ſwell this Anſwer to too great a Bulk, and is not needful where ſo very little is offered for the proof of it. And yet I ſhall be ready to do it, when any thing more important requires it.

I now return to his exceptions againſt the latter part of the former Propoſition, *viz. That Infallibility in a Body of Men, is as lyable to doubts and diſputes, as in thoſe Books from whence only they derive their Infallibility.* The plain meaning of which is, that it is a fooliſh thing to make uſe of a *medium* as uncertain as the thing which is to be proved by it; and therefore if the Infallibility of the Church be as lyable to Doubts and Diſputes as that of the Scriptures, it is againſt all juſt Laws of reaſoning to make uſe of the Churches Infallibility to prove the Scriptures by. And to this no anſwer can be proper, but either by ſaying that there is no abſurdity in ſuch a way of proving; or elſe that the Infallibility of the Church is more certain and evident than that of the Scriptures. Which I ſhould be glad to ſee undertaken by any Man who pretends to ſenſe; which *N. O.* doth too much to meddle with it; and therefore fairly ſhuffles it off, and turns my words quite to another meaning, as though they had been ſpoken of the *doubtful ſenſe of the Decrees of Councils*, which although elſewhere I had ſufficient reaſon to ſpeak of, yet that was not pertinent to this place. But this was a way to eſcape by ſaying ſomething, though not at all to the purpoſe; and yet he gives no ſufficient anſwer to that ſenſe he puts upon my words, by bringing a Commentary upon them out of words uſed by me in another Diſcourſe. Wherein I did at large argue againſt the Infallibility of General Councils, and after diſproving it in general, I undertook to prove, that no Man can have any certainty of Faith as to the Decrees of any Council; becauſe Men can have no certainty of Faith that this was a General Council, that it paſſed ſuch Decrees, that it proceeded lawfully in paſſing them, and that this is the certain meaning of them; all which are neceſſary in order to the believing thoſe Decrees to be infallible with ſuch a Faith as they call divine. The words produced by him do ſpeak of the doubtful ſenſe and meaning of the Decrees of Councils, by which I ſhew that Men can have no more certainty of the meaning of them, than of doubtful places of Scripture, not as though

Rat. Account. part. 3. ch. 1. Sect. 4. p. 510.

though I ſuppoſed it impoſſible *for Councils to give a clear deciſion in matters of Controverſie, ſo as that Men might underſtand their meaning*; but I expreſly mention ſuch Decrees as are purpoſely framed in general terms, and with ambiguous expreſſions to give ſatisfaction to the ſeveral diſſenting Parties; for which I inſtanced in ſome of the *Council of Trent*, whoſe ambiguity is moſt manifeſt by the Diſputes about their meaning raiſed by ſome who were preſent at the making of them. I am far enough from denying *that a Commentary may make a Text plainer, or that a Judges ſentence can be clearer than the Law; or that any Council can, or hath decided any thing clearer than the thing that is in controverſie*; which are his exceptions: but I ſay, if Councils pretend to do more than the Scriptures, and to decide controverſies for the ſatisfaction of the World, and that Men ought to have that certainty of Faith by them, which they cannot have by the Scriptures, they ought never to be lyable to the ſame ambiguity and obſcurity upon the account of which the Scripture is rejected from being a certain rule of Faith. *For*, as he ſaith well, *Infallibility alone ends not Controverſies, but clearneſs; clearneſs in the point controverted:* Which if Councils want, they are as unfit to end Controverſies as the Scriptures can be pretended to be. But this is not the thing intended by me in this Propoſition, and therefore it needs no farther anſwer; for the only ſubject of that Propoſition, is the Infallibility of the Church, and not the clearneſs of the Decrees of Councils.

But I cannot admire the ingenuity of this way of anſwering me, by putting another ſenſe upon my words than they will bear; and by drawing words out of another Diſcourſe, without ſhewing the purpoſe for which they are there uſed, and leaving out the moſt material Paſſages which tended to the clearing of them. If *N. O.* thinks fit to oppoſe that whole Diſcourſe againſt the Infallibility of General Councils, and ſet down fairly the ſeveral Arguments, I ſhould be then to blame not to return a juſt anſwer: But I am not bound to follow him in ſuch ſtrange excurſions, from the 17 Propoſition of this Book to a ſingle Paſſage in a larger Book, and from that back to another at a mighty diſtance in the ſame Book; which being diſmembred from the Body of the Diſcourſe, muſt needs loſe much of their Strength. Yet with all the Diſadvantage he takes them (which is ſuch, that the beſt Book in the World may be confuted in that manner) he hath no great Cauſe to glory in the Execution he hath done upon them. In anſwer to my Lord of *Canterbury*'s Adverſary, who boaſted of the Unity of the *Roman* Church: Becauſe whatever the private Opinions of Men are, they are ready to ſubmit their Judgments to the Cenſure and Determination of the Church, I had ſaid, “ that this will hold as well or better for our Unity as theirs, be-“ cauſe all Men are willing to ſubmit their Judgments to Scripture, “ which is agreed on all ſides to be infallible. Againſt theſe Words thus taken alone *N. O.* ſpends two or three Pages; which might have been ſpared, if he had but fairly expreſſed what immediately follows them in theſe Words. “ If you ſay it cannot be known “ what Scripture determines, but it may be eaſily what the Church “ defines; it is eaſily anſwered, that the Event ſhews it to be far “ otherwiſe, for how many Diſputes are there concerning the Power “ of determining Matters of Faith? To whom it belongs, in what “ Way it muſt be managed, whether Parties ought to be heard in

Rat. Account. p. 1. ch. 4. p. 101

“ Matters of Doctrine, what the meaning of the Decrees are when
“ they are made, which raiſe as many Diviſions as were before
“ them; as appears by the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*, and
“ the later of Pope *Innocent* relating to the five Propoſitions; ſo
“ that upon the whole it appears, ſetting aſide force and fraud,
“ which are excellent Principles of Chriſtian Unity, we are upon as
“ fair terms of Union as they are among themſelves. I do not therefore ſay, that the Church of *Rome* hath no advantage at all in point of Unity, but that all the advantage it hath, comes from *force* and *fraud*, and ſetting theſe aſide, we are upon as good terms of Union as they; and we do not envy them the effects of Tyranny and Deceit. It is the Union of Chriſtians we contend for, and not of Slaves or Fools; we leave the *Turk* and the *Pope* to vie with each other in this kind of Unity, (although I believe the *Turk* hath much the advantage in it) and I freely yield to *N. O.* that they have a juſter pretence to *Unity without Truth* than we. Which is P. 43. agreeable to what he pleads for, *that they are more united in Opinion than we; united in Opinion, I ſay, true or falſe,* ſaith he, P. 44. *here matters not; we ſpeak here of Union not of Truth.* This and the following of *Tyranny*, which we complain of, are the two faireſt Pleas for their *Union* I ever met with. But this is not a place to examine the pretences to Unity on both ſides, that I have at large done in a whole Chapter in the late Book, and if *N. O.* had intended any thing to purpoſe againſt me on this Subject, he ought much rather to have fallen on a juſt Diſcourſe than two ſuch lame Clauſes as he makes theſe to be by his citation of them. And when he doth that, he may hear more of this Subject; in the mean time *Infallibility* is our Buſineſs.

§. 9. *Of the Argument for Infallibility from parity of Reaſon.* Prop. 13.

And therefore I proceed to the third Argument made uſe of by *N. O.* for the proof of Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, which is from *parity of Reaſon.* Becauſe I ſay, that it is repugnant to the nature of the deſign, and the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God to give infallible aſſurance to Perſons, in writing his will for the benefit of Mankind, if thoſe Writings may not be underſtood by all Perſons who ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary to their Salvation; from hence he inferrs, *that if every Chriſtian may become thus infallible in neceſſaries, from* 1. *a clear Rule*; 2. *a due Induſtry uſed*; 3. *and a certainty that it is ſo uſed; may not the Church-Governours ſtill much rather be allowed infallible, and ſo retain ſtill their Infallible Guideſhip; and the People alſo, the more clear the Rule of Faith is proved to be, the more ſecurely be referred to their Direction? and have we not all reaſon to preſume that the chief Guides of the Church (even a General Council of them, or if it be but a major part of this Council, 'tis ſufficient) in their Conſults concerning a point neceſſary to Salvation delivered in Scripture, uſe at leaſt ſo much endeavour (for more needs not) as a plain Ruſtick doth, to underſtand the meaning of it, and alſo the like Sincerity? For what they define for others, they define for themſelves alſo, and their Salvation is as much concerned as any other Man's is, in their Miſtakes. And next, why may not theſe Governours upon ſuch certainty of a ſincere Endeavour and clearneſs of the Rule take upon them to define theſe points and enjoyn an Aſſent to, and Belief of them to their Subjects; eſpecially ſince it is affirmed that all thoſe from whom they require ſuch obedience,* *if they pleaſe to uſe a ſincere Endeavour may be certain thereof as well as they? And are we not here again arrived at Church-Infallibility, if not from extraordinary divine Aſſiſtance, only ſincere Endeavour being ſuppoſed? And thus does not his conditional Infallibility of particular Perſons in neceſſaries, the Condition being ſo eaſie, neceſſarily inferr a moral impoſſibility of the Churches erring in them; eſpecially thoſe Neceſſaries being contracted to the Apoſtles Creed, as it is by ſome.*

To lay open the weakneſs of this Diſcourſe, which appears fair and plauſible at firſt view, I ſhall give an account of theſe two things.

1. What Infallibility I attribute to private Perſons.

2. How far the parity of Reaſon will extend to the Infallibility of the Guides of the Church.

1. As to the *Infallibility* by me attributed to private Perſons; no ſuch thing can be inferred from my words; and I wiſh *N. O.* would have kept to my own Expreſſions, and not foiſted in that term of *Infallibility*, without which all his Diſcourſe would have betrayed its own weakneſs. For take the Terms which I laid down, and apply them to the Guides of the Church, and ſee what a mighty Infallibility ſprings from them. For if it be repugnant to the nature of the Deſign, and to the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God to give infallible aſſurance to Perſons in writing his Will for the benefit of Mankind, if thoſe Writings may not be underſtood by all Perſons who ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their Salvation, how doth it hence follow that the Guides of the Church muſt be infallible in teaching matters of Faith? If I had aſſerted that particular Perſons were infallible in determining what was true and what not; then I grant the Argument would have much more held for thoſe whoſe office it is to guide and direct others. But what he means by Mens *being infallible in neceſſaries*, I do not well underſtand; for it is capable of three ſeveral meanings: 1. That either Men are infallible in judging of neceſſaries to Salvation; 2. Or, That Men are infallible in teaching others what are neceſſaries to Salvation. Or 3. That Men are infallible in believing ſuch things as are neceſſary to Salvation, *i. e.* that ſuch is the Goodneſs of God, and the clearneſs of Scriptures, that no Man who ſincerely deſires to know what is neceſſary to Salvation ſhall be deceived therein; and what is this any more than to aſſert that God will not be wanting in neceſſaries to Mankind? and although I know no reaſon for uſing the term of *Infallibility* thus applied, yet the thing it ſelf I aſſert in that ſenſe, but in neither of the other: And what now can be inferred from hence by a parity of Reaſon, but that the Guides of the Church, ſuppoſing the ſame ſincerity ſhall enjoy the ſame priviledge, which I know none ever denied them; but what is this to their Infallibility in teaching all matters of Faith? Which is the only thing to be proved by him. If he can prove this as neceſſary for the Salvation of Mankind as the other is, then he would do ſomething to his purpoſe, but not otherwiſe. So that all this Diſcourſe proceeds upon a very falſe way of reaſoning from believing to teaching, and from neceſſaries to Salvation, to all matters of Faith, which the Guides of the Church ſhall propoſe to Men.

2. *But may we not inferr, that if God will not be wanting to particular Perſons in matters neceſſary to their Salvation, much leſs will*

he be wanting to the Guides of the Church in all matters of Faith? No certainly, unleſs it be proved that their Guidance is the only means whereby Men can underſtand what is neceſſary to Salvation; which is utterly denied by us, God having otherwiſe provided for that, by giving ſo clear a Rule in matters neceſſary, that no Man who ſincerely endeavours to know ſuch things ſhall fail therein. *But will not the ſame ſincerity in the Guides of the Church extend to their knowing and declaring all matters of Faith?* This is a thing poſſible, and ſuppoſing God had entruſted them with the infallible delivery of all matters of Faith, were not to be queſtioned; but that is the thing ſtill in diſpute, and is not to be ſuppoſed, without proving it by plain evidence from thoſe Books which are agreed on both ſides to contain the Will of God. Beſides, that no Man that is acquainted with the proceedings of the Council of *Trent*, will ſee reaſon to be over-confident of the ſincerity of Councils ſo palpably influenced by the Court of *Rome* as that was. *But however is it not fit in theſe matters that particular Perſons ſhould rather yield to the guidance of others, than to the conduct of their own reaſon?* Which is *N.* O's. farther Argument in this matter, *viz. That a Fallibility being ſuppoſed, it is more fitting to follow prudent and experienced, though fallible Perſons direction rather than our own.* To this I anſwer in theſe following particulars.

§. 10. *Of the Authority of the Guides of the Church.*

1. That God hath entruſted every Man with a faculty of diſcerning Truth and Falſhood; ſuppoſing that there were no Perſons in the World to direct or guide him. For without this there were no capacity in Mankind to be inſtructed in matters of Religion; and it were to no purpoſe, to offer any thing to Men to be believed, or to perſwade them to embrace any Religion. To make this plain, I will ſuppoſe a Perſon come to Years of underſtanding, not yet profeſſing any particular Religion, to whom the ſeveral Religions in the World are propoſed by Men perſwaded of the truth of them, *viz.* the Chriſtian, the Jewiſh, and the Mahumetan: He hears the ſeveral Arguments brought for each of them, and hath no greater opinion of the Teachers of one than of another, I deſire to know whether this Perſon may not ſee ſo much of the truth and excellency of Chriſtian Religion, above the reſt, as to chooſe that and reject all the reſt. I hope no one will deny this; now if a Man does here upon his own judgment and reaſon chooſe the Chriſtian Religion, ſo as firmly to believe it, then God hath given to Men ſuch a faculty of judging, that upon the propoſal of Truth and Falſhood, he may embrace the true Religion and reject the falſe, and ſuch a Faith is acceptable and pleaſing to God; otherwiſe no Man could embrace Chriſtianity at firſt upon good grounds.

2. This Faculty is not taken away, nor Men forbidden the exerciſe of it in the choice of their Religion by any principle of the Chriſtian Religion; for our Saviour himſelf appealed to the judgment of the Perſons he endeavoured to convince; he made uſe of many Arguments to perſwade them, he directed them in the way of finding out of Truth, he reproved thoſe who would not ſearch into the things delivered to them. All which were to no purpoſe at all, if Men were not to continue the exerciſe of their own Judgments about theſe matters. Accordingly we find the Apoſtles appealing to the Judgments of private and fallible Perſons concerning what they ſaid to them,

John 5 36. 39.

1 Cor. 10. 15.

although themſelves were infallible, and had the greateſt Authority over them; we find them, not bidding *the Guides of the Church prove* 1 Theſſ. 5. *all things, and the People hold faſt that which they delivered them*; 21. but commanding them indifferently *to prove all things and hold faſt that which is good, i. e.* what upon Examination they found to be ſo; we find thoſe commended, who *ſearched the Scriptures dai-* Act. 17. 11. *ly whether the things propoſed to them were ſo or no.* So that we ſee the Chriſtian Religion doth not forbid Men the Exerciſe of that Faculty of judging, which God hath given to Mankind.

3. The Exerciſe of this Faculty was not to ceaſe aſſoon as Men had embraced the Chriſtian Doctrine. For the Precepts given by the Apoſtles do belong to thoſe who are already Chriſtians, and that concerning the matters propoſed by their Guides; nay, they are expreſly commended to try and examine all pretences to Infallibility and Revelation upon this great reaſon, becauſe there ſhould be many falſe Pretenders to them. *Beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God, for many falſe Prophets are gone out* 1 Joh. 4. 1. *into the World.* They are commanded, *not to believe any other Goſ-* Gal. 1. 8. *pel, though Apoſtles or an Angel from Heaven ſhould preach it*; and how ſhould they know whether it were another or the ſame if they were not to examine and compare them? They are bid *to contend ear-* Jude v. 4. *neſtly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints*; it might be a new Faith for any thing they could know, if they were not competent Judges of what was once delivered: They are frequently charged *to beware of Seducers and falſe Guides, that ſhould come in the name of* Mat. 24. 4. *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*; they are told, *that there ſhould come a falling* 5. 23 24. *away and departing from the Faith*; and that *the time will come* Acts 20. 29. 30. *when Men will not endure ſound Doctrine, and ſhall turn away their* 1 Tim. 4. 1. *Ears from the Truth and believe Fables*; *that ſuch ſhall come with all* 2 Theſſ. 2. 3. *Deceivableneſs of Unrighteouſneſs*; *with Powers and Signs and lying* 2 Tim. 4. *Wonders.* To what end or purpoſe are all theſe things ſaid, if Men 3. 4. 2 Theſſ. 2. being once Chriſtians are no longer to exerciſe their own Judgments, 9. 10. but deliver them up into the hands of their Guides? What is this, but to put them under a neceſſity of being deluded when their Guides pleaſe? and as our Saviour ſaith, *when the blind lead the blind both* Mat. 15. *ſhall fall into the ditch.* 14.

4. The Authority of Guides in the Church is not abſolute and unlimited, but confined within certain bounds. Which if they tranſgreſs, they are no longer to be followed. So St. Paul *ſaith, if we or* Gal. 1. 8. *an Angel from Heaven teach any other Goſpel, let him be accurſed*, ſo that the Apoſtles themſelves though giving the greateſt Evidence of infallibility, were no longer to be followed, than they held to the Goſpel of Chriſt. And they deſired no more of their greateſt Diſciples whom they had converted to the Chriſtian Faith, than *to be Fol-* 1 Cor. 11. 1. *lowers of them as they were of Chriſt*, they told them *they had no Do-* 2 Cor. 1. 14. *minion over their Faith*, although they were far more aſſiſted with an infallible Spirit, than any other Guides of the Church could pretend to be ever ſince. Therefore no preſent Guides, what ever Names they go by, ought to uſurp ſuch an Authority over the minds of Men which the Apoſtles themſelves did not challenge; although there were greater reaſon for Men to yield up their Minds wholly to their guidance. We are far from denying all reaſonable and juſt Autho-

rity to be given to the Guides of the Church; but we ſay that their Authority not being abſolute is confined to ſome known Rule; and where there is a Rule for them to proceed by, there is a Rule for others to judge of their Proceedings; and conſequently Men muſt exerciſe their Judgments about the matters they determine, whether they be agreeable to that Rule or not.

5. Where the Rule by which the Guides of the Church are to proceed hath determined nothing, there we ſay the Authority of the Guides is to be ſubmitted unto. For otherwiſe, there would be nothing left, wherein their Authority could be ſhewn, and others pay obedience to them, on the account of it. Therefore we plead for the Churches Authority in all matters of meer Order and Decency, in indifferent Rites and Ceremonies; and think it an unreaſonable thing to debar the Governors of a Chriſtian Society the Priviledge of commanding in things which God hath not already determined by his own Law. We plead for the Reſpect and Reverence which is due to the lawful Conſtitutions of the Church whereof we are Members; and aſſert the juſt Authority of the Guides of it, in the exerciſe of that Power which is committed to the Governors of it; as the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles in their care of the Chriſtian Church, although not in their Infallibility.

6. We allow a very great Authority to the Guides of the Catholick Church in the beſt times of Chriſtianity; and look upon the concurrent Senſe of Antiquity as an excellent means to underſtand the mind of Scripture in places otherwiſe doubtful and obſcure. We profeſs a great Reverence to the antient Fathers of the Church: but eſpecially when aſſembled in free and general Councils; We reject the antient Hereſies condemned in them; which we the rather believe to be againſt the Scripture, becauſe ſo antient, ſo wiſe and ſo great Perſons did deliver the contrary Doctrine, not only to be the Senſe of the Church in their own time, but ever ſince the Apoſtles. Nay, we reject nothing that can be proved by an univerſal Tradition from the apoſtolical times downwards; but we have ſo great an opinion of the Wiſdom and Piety of thoſe excellent Guides of the Church in the Primitive times, that we ſee no reaſon to have thoſe things forced upon us now, which we offer to prove to be contrary to their Doctrine and Practice. So that the Controverſie between us is not about the Authority of the Guides of the Church, but whether the Guides of the Apoſtolical and Primitive times ought not to have greater Authority over us, than thoſe of the preſent Church in things wherein they contradict each other? This is the true State of the Controverſie between us; and all the Clamours of rejecting the Authority of Church Guides are vain and impertinent. But we profeſs to yield greater Reverence and Submiſſion of Mind to Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, than to any Guides of the Church ever ſince: we are ſure they ſpake by an infallible Spirit, and where they have determined matters of Faith or Practice, we look upon it as Arrogance and Preſumption in any others to alter what they have declared. And for the Ages ſince, we have a much greater Eſteem for thoſe neareſt the Apoſtolical times and ſo downwards, till Ignorance, Ambition, and private Intereſts ſway'd too much among thoſe who were called the Guides of the Church. And that by the Confeſſion of thoſe who were Members of it at the ſame time; which makes us not to wonder that ſuch

Corruptions of Doctrine and Practice ſhould then come in: but we do juſtly wonder at the Sincerity of thoſe who would not have them reformed and taken away.

7. In matters impoſed upon us to believe or practiſe which are repugnant to plain Commands of Scripture, or the Evidence of Senſe, or the Grounds of Chriſtian Religion; we aſſert that no Authority of the preſent Guides of a Church, is to over-rule our Faith or Practice. For there are ſome things ſo plain, that no Man will be guided by anothers Opinion in them; if any Philoſopher did think his Authority ought to over-rule an ignorant Man's Opinion, in ſaying the Snow which he ſaw to be white was not ſo; I would fain know whether that Man did better to believe his Eyes or the prudent, experienced Philoſopher? I am certain if I deſtroy the Evidence of Senſe I muſt overthrow the Grounds of Chriſtian Religion; and I am as certain if I believe that not to be Bread which my Senſes tell me is ſo, I muſt deſtroy the greateſt Evidence of Senſe; and which is fitter for me, to reject that Evidence which aſſures my Chriſtianity to me, or that Authority which by its Impoſitions on my Faith overthrows the Certainty of Senſe? We do not ſay that we are to reject any Doctrine delivered in Scripture which concerns a Being infinitely above our Underſtanding, becauſe we cannot comprehend all things contained in it; but in Matters lyable to Senſe and the proper Objects of it, we muſt beg Pardon if we prefer the grounds of our common Chriſtianity before a novel and monſtrous Figment, hatched in the times of Ignorance and Barbariſm, foſter'd by Faction, and impoſed by Tyranny. We find no Command ſo plain in Scripture that we muſt believe the Guides of the Church in all they deliver, as there is that we muſt not worſhip Images, that we muſt pray with Underſtanding, that we muſt keep to our Saviour's Inſtitution of the Lord's Supper; but if any Guides of a Church pretend to an Authority to evacuate the force of theſe Laws, we do not ſo much reject their Authority, as prefer Gods above them. Doth that Man deſtroy the Authority of Parents, that refuſes to obey them, when they command him to commit Treaſon? That is our caſe in this matter, ſuppoſing ſuch Guides of a Church which otherwiſe we are bound to obey, if they require things contrary to a direct Command of God, muſt we prefer their Guidance before Gods? If they can prove us miſtaken, we yield; but till then the Queſtion is not, whether the Guides of the Church muſt be ſubmitted to rather than our own reaſon? but whether God's Authority or theirs muſt be obeyed? And I would gladly know whether there be not ſome Points of Faith, and ſome parts of our duty ſo plain that no Church Authority determining the contrary ought to be obey'd?

8. No abſolute Submiſſion can be due to thoſe Guides of a Church who have oppoſed and contradicted each other, and condemned one another for Errour and Hereſie. For then in caſe of abſolute Submiſſion a Man muſt yield his aſſent to Contradictions; and for the ſame reaſon that he is to be a Catholick at one time, he muſt be a Heretick at another. I hope the Guides of the preſent Church pretend to no more Infallibility and Authority than their Predeceſſors in the ſame Capacity with themſelves have had; and we ſay they have contradicted the Senſe of thoſe before them in the matters in diſpute between us. Yet that is not the thing I now inſiſt upon; but that theſe Guides of the Church have declared each other to be fallible by condemning

demning their Opinions and Practices; and by that means have made it neceſſary for Men to believe thoſe not to be infallible, unleſs both Parts of a Contradiction may be infallibly true. Suppoſe a Man living in the times of the Prevalency of *Arrianiſm*, when almoſt all the Guides of the Church declared in favour of it, when ſeveral great Councils oppoſed and contradicted that of *Nice*, when Pope *Liberius* did ſubſcribe the *Sirmian* Confeſſion and communicated with the *Arrians*, what advice would *N. O.* give ſuch a one if he muſt not exerciſe his own Judgment, and compare both the Doctrines by the rule of Scriptures? muſt he follow the preſent Guides even the Pope himſelf? Then he muſt joyn with the *Arrians*. Muſt he adhere to the *Nicene* Council? but there were more numerous Councils which condemned it. What Remedy can be ſuppoſed in ſuch a caſe, but that every Perſon muſt ſearch and examine the ſeveral Doctrines, according to his beſt Ability, and judge what is beſt for him to believe and practiſe? No anſwer can be more abſurd in this caſe than that which ſome give, that *Liberius* only erred in his *external Profeſſion of Faith and not in the belief of it*; for we are now ſpeaking of ſuch as are to be *Guides* to others, and on whoſe Direction they are to rely, which muſt be ſomething which may be known to them. Suppoſing then, that *Liberius* when he ſubſcribed and joyned with the *Arrians*, was a Catholick in his Heart, this takes as much off from the Authority of a Guide, as Errour would do. For who dare rely upon him who acts againſt his conſcience and believes one way and does another? Would any in the Church of *Rome* think it fit to ſubmit themſelves to the Direction of ſuch Perſons, whom they were aſſured, did not believe one Word of what they profeſſed; but joyned in Communion with that Church only for ſome temporal ends? But in truth *Liberius* went ſo far, that *Hilary* denounces an *Anathema* againſt him, and all that joyned with him. Neither was this the only caſe of this Nature to be ſuppoſed; for the Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon* proving ineffectual for the ſuppreſſion of the Neſtorian and Eutychian Hereſies, and rather greater Diſturbances ariſing in the Church after the later of theſe, becauſe the Writings of *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſtia* and *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*, and of *Ibas* to *Maris* the *Perſian* not being therein condemned which were ſuppoſed to favour the *Neſtorian* Hereſie, the *Neſtorians* increaſing their Faction under the Authority of thoſe Writings, and the *Eutychians* making that their Plea for rejecting that *Council* becauſe it ſeemed to favour *Neſtorianiſm*; the Emperour *Juſtinian* by the Perſwaſion of *Theodorus* of *Cæſarea* reſolves to have thoſe *three Chapters* (as they were called) condemned, hoping by this means to perſwade the *Eutychian* Faction to accept the Council of *Chalcedon*, and thereby to ſettle Peace in the Church, which was then miſerably rent and divided. To this end by the conſent of the four Eaſtern *Patriarchs*, he publiſhes an *Edict* wherein he condemns the *three Chapters*, and anathematizes thoſe who ſhould defend them; to this *Edict* the Guides of the Eaſtern Church ſubſcribed; But *Vigilius* then *Pope*, (although *Victor Tununenſis*, a Writer of that Age ſaith, *that he had given it under his hand to Theodora the Empreſs, that if he might be made* Pope *he would condemn the three Chapters*) yet now being by violent hands thruſt into the Chair, he changes his Mind, and declares againſt the *Edict*; and threatens Excommunication to thoſe who ap-

Victor Tununenſ. Chronic. Poſt Conſulat. Baſiliis.

proved it as being contrary to the Catholick Faith, eſtabliſhed in the Council of *Chalcedon*; and accordingly *Stephanus* his *Legat* withdrew from the Communion of the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople.* Upon this, the Emperor ſends for *Vigilius* to *Conſtantinople*, who being come thither excommunicates the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* and all who condemned the *three Chapters*, or joyned with thoſe who condemned them; and the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* again excommunicates him; but after 4. or 5. Months time, theſe Excommunications were taken off: and Pope *Vigilius* after that publiſhes a *Decree* wherein the *three Chapters* were condemned by him, with a *Salvo* to the Authority of the *Council* of *Chalcedon.* Which made the Biſhops of *Africa*, *Illyricum* and *Dalmatia* to fall off from him, and *Ruſticus* and *Sebaſtianus* two *Deacons* of his own Church; whom the Pope excommunicated for ſo doing. Yet the Emperour himſelf was not ſatisfied with that *Salvo*, and the Pope not yielding without it, a general Council was called at *Conſtantinople* to put an end to this Controverſie; to which the Pope being ſolemnly invited refuſed to come, the Council however proceeds in the Examination of the *three Chapters*; during their Seſſion, *Vigilius* publiſhes his apoſtolical Decree or *Conſtitution*, to the whole Catholick Church, with the aſſiſtance of ſixteen Biſhops of *Italy*, *Africa, and Illyricum*, and three *Roman* Deacons; wherein the Pope defends the *three Chapters*, and defines in the Concluſion of it, *That it ſhould be lawful for none to write or teach any thing about theſe matters, contrary to his preſent Definition; or to move any farther Queſtion about them.* Notwithſtanding which Definition of the Popes, the Council proceeds to the condemning the *three Chapters*, and to the *anathematizing* thoſe who did not condemn them. That this is the true matter of fact, I am content to appeal to the *Acts* of the *Council*, the *Edict* of *Juſtinian*, the Popes own *Decree*, or the *Writers* of that *Age*, or the moſt Learned Perſons of the *Roman* Church, ſuch as *Baronius*, *Petavius* and *Petrus de Marcâ*, who have all given an account of this Controverſie. I now deſire to know, what a Perſon in that time ſhould do who was bound to yield an internal aſſent to the Guides of the Church? muſt he believe the Pope? He not only contradicts the Council but himſelf too; for it now appears by a Greek Epiſtle firſt publiſhed by *Petrus de Marcâ* out of the King of *France*'s Library, that *Vigilius* being baniſhed by *Juſtinian* did afterwards retract his own Decree ſo ſolemnly made, and confirmed the Council. Would not a Man now be in a pretty Condition that were bound to believe one in all he ſaid that ſo often contradicted himſelf? Muſt he believe the Council? what then becomes of the Popes Infallibility? when they were ſo far from receiving the Popes Definition (though done in ſuch a manner, in which *Bellarmin* ſaith, *the Pope cannot err*, viz. *When he teaches the whole Church*;) that they reject his Decree and determine the quite contrary. I know but one way of evading this, (which is that commonly inſiſted on by thoſe of the *Roman* Church, viz. *that all this was not a Controverſie about Faith but Perſons.* So indeed ſome of the Succeſſors of *Vigilius* ſaid, when they endeavoured to extenuate the matter as much as they could, finding that the Biſhops of *Africa*, and many in *Italy* broke off from the Communion of the *Roman* Church on the account of this quarrel; But I deſire any one in this matter to look to their Judgment who were concerned in this quarrel;

Baron. *A. D.* 546. 547 553. Petav. dogmat. Theolog. Tom. 4. l. 1. c. 18. Petr. de Marcâ, diſſert. de Vigilii decreto.

Bell. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4 c. 3.

rel; and if Men are bound to believe their Guides, they ought to believe them when they tell them what is a matter of Faith. And from the beginning of this Controverſie it was accounted a matter of Faith, not only by the Emperor, but by the Pope, by the Council, and by the Biſhops who oppoſed the Council; and muſt we truſt them in other things and not in this? Beſides, the very Proceedings of the Council manifeſt it according to *Bellarmins* own Rules; for ſaith he, *we then know a thing to be matter of Faith, when the Council declares it to be ſo, or them to be Hereticks who hold the contrary; or, which is the moſt common, when they denounce* Anathema, *and exclude from the Church, thoſe who hold otherwiſe*; all which agree to this, as will appear by the laſt collation of that Council. And Pope *Vigilius* in the *Greek* Epiſtle now publiſhed in the *Tomes* of the *Councils*, wherein he approves the fifth Council, not only condemns the three Chapters as contrary to Faith, but *anathematizes* all thoſe who ſhould defend them: And like an infallible Judge very ſolemnly recants his former Apoſtolical Decree, though delivered by him upon great Deliberation, and with an Intention to teach the whole Church. I wonder who there could be in that Age, that believed the Pope to be an infallible Guide? Not the Eaſtern Biſhops; who excommunicated him, and decreed directly contrary to him; not the Weſtern, for they likewiſe excommunicated him, and not only forſook his Communion, but that of the *Roman* Church: But did he believe himſelf infallible, when he ſo often changed his mind, and contradicted himſelf *in Cathedra*? If he did, he was without doubt a brave Man, and did as much as a Man can do.

Bellarm. de Concil. Auctor. l. 2. c. 12.

This Controverſie was ſcarce at an end, (for the Biſhops of *Iſtria* continued in their ſeparation from the *Roman* Church for ſeventy Years, which was till the time of *Honorius*, A. D. 626.) when another was ſtarted, which gives us yet a more ample diſcovery of the more than Fallibility of the Guides of the Church in that Age, when a Pope was condemned for a Heretick by a General Council; in which caſe, I would fain know whether of them was infallible? and to which of the Guides of the Church a Man owed his internal Aſſent, and external Obedience? This being an Inſtance of ſo high a nature, that the truth of it being ſuppoſed, the pretence of abſolute Authority and Infallibility in the Guides of the *Roman* Church muſt fall to the ground, no wonder, that all imaginable Arts have been uſed by thoſe of the Church of *Rome* to take away the force of it; among whom *Pighius*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, *Petavius*, and *Petrus de Marcâ* have laboured hardeſt in acquitting *Honorius*, but have proceeded in different ways; and the two laſt are content the Pope ſhould be condemned for *ſimplicity* and *negligence*, the better to excuſe him from *Hereſie*; but one would think theſe two were as contrary to the office of a *truſty Guide*, as *Hereſie* to one that pretends to be *infallible*. But the better to underſtand the force of this Inſtance, I ſhall give a brief account of the matter of Fact, as it is agreed on all ſides; and the repreſenting the Diviſions among the *Guides* of the *Church* at that time, will plainly ſhew how unreaſonable it had been, to have required abſolute Submiſſion to ſuch who ſo vehemently contradicted each other.

We are therefore to underſtand, that the late *Council* at *Conſtan-*

tinople being found unſucceſsful, for bringing the *Eutychians* and their Off-ſpring, to a ſubmiſſion to the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, another *expedient* was found out for that end, *viz.* that acknowledging two Natures in Chriſt they ſhould agree in owning that there was but one will and operation in him after the Union of both Natures: Becauſe will and operation were ſuppoſed to flow from the Perſon, and not barely from the Nature; and the aſſerting two Wills would imply two contrary Principles in Chriſt which were not to be ſuppoſed. This *Expedient* was firſt propoſed to *Heraclius* the Emperour by *Athanaſius* the *Patriarch* of the *Jacobites*, or *Paulus* the *Severian*, and approved by *Sergius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and by *Cyrus* of *Alexandria*, and *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Pharan* near *Ægypt*. *Cyrus* proceeded ſo far in it as by that means to reconcile the *Theodoſiani*, a ſort of Eutychians in *Alexandria*, to the Church, of which he gives an account to *Sergius* of *Conſtantinople*, and ſends him the *Anathema's* which he publiſhed, among which the ſeventh was againſt thoſe who aſſerted more than one operation in Chriſt. *Sergius* approves what *Cyrus* had done; but *Sophronius* a learned Monk, coming to *Alexandria* vehemently oppoſed *Cyrus* in this buſineſs; but *Cyrus* perſiſting, he makes this addreſs to *Sergius* at *Conſtantinople*, and tells him of the dangerous Hereſie that was broaching under the pretence of Union; after ſome Heats *Sergius* yielded, that nothing ſhould be farther ſaid of either ſide. But *Sophronius* being made *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, he publiſhes an Encyclical Epiſtle, wherein he aſſerts two Operations, and anathematizes thoſe who held the contrary, and were for the Union; and writes to *Honorius* then Pope, giving him an account of this new Hereſie of the *Monothelites*; the ſame Year *Sergius* writes to him likewiſe of all Tranſactions that had hitherto been in this matter, and deſires to know his judgment in ſuch an affair, wherein the Peace of the Church was ſo much concerned. *Honorius* writes a very ſolemn Letter to *Sergius*, wherein he condemns the contentious humour of *Sophronius*, and makes as good a confeſſion of his Faith as he could, in which he expreſly aſſerts, that there was but *one Will in Chriſt*, and agrees with *Sergius that there ſhould be no more diſputing about one or two Operations in Chriſt*. Accordingly *Heraclius* by the advice of *Sergius* publiſhes his *Ectheſis* or *Declaration* to the ſame purpoſe, which was approved by a *Synod* under *Sergius*; but oppoſed by *John* IV. *Biſhop* of *Rome*, yet ſtill maintained at *Conſtantinople* not only by *Sergius*, but by *Pyrrhus*, and *Paulus* his Succeſſors, who were both excommunicated by *Theodorus* ſucceeding *John*; after him *Pope Martin* calls a *Council*, wherein he condemns all the Eaſtern Biſhops who favoured this new Hereſie, and the Two *Edicts* of ſilence publiſhed by *Heraclius* and *Conſtans*: But was for his pains ſent for to *Conſtantinople* and there dyed. Theſe Contentions daily increaſing, after the death of *Conſtans*, *Conſtantinus Pogonatus* reſolves to try all ways for the Peace of the Church; and therefore calls a General Council at *Conſtantinople A. D.* 680. wherein the Hereſie of the *Monothelites* was condemned; and the Writings of *Sergius*, *Cyrus*, *Theodorus* and *Honorius* in this matter, *as repugnant to the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, and Decrees of Councils, and the judgment of the Fathers*; *and agreeable to the falſe Doctrine of Hereticks, and deſtructive to Souls*: and not content meerly to condemn their Doctrine, they further proceed

Concil. Conſtant. 3. Act 13.

proceed to *anathematize*, and *expunge out of the Church the names of* Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Petrus, Paulus, *and* Theodorus: And after theſe, *Honorius*, *as agreeing in all things with* Sergius, *and confirming his wicked Doctrines*.

Here we are now come to the main point; we ſee a Pope delivering his judgment in a matter of Faith concerning the whole Church condemned for a *Heretick* by a General Council for ſo doing: Either he was rightly condemned or not; if rightly, what becomes of the Infallibility of the Pope when he pretends to teach the whole Church in a matter of Faith? If not rightly, what becomes of the Authority and ſincerity of General Councils, if a Council ſo ſolemnly proceeding ſhould condemn one for Hereſie, that not only did not err; but if ſome may be believed, could not? Surely the Council never thought of that, when they make no ſcruple of condemning him with the reſt. What? Were Pope *Agatho's* Legats there preſent, and could not inform the Council of their Preſumption in judging the infallible See? But no ſuch thing was heard of in thoſe times; theſe latter Ages have been only bleſſed with the knowledge of this unerring Priviledge; and happy had it been, if all the Records of former times had been burnt, that no Inſtances might have been brought to overthrow it. Yet wit and induſtry have not been wanting to bring poor *Honorius* off, if it had been poſſible: The ſum of all may be reduced to theſe three Anſwers. 1. Either that the Acts of the Council are falſified. Or, 2. That the Pope did not err in Faith. Or, 3. Suppoſing he did err, it was only as a private Perſon, and not as Head of the Church.

1. That the Acts of the Council are falſified. This is a ſhrewd ſign of a deſperate Cauſe, when againſt the conſent of all antient Copies, both Greek and Latin, and the Teſtimonies of ſeveral Popes and Councils afterwards, learned Men are driven to ſo miſerable a ſhift as this. The firſt I find, who made this Anſwer was *Albertus Pighius*, and after him *Baronius* and *Bellarmin* have embraced it: But the more ingenuous Men of their own Church have been aſhamed of it. *Melchior Canus* confeſſeth that not only this General Council, but the ſeventh, and eighth under *Adrian*, and that ſeveral other Popes have confeſſed the Truth of the thing; and therefore he doth not ſee how *Pighius* can vindicate *Honorius* in this matter. *Franciſcus Torrenſis* (afterwards better known by the name of *Turrianus*) a Man highly applauded by *Baronius*, *Hoſius*, *Lindanus*, and others, writ a Book of the ſixth ſeventh and eighth Synod, wherein he ſeverely chaſtiſes *Pighius* for his ill uſage of this *ſixth Council*, and ſaith that in this matter he ſhewed more Prejudice than Judgment. For, whereas he ſuſpects that the Letter of *Honorius* to *Sergius* was not ſufficiently examined and compared with the Original, this betrays ſaith *Turrianus* his great Negligence in reading the Acts of the Council; for in the latter end of the twelfth Seſſion, it is expreſly ſaid, that the Authentick Latin Epiſtle of *Honorius* was produced and compared by the *Biſhop* of *Porto*; Beſides how comes, ſaith he, the Name of *Honorius* to be no leſs than nine times in the Council? and if all this had been by the Greeks corrupting the Copies, ſurely they would never have left that Paſſage remaining concerning the corrupting the Letters of *Mennas* and *Vigilius*: How comes *Leo* II. in his Epiſtle to the Emperour wherein he confirms the Council, to anathematize

Canon. loc. Theol. l. 6. c. 8.

Franciſ. Torrenſ. de 6, 7, 8. Synod. Elor. A.D. 1551.

P. 11, 12.

P. 14.

thematize *Honorius* by Name as guilty of Hereſie; ſome indeed, ſaith he, may ſay this is counterfeit too, (ſo do *Baronius* and *Binius*) but they have nothing but their bare conjecture for it, no Argument, or Authority to confirm it. Not only the Greek Writers, but the Latin confeſs he was there condemned, ſo doth *Bede*, ſaith he, ſo doth the *Pontifical Book* in the Life of *Leo* II. and in the Council under *Martin* at *Rome* the Epiſtle of *Paulus* to *Theodorus* was read, wherein was mentioned the conſent of *Honorius* and *Sergius*, and no one there oppoſed it. *Humbertus* Legat of *Leo* IX. in his Book againſt the *Greeks* reckons *Honorius* among the condemned *Monothelites*. How came all the Copies to be corrupted at once, as he farther urges, that there are none left ſound to correct others by? But that which he inſiſts upon as the ſtrongeſt Argument of all is, from *Hadrian* II. who calling a Council at *Rome* for the condemning of *Photius*, for anathematizing him, hath theſe remarkable words; *that no Biſhop of* Rome *was anathematized before unleſs it were* Honorius *who after his death was condemned for Hereſie, in which caſe alone it is lawful for Inferiours to reſiſt their Superiours, and to reject their Doctrine; although even there, they would never have done it, if the Biſhop of the firſt See had conſented to it.* A very conſiderable Teſtimony; not only to prove that *Honorius* was condemned for Hereſie, but that a Pope may be guilty of it, and be lawfully proceeded againſt for it, and that Pope *Agatho* did himſelf conſent to the condemnation of *Honorius*. Notwithſtanding theſe Arguments of *Torrenſis*, *Baronius* ſeeing that no other Defence could be made, perſiſts in the ſame accuſation of *Forgery*: And out of his own head frames an improbable ſtory of the corrupting the Copies of the Council by *Theodorus*, *who being*, ſaith he, *anathematized as a Monothelite, expunged his own name, and put in that of Honorius.* A fiction ſo groundleſs and unreaſonable, that nothing but meer deſpair could drive a Man of common underſtanding to it. For there is not the leaſt countenance for it in any Author; not the leaſt colour of Probability in the thing. For, that all the Copies of the Council ſhould be corrupted by one Man, and neither the Popes Legats preſent at the Council, nor any elſe ſhould take notice of it; that no ſucceeding Popes ſhould diſcover it, when they were concerned to vindicate *Honorius*, but did own the thing to be true; that *Theodorus* then living ſhould be condemned, before it was known whether he would ſubmit to the Council or not; that in the ſeventh and eighth Councils this ſhould not be at all ſuſpected, but the condemning *Honorius* expreſly mentioned in both that, a Man at that time depoſed from his Patriarchat of *Conſtantinople* ſhould be able to make ſuch a razure and forgery in the Copies of the Councils; that the Emperour *Conſtantine* who took ſo much care about the Council ſhould ſuffer ſuch a thing to be done, do all make this figment of *Baronius* ſo remote from any likelyhood, that *Baronius* had need to have prayed as once a Man upon the rack did, that he might tell *probable Lyes*. But all the miſcarriages of *Baronius* in this matter are ſo fully laid open by one of their own Church, that I need not inſiſt any longer upon it; to whom no Anſwer hath been given but that ſubſtantial one of an *Index Expurgatorius*. *Bellarmin* likes this way of anſwering the difficulty about *Honorius*; but the greateſt ſtrength he adds to *Baronius* is only ſaying, *without doubt it is ſo*: And he grants that the

P. 24.

Errat. Allocutio 3. Hadriani 2. ad Concil. Rom. Tom. 8. Concil. Gen. Ed. Lut. Par. 1671. P. 1091.

Baron. *A. D.* 681. *n.* 29.

Franciſ. Combeſis Hiſtoria hæreſ. Monothelitar. c. 2. Alex. 7. Index Expurgator. p. 277. Bellarm. de Rom. Pontifice. l. 4. c. 11.

ſeventh and eighth Council did believe that Pope *Honorius* was condemned, but he ſaith they were deceived by the falſe Acts of the Council. But however they muſt believe that the Pope might fall into Hereſie and be condemned by a Council for it. Yet *Bellarmin* hath a fetch in this caſe beyond *Baronius*, viz. *That either the Acts of the Council are falſified, or the Council was guilty of intollerable impudence and errour in condemning Honorius without reaſon*; *for all the evidence they produce againſt him is from his Epiſtles,in which*, ſaith he, *nothing is contained, but what is Sound and Orthodox*; and this was the ſecond way of defending *Honorius*, viz. that he did not err in Faith at all; and this way is taken by *Petavius*, and others; and was the way intended by *Petrus de Marcâ*, as appears by the account given of his deſign by *Baluzius*; which was firſt to prove by moſt evident Arguments, that the Acts of the Council were never corrupted by the *Greeks*, againſt the opinion before mentioned, and next that he was truly condemned by the Council; but not for Hereſie, but only for negligence and remiſsneſs. I think there needs nothing to ſhew the weakneſs of this, but barely reading the *Anathema* of the Council againſt him, which is not, *for bare negligence but for confirming the wicked Doctrines of Sergius*. And I am apt to think, that learned Perſon ſaw the weakneſs of his deſign too much to go on with it: And *Baronius* and *Bellarmin* ſaw well enough, that whoſoever was there anathematized it was upon the account of *Hereſie* that he was ſo; and therefore *Baronius* would make Men believe the *Anathema* belonged to *Theodorus* and not to *Honorius*. *Petavius* thinks that *Honorius* was deceived, but it was only by his *ſimplicity and weakneſs*, not underſtanding the Controverſie aright. So of old *John* IV. and *Maximus* in his diſpute with *Pyrrhus* defended *Honorius*, that he ſpake indeed of *one Will*, *but that*, ſay they, *was to be underſtood only of one Will in his Human Nature*. Which as *Combeſis* ſaith, is *a more pious than ſolid defence of him*; and would as well ſerve, for *Sergius* and *Cyrus*, for *Heraclius* his *Ectheſis* and *Conſtans* his *Type* as *Honorius* his Letter. For who ever will peruſe them, will find they all proceed on the ſame Argument, that there could not be two Wills in Chriſt, but one muſt be contrary to the other. But that which I inſiſt on is this, that it is certain the Council approved by the Pope did condemn him for Hereſie; I deſire therefore again to know whether he was rightly condemned or not; if he was, then the *Pope* muſt be guilty, and ſo not infallible; if not, then the Council muſt be according to *Bellarmine*, guilty of *intollerable impudence and errour*; but in either caſe, there was no Infallibility in the *Guides* of the Church which could require our internal Aſſent to what they declared. But another defence is yet behind, which is, that though the Pope did err, yet it was in his *private Capacity*, and not as Head of the Church. But when doth he act as *Head* of the *Church* if not when he is conſulted about important matters of Faith, as this was then ſuppoſed to be, by two Patriarchs; and when the Church was divided about them; and thereupon ſolemnly delivers his Opinion? This is then a mere ſubterfuge, when Men have nothing elſe to ſay. I conclude therefore this Inſtance of *Honorius* with the ingenuous Confeſſion of Mr. *White*, *that things are ſo clear in the cauſe of* Honorius, *that it is unworthy*

Petav. dogmat. Theol. l. 1. c. 21. ſ. 11. Baluzius de vitâ Petri Marcæ p. 28, 29.

Petav. ib. ſect. 13.

Combeſis c. 2. ſect. 3.

any grave Divine to pawn his own Honour and that of Divinity too, in ſowing together Fig-leaves to palliate it.

Tabulæ ſuffrag. p. 130.

Thus far I have ſhewn, that thoſe who pretend the moſt to be infallible Guides of the Church have oppoſed and condemned each other; from whence it neceſſarily follows, that no abſolute ſubmiſſion is due to them, unleſs we can be obliged to believe Contradictions. I might purſue this much further, and draw down the Hiſtory of theſe Contradictions to each other, through the following Ages of the Church; wherein Biſhops have been againſt Biſhops, Popes againſt Popes, Councils againſt Councils, Church againſt Church; eſpecially after the breach between the Eaſtern and Greek Churches, the Greek and the Roman, and the Roman and thoſe of the Reformation; but a Man who is bound to rely only on the Authority of his Guides, muſt ſuppoſe them to be agreed; and in caſe of difference among them, he muſt firſt chuſe his Religion and by that his Guide.

9. In the preſent divided State of the Chriſtian Church, a Man that would ſatisfy his own Mind, muſt make uſe of his Judgment in the choice of his Church, and thoſe Guides he is to ſubmit to. Unleſs a Man will ſay, that every one is bound to yield himſelf abſolutely to the Guidance of that Church which he lives in, whether *Eaſtern* or *Greek*, *Roman* or *Proteſtant:* which I ſuppoſe *N. O.* will never yield to, for a reaſon he knows, becauſe then no Revolter from us could be juſtified. The true State then of the preſent caſe concerning the *Guides* of the *Catholick Church* is this; that it hath been now for many Ages rent and torn into ſeveral diſtinct Communions; every one of which Communions, hath particular *Guides* over it, who pretend it to be the Duty of Men to live in Subjection to them, becauſe every *Church* doth ſuppoſe it ſelf to be in the right; now the Queſtion propoſed is, whether it be not fitter for me to ſubmit to the *Guides* of the *Catholick Church*, than to truſt my own Judgment? I ſhould make no ſcruple in all doubtful matters to reſolve the Affirmative, ſuppoſing that all the Guides of the Catholick Church were agreed; for I ſhould think it Arrogance and Preſumption in me to ſet up my own private opinion in oppoſition to the unanimous Conſent of all the Guides of the Catholick Church, in ſuch a caſe; but that is far from ours, for we find the Chriſtian World divided into very different Communions. The *Eaſtern Churches* are ſtill as numerous, tho' not ſo proſperous as the *Roman*; the extent of the *Greek Church* alone is very great, but beſides that, there are two other diſtinct Churches in thoſe parts who break off Communion with the *Greek* on the account of the Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*; and the latter ſort eſpecially are very far ſpread in thoſe parts, from *Armenia* to the *Abyſſine Empire*. In the time of *Jacobus de Vitriaco*, he ſaith *theſe two Churches were ſaid to be more numerous than the Greek and the Latin*; and *Bellonius* in theſe later times aſſures us, *that the Rites of the Greek Church do yet extend farther than the Latin.* What then makes theſe Churches to be left out in our Enquiries after the Guides of the Catholick Church? Are theſe ſuch inconſiderable Parts of the Body, that no Regard is to be had to them? I believe upon a ſtrict Examination, notwithſtanding the Reproach of Hereſie and Schiſm, which thoſe of the Church of *Rome* caſt upon all but themſelves, they will be found much more ſound Parts of the Catholick Church, than the *Roman* Church is. Five great Bodies or Communions of Chriſtians are

Jacob. de Vitriaco hiſt. Orient. cap. 77. Bellonii Obſer. l. 1. c. 35.

at this day in the World. 1. The moſt *Eaſtern Chriſtians*, commonly called *Neſtorians*, whether juſtly or no I ſhall not now examine, theſe are ſpread over the moſt Eaſtern Parts, and all live in Subjection to the *Patriarch* of *Muzal.* 2. The *Jacobites*, who are diſperſed through *Meſopotamia*, *Armenia*, *Ægypt* and the *Abyſſine Empire*, and live under ſeveral *Patriarchs* of their own. 3. The *Greek Church*, of which, beſides the *Muſcovites*, are to be reckoned the *Melchites* or *Suriani*, and the *Georgians*; for though their Language be different, they all agree in Doctrine. 4. The *Roman Church*, taking under it all in the Eaſtern Parts who have ſubmitted to the *Biſhop* of *Rome.* 5. The *Proteſtant Churches* who have caſt off Subjection to the Pope, and reformed the Corruptions they charge the Church of *Rome* with. Now of theſe five Parts, four of them are all agreed, that there is no neceſſity of living in Subjection to the *Guides* of the *Roman Church*; but they are all under their own proper Guides, which they do not queſtion will direct them in the right way to Heaven. Only thoſe of the Church of *Rome* take upon themſelves againſt all Senſe and Reaſon to be the *Catholick Church*, and ſo exclude four parts of five out of a Capacity of Salvation; and challenge Infallibility as belonging to the Guides of it alone. In this caſe, the Arrogance of the pretence the Uncharitableneſs of rejecting ſo mighty a number of Chriſtians from the Poſſibility of Salvation are ſufficient to make any Man not yield up his Faith at the firſt demand; but to conſider a while, whether there be no other Churches, or Guides in thoſe Churches? When he finds ſo many and thoſe not inferiour to the *Roman Church* in any thing ſave only in Pomp, Pride, and Uncharitableneſs; and all oppoſing thoſe arrogant pretences of Authority and Infallibility in it, what reaſon can he have, ſuppoſing that he is to ſubmit to any Guides, that he muſt ſubmit only to thoſe of the *Roman Church*? Why not as well to thoſe of the *Eaſtern*, *Greek*, or *Proteſtant* Churches? If any one goes about to aſſign a reaſon, by charging them with *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm*, he unavoidably makes him Judge of ſome of the greateſt difficulties in Religion, before he can ſubmit to his infallible Guides. He muſt know what *Neſtorianiſm*, *Eutichianiſm*, *Monotheliſm* mean, how they came to be *Hereſies*, whether the Churches accuſed be juſtly charged with them? He muſt underſtand all the Subtilties of Perſonality, Subſiſtence, Hypoſtatical Union; whether the Union of two Natures in Chriſt be ſubſtantial, natural, or accidental? Whether it be enough to ſay, that the divine and human are one by Inhabitation, or one by Conſent, or one by Communion of Operation, or one by Communion of Dignity and Honour, all which the *Neſtorians* acknowledged, only denying the Union of two natures to make one Perſon? ſuppoſing a Man be come to this, he muſt then be ſatisfied that the preſent *Eaſtern Chriſtians* do hold the Doctrine of the old *Neſtorians*, for they acknowledge Chriſt to be perfect God and perfect Man; and that the *Bleſſed Virgin* may be called the *Mother of the Son of God, or the Mother of the Word*, but they ſtick only at calling her *the Mother of God*. Then for the other Churches which are charged with *Eutichianiſm*, he muſt underſtand, the exact Difference between *Nature* and *Perſon*, for if there cannot be two Natures without two Perſons, then either the *Neſtorians* were in the right who aſſerted two Perſons, or the *Eutychians* who denyed two Natures; but this being granted, he muſt be ſatiſfied that thoſe called *Jacobites* are *Eutychians*, although they diſown *Eutyches*, and follow *Dioſcorus*, aſſerting that there were two Natures before the Union, and but one after; and that *Dioſcorus* was rightly condemned in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*; but ſuppoſing they are willing to leave the Diſpute of two Natures, on condition, that the human Nature be only made the *Inſtrument* of the divine in its Operations, whether they are juſtly charged with *Hereſie* in ſo doing? All theſe things a Man muſt fully be ſatisfied in, before he can pronounce thoſe Churches guilty of *Hereſie*, and ſo not to be followed. But ſuppoſing thoſe Churches be rejected, why muſt the *Greek*, which embraces all the *Councils* which determined thoſe ſubtle Controverſies? Here comes the Myſtery of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt to be examined, whether from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son? but ſuppoſing this to be yielded, why may he not joyn with thoſe Churches, which agree with the *Church* of *Rome* in all thoſe points, as the *Proteſtant Churches* do? Here a Man muſt examin the Notes of the Church, and enquire whether they be true Notes, whether they agree only to the *Roman Church*? And one of the greateſt of thoſe Notes being *conſent with the Primitive Church*, a Man that would be well ſatisfied, muſt go through all the Diſputes between us and the Church of *Rome*, and by that time he is well ſettled in them, he will ſee little uſe, and leſs neceſſity of an infallible Guide. So that a Man who would ſatisfie himſelf in this divided State of the Chriſtian Church, what particular Communion he ought to embrace, and what *Guides* he muſt follow, muſt do all that, for the preventing of which an infallible Guide is ſaid to be neceſſary, *i. e.* he muſt not only exerciſe his own Judgment in particular Controverſies, but muſt proceed according to it, and joyn with that Church which upon Enquiry he judges to be the beſt.

10. A prudent Submiſſion is due to the Guides of that Church, with which a Perſon lives in Communion. Having ſhewed that abſolute Submiſſion is not due, all that can be left is a Submiſſion within due bounds, which is that I call a prudent Submiſſion. And thoſe bounds are theſe following.

1. Not to ſubmit to all thoſe who challenge the Authority of Guides over us, though pretending to never ſo much Power and Infallibility. When *N. O.* would perſwade me to ſubmit my Underſtanding to the infallible Guides of the Church; He muſt think me a very eaſie Man to yield, till I be ſatisfied firſt that God hath appointed ſuch to be my *Guides*, and in the next Place that he hath promiſed Infallibility to them. And that is the true State of the Controverſie between us and thoſe of the Church of *Rome* in this matter; they tell us we are bound to ſubmit to the *Guides* of the *Church*; we deſire to know whom they mean by theſe *Guides*; and at laſt we underſtand them to be the Biſhop of *Rome* and his Clergy. Here we demur, and own no Authority the Biſhop of *Rome* hath over us; we aſſert that we have all the *Rights* of a *Patriarchal Church* within our ſelves, that we owe no account to the Biſhop of *Rome* of what we believe or practiſe; it is no Article of our Creed that God hath made him *Judge either of the quick or the dead*; We have Guides of our Church among our ſelves, who have as clear a Succeſſion and as good a Title as the Biſhops of any Church in the World. To theſe, who are our lawful Guides, we promiſe a due Obedience, and are blame

worthy

worthy if we give it not; but for the Biſhop and Clergy of *Rome*, we own none to them, let them challenge it with never ſo much Confidence, and arrogant pretences to Infallibility. So that here is a Conteſt of *Right* in the caſe, antecedent to any duty of Submiſſion, which muſt be better proved than ever it hath yet been, before we can allow any Diſpute, how far we are to ſubmit to the Guides of the *Roman* Church ?

2. Not to ſubmit to thoſe who are lawful Guides in all things they may require. For our Diſpute is now about Guides ſuppoſed to be fallible, and they being owned to be ſuch may be ſuppoſed to require things to which we are bound not to yield. But the great Difficulty now is, ſo to ſtate theſe things, as to ſhew that we had reaſon not to ſubmit to the Guides of the *Roman* Church, and that thoſe of the Separation have no reaſon not ſo ſubmit to the Guides of our Church. For that is the obvious Objection in this caſe, that *the ſame pretence which was uſed by our Church againſt the Church of* Rome, *will ſerve to juſtifie all the Separations that have been or can be made from our Church.* So my Adverſary *N. O.* in his Preface ſaith, *that by the Principles we hold, we excuſe and juſtify all Sects which have or ſhall ſeparate from our Church.* In anſwer to which Calumny I ſhall not fix upon the Perſwaſion of Conſcience, for that may equally ſerve for all Parties; but upon a great difference in the very Nature of the caſe, as will appear in theſe particulars.

1. We appeal to the Doctrine and Practice of the truly Catholick Church in the matters of difference between us and the Church of *Rome*: we are as ready as they to ſtand to the unanimous Conſent of Fathers, and to *Vincentius Lerinenſis* his Rules, of Antiquity, Univerſality and Conſent; we declare, let the things in Diſpute be proved to have been the Practice of the Chriſtian Church in all Ages, we are ready to ſubmit to them: but thoſe who ſeparate from the Church of *England* make this their Fundamental Principle as to worſhip, (wherein the difference lyes,) that nothing is lawful in the worſhip of God, but what he hath expreſly commanded; we ſay all things are lawful which are not forbidden, and upon this ſingle point ſtands the whole Controverſie of Separation as to the Conſtitution of our Church. We challenge thoſe that ſeparate from us to produce one Perſon for Fifteen Hundred Years together, that held Forms of Prayer to be unlawful; or the Ceremonies which are uſed in our Church; We defend the Government of the Church by Biſhops to be the moſt Antient and Apoſtolical Government, and that no Perſons can have ſufficient reaſon to caſt that off, which hath been ſo univerſally received in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles times: if there have been Diſputes among us about the Nature of the difference between the two orders, and the neceſſity of it in order to the Being of a Church, ſuch there have been in the Church of *Rome* too. Here then lyes a very conſiderable Difference, we appeal and are ready to ſtand to the Judgment of the Primitive Church for interpreting the Letter of Scripture in any difference between us and the Church of *Rome*; but thoſe who ſeparate from our Church will allow nothing to be lawful but what hath an expreſs Command in Scripture.

2. The Guides of our Church never challenged any Infallibility to themſelves; which thoſe of the Church of *Rome* do, and have done ever ſince the Controverſie began. Which Challenge of Infallibility

makes the Breach irreconcilable while that pretence continues; for there can be no other way but abſolute Submiſſion where Men ſtill pretend to be infallible: It is to no purpoſe to propoſe Terms of Accommodation between thoſe who contend for a Reformation, and ſuch who contend that they can never be deceived; on the one ſide, Errours are ſuppoſed; and on the other, that it is impoſſible there ſhould be any. Until therefore this pretence be quitted, to talk of Accommodation is Folly, and to deſign it Madneſs. If the Church of *Rome* will allow nothing to be amiſs, how can ſhe reform any thing? and how can they allow any thing to be amiſs, who believe they can never be deceived? So that while this arrogant pretence of Infallibility in the *Roman* Church continues, it is impoſſible there ſhould be any Reconciliation: But there is no ſuch thing in the leaſt pretended by our Church, that declares in her Articles, *that General Councils may err, and ſometimes have erred even in things pertaining to God; and that all the Proof of things to be believed is to be taken from Holy Scripture.* So that as to the Ground of Faith there is no difference between our Church and thoſe who diſſent from her; and none of them charge our Church with any Errour in Doctrine; nor plead that as the Reaſon of their Separation.

Article 21.
Article 3.

3. The Church of *Rome* not only requires the Belief of her Errors, but makes the Belief of them neceſſary to Salvation: Which is plain by the often objected Creed of *Pius* IV. Wherein the ſame neceſſity is expreſſed of believing the additional Articles, which are proper to the *Roman* Church, as of the moſt Fundamental Articles of Chriſtian Faith. And no Man who reads that *Bull* can diſcern the leaſt difference therein made between the Neceſſity of believing one and the other; but that altogether make up that Faith, without which no Man can be ſaved; which though only required of ſome Perſons to make Profeſſion of, yet that Profeſſion is to be eſteemed the Faith of their Church. But nothing of this Nature can be objected againſt our *Church* by Diſſenters, that excludes none from a Poſſibility of Salvation meerly becauſe not in her Communion, as the Church of *Rome* expreſly doth: For it was not only *Boniface* the VIII. who determined as ſolemnly as he could, *that it was neceſſary to Salvation to be in Subjection to the Biſhop of* Rome; but the *Council* of *Lateran* under *Leo* the IX. decreed the ſame thing.

Concil. Lateran. A.D. 1516. *ſeſſ.* 11.

4. The Guides of the *Roman* Church pretend to as immediate Authority of obliging the Conſciences of Men as Chriſt or his Apoſtles had; but ours challenge no more than teaching Men to do what Chriſt had commanded them, and in other things, not commanded or forbidden to give Rules, which on the account of the general Commands of Scripture, they look on the Members of our Church as obliged to obſerve. So that the Authority challenged in the *Roman* Church encroaches on the Prerogative of Chriſt, being of the ſame Nature with his; but that which our Governors plead for, is only that which belongs to them as Governors over a Chriſtian Society. Hence in the Church of *Rome* it is accounted as much a mortal Sin to diſobey their Guides in the moſt indifferent things, as to diſobey God in the plain Commands of Scripture: but that is not all they challenge to themſelves, but a Power likewiſe to diſpence with the Laws of God, as in matter of Marriages, and with the Inſtitution of Chriſt as in Communion in one kind; and promiſe the ſame ſpiritual effects to their

own Inſtitutions as to thoſe of Chriſt, as in the five Sacraments they have added to the two of Chriſt, and to other Ceremonies in uſe among them.

5. Setting aſide theſe Conſiderations, we dare appeal to the Judgment of any Perſon of what Perſwaſion ſoever, whether the reaſons we plead for Separation from the Church of *Rome* be not in themſelves far more conſiderable than thoſe, which are pleaded by ſuch, who ſeparate from our Church? *i. e.* Whether our Churches impoſing of three Ceremonies declared to be indifferent by thoſe who require them, can be thought by any Men of common Senſe ſo great a burden to their Conſciences, as all the load of ſuperſtitious Fopperies in the *Roman* Church? Whether praying by a preſcribed form of Words be as contrary to Scripture, as praying in an unknown Tongue? Whether there be no difference between kneeling at the Sacrament upon Proteſtants Principles and the Papiſts Adoration of the Hoſt? Whether Tranſubſtantiation, Image-worſhip, Invocation of Saints, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Pope's Supremacy, be not ſomewhat harder things to ſwallow, than the Churches Power to appoint matters of Order and Decency? Which particulars make the difference ſo apparent between the ſeparation of our Church from the Church of *Rome*, and that of Diſſenters from our Church; that it ſeems a very ſtrange thing to me that this ſhould be objected by our Enemies on either ſide. And thus much may ſuffice to clear this point of Submiſſion to the Guides of a Church; of which I have the more largely diſcourſed, not for any difficulty objected by *N. O.* but becauſe the thing it ſelf did deſerve to be more amply conſidered. But ſome other things relating to Church-Authority I muſt handle afterwards, and therefore now return to my Adverſary.

§. 11. *Of the ſenſe of Scripture*

The next thing to be debated is, what Aſſurance we can have of the Senſe of Scripture in doubtful Places, if we allow no infallible Guides to interpret them? For that is the ſecond main Principle of *N. O. that without this infallible Aſſiſtance of the Guides of the Church, there can be no certainty of the Senſe of Scripture.* And it is chiefly on this Account that *N. O.* doth aſſert the neceſſity of Infallible Guides of the Church: For as appears by his Conceſſions P. 37. he yields that the Churches *Infallibility is not neceſſary to the Foundation of Faith*; for *Men's Faith*, he ſaith, *may begin at the Infallible Authority of Scriptures*; but the main ground on which he contends for the neceſſity of infallible Guides is for the Interpretation of controverted Places and giving the true Senſe of P. 6. 14. Scripture: for which he often pleads for neceſſity of an external infallible P. 47. Guide. *Becauſe God hath referred all in the dubious Senſe of Scripture to the Direction of his Miniſters their ſpiritual Guides, whom he hath ſet over them to bring them in the Unity of the Faith to* Epheſ. 4. 11, 13, 14. *a perfect Man; and that they may not be toſſed to and fro and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, by the ſleight of thoſe who lye in wait to deceive. And without which Guide St.* Peter *obſerves that in his time ſome Perſons (for any thing we know diligent enough) yet through want of Learning, and the Inſtability of adhering to their Guides, being unlearned,* ſaith he, *and unſtable, wreſted ſome Places* 2 Pet. 3. 16. *of Scripture, hard to be underſtood, to their own Deſtruction. Therefore theſe Scriptures are alſo in ſome great and important points hard* *to be underſtood. And afterwards,* he ſaith, *that Chriſtians who have ſufficient Certainty of the truth of Chriſtianity, may be deficient in a right belief of ſeveral neceſſary Articles of this Chriſtian Faith, if deſtitute of that external infallible Guide therein: Without which he determines that Men muſt fluctuate and totter, and vary one from another, whilſt the Scriptures are ambiguous in their ſenſe and drawn with much art to ſeveral Intereſts.* The force of all which, comes to this, that we can arrive at no certainty of the ſenſe of Scripture in controverted places, without an external infallible Guide: And therefore we are bound to ſubmit to him. P. 67.

Here are two things to be diſcuſſed. 1. What neceſſity there is for the Salvation of Perſons, to have an infallible Interpretation of controverted places of Scripture? 2. Whether the denying ſuch an infallible Interpreter makes Men uncapable of attaining any certain ſenſe of doubtful places? For if either it be not neceſſary that Men ſhould have an infallible Interpretation; or Men may attain at a certain ſenſe without it, then there can be no colour of an Argument drawn from hence to prove the neceſſity of an infallible Guide.

1. We are to enquire into the neceſſity of ſuch an infallible interpretation of doubtful places of Scripture. There are but three grounds on which it can be thought neceſſary, either that no Man ſhould miſtake in the ſenſe of Scripture, or that the Peace of the Church cannot be preſerved, or that Mens Souls cannot be ſaved without it. If it were neceſſary on the firſt account then every particular Perſon muſt be infallible; which being not pleaded for, we muſt conſider the other two grounds of it. But here we are to take notice, that the matter of our preſent Enquiry is concerning the clearneſs of Scripture in order to the Salvation of particular Perſons; of which the Propoſition laid down by me expreſly ſpeaks. If therefore *N. O.* do any thing to overthrow this, he muſt prove, not that there are doubtful and controverted places, which no one denyes, but that the ſenſe of Scripture is ſo doubtful and obſcure in the things which are neceſſary to Mens Salvation, that Perſons without an infallible Guide cannot know the meaning of them. If he prove not this, he doth not come near that which he ought to prove. We do not therefore deny, that there are places of great difficulty in the Books of Scripture; but we aſſert, that the neceſſaries to Salvation do not lye therein; but thoſe being plain and clear, Men may be ſaved without knowing the other. As a Seaman may ſafely direct his Compaſs by the Stars, although he cannot ſolve all the difficulties of Aſtronomy. Can any Man in his ſenſes imagine that Chriſts coming into the World to dye for Sinners, and the Precepts of a holy Life which he hath given, and the motives thereto from his ſecond coming to judge the World, are not more plain than the Apocalyptical Viſions, or the proofs for the Church of *Romes* Infallibility? If a Perſon then by reading and conſidering thoſe things which are plain, may do what Chriſt requires for his Salvation; what neceſſity hath ſuch a one to trouble himſelf about an infallible Guide? For either he may go to Heaven without him, or not? If he may, let them ſhew the neceſſity he is of to that end, which may be attained without him; if not, then the things neceſſary to Salvation cannot be known without him. Let this be proved, and I will immediately yield the whole cauſe: And till it be proved my Principles remain unſhaken.

But ſaith N. O. *the Scripture is obſcure in ſome great and important points, becauſe St.* Peter *ſaith, that Men unlearned and unſtable, (though it may be diligent enough) wreſted ſome places of Scripture hard to be underſtood to their own deſtruction.* But doth St. *Peter* ſay that *the Scriptures are ſo hard to be underſtood* that ſober and devout Minds cannot learn therein, what is neceſſary to their Salvation? This had been indeed to their purpoſe: But it is far enough from St. *Peters.* He only ſaith that in St. *Pauls Epiſtles there are ſome difficult paſſages,* which Men that wanted judgment and conſtancy, and it may be diligence too, were ready to pervert to their own miſchief. But if there be ſuch difficulties, is there nothing plain and eaſie? If bad Men may pervert them, may not good Men make a good uſe of them? If ſome may deſtroy themſelves by their own weakneſs and folly, may not others be ſaved by their diligence and care? If it were proved by *N. O.* that *St. Peter* charged all this upon them for want of adhering to their Guides, that would approach nearer his buſineſs; but if St. *Peter* had intended any ſuch thing as *N. O.* inſinuates, what fairer opportunity had there been of preventing this Inſtability in others by telling them, that God had appointed infallible Guides in his Church to prevent ſuch abuſes of Scripture, and that, ſo long as they adhered to them, they were ſafe; but there is not the leaſt word in St. *Peter* to this purpoſe, when it had been moſt neceſſary to have given ſuch Advice; but he only bids them, have a care of *imitating the inconſtancy of ſuch wicked Men, and grow in the Grace and Knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt.* If on ſo fair and juſt an occaſion offered, St. *Peter* himſelf whom they believe to have been Head of the Church at that time, and at *Rome* at the writing of this Epiſtle, doth wholly omit referring Men in the ſenſe of obſcure places to infallible Guides; what can we elſe inferr but that St. *Peter* knew of ſuch appointment of Chriſt, or thought no ſuch thing of neceſſity for his Church? For if he had, ſuch was his care and faithfulneſs, he would never have omitted ſo neceſſary a thing; if the Salvation of Mens Souls had depended upon it.

2 Peter 3. 17, 18.

§. 12. *Of a Judge of Controverſies.*

If it be not then neceſſary to Mens Salvation to have an infallible Interpretation, of doubtful places; for what other end can it become neceſſary? Is it, *that without this, the Churches Peace cannot be preſerved, becauſe Controverſies ariſing in the Church, no Iſſue can be put to them, unleſs there be an infallible Judge to determine which is the true ſenſe of Scripture? For it is impoſſible that Scripture it ſelf ſhould be Judge, becauſe the Controverſie is about* the ſenſe of Scripture. So that either *there is no way left to determine Controverſies, or there muſt be an infallible Judge to deliver the ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful places.* This is the force of all that I know can be ſaid in this matter; to which I anſwer.

3. The ſtrength of this Argument depends upon the ſuppoſition of the neceſſity of determining Controverſies in Religion by a living Judge, who muſt pronounce ſentence between the Parties in difference. Which ſuppoſition, how plauſible ſoever it ſeems, is not built on any ſufficient foundation of Scripture or Reaſon. For the weakneſs of human underſtanding, the power of Intereſt and Paſſion, and the ambiguity of Words, are as apt to beget Diſputes in Religion as in any other things; ſo that we have no cauſe at all to wonder that there ſhould happen to be Controverſies among Men about

theſe matters; when we ſee them daily happen about the Laws of every Country. The only Queſtion now is; whether as the neceſſities of People have made it neceſſary that there ſhould not only be Laws but Judges, who ſhould be as the moſt equal Arbitrators to put an end to ſuch Differences as may happen among Men about matters of Right and Law, it be thus in Religion too? And this Queſtion is plainly about a matter of Fact, *i. e.* whether Chriſt hath appointed ſuch Judges in all Ages, who are to determine all emergent Controverſies about the difficult places of his Law? And in this caſe we think it is all the reaſon in the World, that they who *affirm ſhould prove*, eſpecially, when they affirm a matter of their own Right, and challenge a ſubmiſſion from others on the Account of it. We deſire them who challenge to be our infallible Guides, that they would ſhew their Commiſſion, and produce their Patent: For as we are ready to yield *Obedience*, if they crave it, ſo we think it Treaſon and Tyranny in them to uſurp it, if they have it not. And it is to no purpoſe to talk of the Benefits that would come to the World by an infallible Judge of Controverſies unleſs they firſt prove that there is one. But we muſt not allow Men to prove things to be, meerly becauſe they think it fitting they ſhould be; for that is to make themſelves wiſer than Chriſt, and rather to tell him what he ſhould have done, than prove what he hath done. What if Chriſt having provided for the neceſſaries of Salvation by a clear Revelation ſhould leave other things in the dark, to exerciſe the Wits of ſome and the Charity of others? What if he thought it ſufficient to oblige Men to the greateſt Honeſty and Integrity in knowing and doing the Will of God, and hath promiſed to paſs by the errours and failings Men are ſubject to barely as Men? What if he foreſaw this matter of ending Controverſies would be an occaſion of raiſing one of the greateſt in the Chriſtian World, and become a pretence of the moſt intollerable Tyranny over the minds of Men? And therefore, what if he thought it reaſonable to leave the failings of Mens underſtandings and lives upon the ſame Terms, ſo as to give ſufficient means to prevent either, but not effectually to hinder Men from falling into either of them? What if the nature of Religion will not bear ſuch a determination of Controverſies as civil Matters will? Becauſe, civil Matters concern the right and wrong of particular Perſons, in which it is not the ſentence of the Judge ſo much as the civil Force, whereby it is backed which puts an end to the Diſpute; but in matters of Religion, the ending Controverſies can be no effect of force and power, but of reaſon and conviction of Conſcience; and all the pretended Infallibility in the World can never ſatisfie my mind, unleſs I be firſt aſſured of that Infallibility. In all civil cauſes, it is agreed on both ſides that ſuch Judges are appointed to determine caſes of Law; and on the ſuppoſition of this Men proceed to Tryal before them; but in our caſe this is the main thing in Diſpute, and he that pretends to be the Judge is the moſt accuſed Party, and what reaſon can there be, that only on the pretence of greater Peace, if Controverſies were referred to an infallible Judge, we muſt therefore allow every one that pretends to it to be ſuch an infallible Guide? And we muſt on the ſame ground allow every one, if we muſt not firſt be ſatisfied of the grounds on which it is challenged by any one. And withal, ſince Chriſt is the beſt Judge of what is fitteſt for his Church, we muſt ſee by his

Laws whether he hath made it neceſſary for all Controverſies to be ended by a ſtanding Judge, that ſhould ariſe about the ſenſe of Scripture? If he hath not done it, it is to no purpoſe to ſay, it is fit he ſhould have done it; for that is to upbraid Chriſt with weakneſs and not to end differences in his Church.

2. Suppoſing it neceſſary that Controverſies ſhould be ended, it may as well be done without an infallible Judge of the ſenſe of Scripture as with one; for all that is pretended to be done by an infallible Judge is to give a certain ſenſe of controverted places; ſo that Men are either bound to look on that which they give as the certain ſenſe on the account of the Infallibility of the Interpreter, or that ſuch an infallible Interpretation being ſet aſide, there is no way to know the certain ſenſe of Scripture. If the firſt, then no Man can be more certain of the ſenſe of any doubtful place, than he is of the Infallibility of his Interpreter: I deſire therefore to be reſolved in this caſe. I am told *I can arrive at no certainty of the ſenſe of doubtful places of Scripture without an infallible Interpreter*, I ſay the places of Scripture which are alledged for ſuch an infallible Judge are the moſt doubtful and controverted of any; I would fain underſtand by what means I may come to be certain of the meaning of theſe Places, and to find out the ſenſe of them? Muſt I do it only by an infallible Guide? But that is the thing I am now ſeeking for, and I muſt not ſuppoſe that which I am to prove. If I may be certain without ſuppoſing ſuch an infallible Guide, of the meaning of theſe very doubtful and controverted Places, then why may I not by the ſame way of proceeding arrive at the certainty of any other leſs doubtful and obſcure Places? Unleſs there be ſome private way to come at the ſenſe of thoſe Places which will hold for none elſe beſides them, which is not ſo eaſie to underſtand.

3. I come therefore to the ſecond Enquiry, which is about the means of attaining the certain ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful Places, without the ſuppoſition of an infallible Guide. It will not I hope be denyed, that the Primitive Chriſtian Church had a certain way of underſtanding the ſenſe of doubtful Places, as far as it was neceſſary to be underſtood, and that they wanted no means which Chriſt had appointed for the ending of Controverſies. But I ſhall now ſhew, that they proceeded by no other means than what we uſed, ſo that, if they had any means to come to a certain ſenſe of Scripture, we have the ſame; and it would be a very hard caſe if by the uſe of the ſame means we cannot attain the ſame end. I ſhall therefore give an account of the proceeding of the Primitive Church in this weighty Controverſie concerning the ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful Places; and if no ſuch thing was then heard of as an infallible Judge, it is a plain demonſtration, they thought there was none appointed; becauſe the Diſputes that happened then required as much the Authority of ſuch a Judge as any that are at this day in the Chriſtian Church.

§. 13. *The way uſed in the Primitive Church for finding the ſenſe of Scripture.*

In the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, there were two ſorts of Controverſies which diſturbed the Church; one was concerning the Authority of the Books of the New Teſtament, and the other concerning the ſenſe of them. For, there was no one Book of the New Teſtament whoſe Authority was not called in Queſtion, by ſome Hereticks in thoſe firſt Ages. The *Gnoſticks*, (by whom I underſtand the Followers of *Simon Magus*, *Menander*, *Saturninus* and *Baſilides*,) had framed

a

a new Religion of their own under the Name of *Chriſtian*, and had no regard to the Writings either of the Old or New Teſtament, but had a Book of their own, which they called the *Goſpel of Perfection*. But as *Epiphanius* well obſerves, *no Man that hath underſtanding, needs Scripture to refute ſuch a Religion as theirs was; for right reaſon alone was ſufficient to diſcover the folly and filthineſs of it.* The Followers of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* acknowledged no other Goſpel but that of St. *Matthew*; and that not entire, but with diverſe Corruptions and Interpolations according to their ſeveral Fancies. *Cerdon* and *Mercion* allowed no Goſpel but that of St. *Luke*, which they altered according to their pleaſure, cutting off the Genealogy and other Places, and inſerting many things as it ſerved moſt to their purpoſe, as may be ſeen at large in *Epiphanius*. Some ſay, the *Valentinians* received no other *Goſpel* but that of St. *John*, (as the *Alogi* in *Epiphanius* rejected that alone,) but I do not find that *Valentinus* did reject any, but added more; for *Irenæus* chargeth the *Valentinians* only with adding another *Goſpel*, which they called the *Goſpel* of *Truth*; and *Tertullian* expreſly ſaith, that *Valentinus therein differed from* Marcion, *that* Marcion *cut off what he pleaſed with his Sword, but* Valentinus *corrupted it with his Pen; for although he allowed all the Books of the New Teſtament, yet he perverted the meaning of them.* *Euſebius* tells us, *that the Followers of* Severus *rejected the* Epiſtles *of St.* Paul *and the* Acts of the Apoſtles; *and interpreted the Law, and the Prophets and the Goſpels after a peculiar ſenſe of their own.* So that we ſee thoſe who undertook to confute theſe Hereticks were not only to vindicate the true ſenſe of Scripture, but to diſpute with ſuch, who did not own the ſame Books which they did; and therefore were forced to uſe ſuch ways of arguing as were proper to them: As may be ſeen at large by the proceedings of *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian* againſt them. But becauſe the *Valentinians* and *Marcionites* did endeavour to ſuit their extravagant fancies to the Scriptures allowed by them, it will be neceſſary for us, to enquire by what means they went about to clear the true ſenſe of Scripture from their falſe Gloſſes and Interpretations. *Irenæus* in the beginning of his Book, relating at large the Doctrines of the *Valentinians*, ſaith, *that by the perverſe Interpretations and corrupt Expoſitions of the Scripture, they drew away unſtable Minds from the true Faith; for they pretended to find out deeper and more myſterious things in the Scripture, than others were acquainted with,* viz. *That Chriſt intimated the* 30. *Æons by not appearing till the* 30th. *year of his Age. That the parable of Men called at the firſt, the third, the ſixth, the ninth, the eleventh Hour referred to the ſame thing, for thoſe Hours make up the number of* 30. *that St.* Paul *often mentions theſe Æons and the Productions of them; that the duodecade of Æons was implyed in our Saviours diſputing with the Doctors at* 12. *years of Age, and in the choice of the* 12. *Apoſtles: And the remaining* 18. by his *abiding* 18. *Months as they ſaid with his Diſciples after his Reſurrection: And where ever in Scripture they met with words ſuitable to the deſcription of their Æons, they pretended that they did refer to their Notions, but were obſcurely expreſſed on purpoſe: For which end they made uſe of Parables, and the firſt of St.* John *and many Paſſages in St.* Pauls *Epiſtles.* What courſe now doth *Irenæus* take to clear the ſenſe of Scripture in theſe controverted Places? Doth he tell them that God had

Epiphan. hæreſ. 26. ſect. 2, 3.

Epiphan. hæreſ. 28. 30.

Irenæ. l. 1. c. 26.

C. 29.

L. 3. c. 11.

Epiphan. hæreſ. 42.

Iren. l. 3. c. 11.

Tertul. de præcip. hæret. c. 38.

Euſeb. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 4. c. 29.

Iren. l. 1. c. 1.

had appointed infallible Guides in his Church, to whom Appeal was to be made in all ſuch caſes? Nothing like it, through his whole Book; but he argues with very good reaſon that no ſuch thing as they imagined could be intended by the Scripture.

1. From the ſcope and deſign of the Scripture, which ought chiefly to be regarded; whereas they only took ſome particular Paſſages which ſerved moſt to their purpoſe, without looking to the ſeries of the Diſcourſe wherein they were. " Therefore ſaith he, they make " only a rope of Sand, when they apply the Parables of our Saviour, " or the Sayings of the Prophets or Apoſtles to their Opinions; for " they paſs over the order and connexion of the Scriptures; and as " much as in them lyes looſe the Members of Truth from each " other; and then transform and change them from one thing to " another, thereby deceiving Men. As if, ſaith he, a Man ſhould " take an excellent Image of a Prince, done with a great deal of Art " in pretious Stones; and remove thoſe Stones out of their proper " Places, and turn them into the Shape of a Dog or a Fox, ill put together, and ſhould then affirm, that becauſe the Stones are the " ſame, that this Image of a Dog or a Fox, was the Image of the " Prince made by ſuch an excellent Artiſt: after the very ſame way, " ſaith he, do they uſe the Scriptures. Or as he afterwards expreſſeth it, they take ſeveral Words aud Names here and there, and " put them together, much after the way of thoſe who would apply " the Words of *Homer* to any Argument propoſed to them; which " ſome have done ſo artificially, that unskilful Men have been perſwaded that *Homer* did mean that very thing when he wrote his Poem. As one did the going of *Hercules* to *Cerberus* ſo exactly in the " Words of *Homer*, (put together in the *Greek* Fragments of *Irenæus*,) " that thoſe who did not conſider upon what different occaſions thoſe " Words were uſed by him, ſome being ſpoken of *Ulyſſes*, ſome of " *Priamus*, ſome of *Menelaus*, and *Agamemnon*, and ſome of *Hercules*, " might imagine that the Poet intended to deſcribe what the other " expreſſed by him. But he that will examine the ſeveral Places will " find that the Words indeed are *Homers*, but the Senſe his that ſo " applyed them. So it is in this caſe, the Words are the Scriptures, " but applyed quite in another way, than they were intended; the " Stones are the ſame, but yet the Image of the Fox is not to be taken for that of the Prince: and when he hath taken the Pains to " put every thing in its proper and due place, he will then eaſily find " out the Deceit. And by the help of this rule *Irenæus* vindicates the Places of Scripture, which the *Valentinians* made uſe of; and makes it evident that could not be the Senſe of them which they put upon them. As he doth particularly prove that St. *John* by the beginning of his Goſpel could not mean the firſt *Ogdoad* of the *Valentinians*. To the very ſame purpoſe doth *Tertullian* argue againſt their way of interpreting *Scripture*; " that although it ſeems to have Wit " and Eaſineſs in it, yet it is no more than is often practiſed on *Virgil* and *Homer* as well as the Scriptures. For we have ſeen *Virgil*, " ſaith he, with the ſame Words turned quite to another Senſe; as " *Hoſidius Geta* made the Tragedy of *Medea*, out of *Virgil*, (ſome " Fragments whereof are ſtill extant) and one had explained *Cebes*'s " Table in *Virgil*'s Words; and many had applyed the Words of *Homer* in their *Cento's* to different purpoſes, and not only ſome of late, but

Iren. l. 1. c. 1.

Tertull. de præſcrip. hæret, c.39.

Pet. Scriverii fragmata vv. Tragicorum p. 187.

but *Iſiodore* ſaith, that *Proba* and *Pomponius* before his time had made *Virgil* evangelize. “Therefore it is no wonder, ſaith *Tertullian*, that the Scripture ſhould be ſo abuſed, it being much more fruitful, and applicable to ſeveral purpoſes than other Writings are. Nay ſaith he, I am not afraid to ſay, that the Scriptures were ſo framed by the Will of God, that they might afford Matter for Hereticks to work upon; ſince I read that there muſt be Hereſies which cannot be without the Scripture. And ſurely then, he did not imagine that God had appointed an infallible Judge on purpoſe to prevent the being of Hereſies, by giving an infallible Senſe of Scripture.

Iſidor. Origin. l. 1. c. 38.

2. From the Repugnancy of the Senſe they gave to other places of Scripture. “*Irenæus*, obſerves, that the Hereticks delighted moſt in dark Places, and left the plain ones; whereas we ought moſt to rely upon the plain places and by them interpret the obſcure. For ſuch who loved God and the Truth would ſtudy moſt thoſe things which God put under our Command and Knowledge: and thoſe are things which are plain before our Eyes, and are open and without Ambiguity laid down in Scriptures; and to theſe Parables and dark Places ought to be fitted, and by this means they may be interpreted without danger, and of all alike, and the Body of Truth remains entire with a ſuitableneſs of all its Parts. But without this every Man interprets as he pleaſes, and there will be no certain Rule of Truth; but every Interpretation will be according to the opinion of the Interpreter, and Men will contradict each other as the Philoſophers did. And by this means Men will be always ſeeking and never finding, becauſe they caſt away the means of finding. Seeing therefore, ſaith he, that all the Scriptures both Prophetical and Evangelical are plain and clear, and may be heard alike of all: they muſt be very blind that will not ſee in ſo great Light, but darken themſelves in Parables, wherein every one of them thinks he hath found a God of his own. And from hence he very much blames the Hereticks, ſince they could not ſo much as pretend that any thing was plainly ſaid for them in Scripture, but only intimated in dark Sayings and Parables, that they would leave that which is certain and undoubted and true, for that which was uncertain and obſcure. Which, he ſaith, is not to build the Houſe upon the firm and ſtrong Rock; but upon the Uncertainty of the Sand; on which it may be eaſily overturned. This excellent Rule for interpreting Scripture *Irenæus* makes great uſe of in his following Diſcourſe, and in the very next Chapter urges this as the Conſequence of it, that having Truth for our Rule, and ſo plain Teſtimony of God, Men ought not to perplex themſelves with doubtful Queſtions concerning God, but grow in the Love of him who hath done and doth ſo great things for us, and never fall off from that Knowledge which is moſt clearly revealed. And we ought to be content with what is clearly made known in the Scriptures, becauſe they are perfect, as coming from the Word and Spirit of God. And we need not wonder if there be many things in Religion above our Underſtandings, ſince there are ſo in natural things which are daily ſeen by us: as in the Nature of Birds, Water, Air, Meteors, *&c.* of which we may talk much, but only God knows what the Truth is. Therefore why ſhould we think much if it be ſo in Religion too? Wherein are ſome Things we may underſtand, and others

Iren. l. 2. c. 46.

" others we muſt leave to God, and if we do ſo we ſhall keep our
" Faith without danger. And all Scripture being agreeable to it
" ſelf, the dark places muſt be underſtood in a way moſt ſuitable
" to the ſenſe of the plain.

3. The ſenſe they gave of Scripture was contrary to the Doctrine
of Faith received by all true Chriſtians from the beginning; which
Irenæ.l.1. he calls " the unmoveable rule of Faith received in Baptiſm; and
c.1. " which the Church diſperſed over the Earth did equally receive
C. 2. " in all Places; with a wonderful conſent. For although the Places
C. 3. " and Languages be never ſo diſtant or different from each other,
" yet the Faith is the very ſame, as there is one Sun which inlightens
" the whole World; which Faith none did enlarge or diminiſh.
" And after having ſhewn the great abſurdities of the Doctrines
" of the Enemies of this Faith, in his firſt and ſecond Books, in the
L. 3. c.1. " beginning of the third he ſhews that the Apoſtles did fully
" underſtand the mind of Chriſt, that they preached the ſame Doctrine
" which the Church received, and which, after their preaching
" it, was committed to writing by the Will of God in the Scriptures,
" to be the pillar and ground of Faith. Which was the true
C. 2. " reaſon why the Hereticks did go about to diſparage the Scriptures
" becauſe they were condemned by them: Therefore they
" would not allow them ſufficient Authority, and charged them with
" Contradictions, and ſo great obſcurity that the Truth could not
" be found in them without the help of Tradition, which they accounted
" the Key to unlock all the Difficulties of Scripture.
" And was not to be ſought for in Writings, but was delivered
" down from Hand to Hand; for which Cauſe St. *Paul* ſaid we
C. 3. " ſpeak Wiſdom among them that are perfect. Which Wiſdom they
" pretended to be among themſelves. On this account the matter
" of Tradition came firſt into Diſpute in the Chriſtian Church: And
" *Irenæus* appeals to the moſt eminent Churches and eſpecially that
" of *Rome*, becauſe of the great reſort of Chriſtians thither, whether
" any ſuch Tradition was ever received among them, and all the
" Churches of *Aſia* received the ſame Faith from the Apoſtles,
C. 4. " and knew of no ſuch Tradition as the *Valentinians* pretended
" to. And there was no reaſon to think, that ſo many Churches,
" founded by the Apoſtles, or Chriſt, ſhould be ignorant of ſuch a
" Tradition; and ſuppoſing no Scriptures at all had been written by the
" Apoſtles, we muſt then have followed the Tradition of the moſt Ancient
" and Apoſtolical Churches, and even the moſt barbarous Nations that had
" embraced Chriſtianity without any Writings: Yet fully agreed with
" other Churches in the Doctrine of Faith, for that is it he means by
L. 1. c. 2. " the *rule* of *Faith*, viz. a ſummary comprehenſion of the Doctrine
L. 4 Præfat. received among Chriſtians, ſuch as the Creed is mentioned by
Irenæus; and afterwards he ſpeaks of the *Rule* of the *Valentinians*
in oppoſition to that of the ſound Chriſtians. From hence *Irenæus*
proceeds to confute the Doctrine of the *Valentinians* by Scripture
L. 5. Præfat. and Reaſon in the third, fourth and fifth Books: All which ways
of finding out the ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful Places, we allow
of and approve, and are always ready to appeal to them in any of
the matters controverted between us and the Church of *Rome*.
But *Irenæus* knew nothing of an infallible Judge to determine
the ſenſe of Scripture; for if he had, it would have been very
ſtrange he ſhould have gone ſo much the fartheſt way about,
when

when he might ſo eaſily have told the *Valentinians* that God had entruſted the Guides of his Church, eſpecially at *Rome*, with the faculty of interpreting Scripture, and that all Men were bound to believe that to be the ſenſe of it which they declared, and no other. But Men muſt be pardoned if they do not write that which never entred into their Heads. After *Irenæus*, *Tertullian* ſets himſelf the moſt to diſpute againſt thoſe who oppoſed the *Faith* of the *Church*; and the method he takes in his *Book of Preſcription* of *Hereticks* is this.

1. That there muſt be a certain unalterable *Rule of Faith*. “For Tertull. præſcrip.
“ he that believes, doth not only ſuppoſe ſufficient grounds for his hæret. c. 8.
“ Faith, but Bounds that are ſet to it; and therefore there is no need
“ of further ſearch ſince the Goſpel is revealed. This he ſpeaks to C. 9.
“ take away the pretence of the *Seekers* of thoſe Days, who were
“ always crying, *ſeek and ye ſhall find*: To which he replies, that
“ we are to conſider not the bare words, but the reaſon of them;
“ and in the firſt place we are to ſuppoſe this, that there is one cer-
“ tain and fixed Doctrine delivred by Chriſt which all Nations
“ are bound to believe, and therefore to ſeek, that when they have
“ found they may believe it. Therefore all our Enquiries are to be
“ confined within that Compaſs; what that Doctrine was, which C. 10.
“ Chriſt delivered: For otherwiſe there will be no end of ſeeking.

2. “He ſhews what this *Rule* of *Faith* is, by repeating the Ar-
“ ticles of the Ancient Creed, which he ſaith was univerſally received
“ among true Chriſtians and diſputed by none but Hereticks. Which
“ *Rule* of *Faith* being embraced, then he ſaith, a liberty is allowed C. 13.
“ for other Enquiries in doubtful or obſcure matters. For Faith lyes
“ in the Rule; but other things were matters of skill and curioſity;
“ and it is Faith which ſaves Men, and not their skill in expounding
“ Scriptures: And while Men keep themſelves within that Rule, they
“ are ſafe enough, for to know nothing beyond it, is to know all.

3. *But they pretend Scripture for what they deliver, and by that means unſettle the minds of many.* To this he anſwers ſeveral ways.

1. “That ſuch Perſons as thoſe were, ought not to be admitted to
“ a Diſpute concerning the ſenſe of Scripture; becauſe they rather
“ deſerved to be cenſured than diſputed, for bringing ſuch new He-
“ reſies into the Church; but chiefly becauſe it was to no purpoſe
“ to diſpute with them about the ſenſe of Scripture, who received
“ what Scriptures they pleaſed themſelves, and added and took away C. 16.
“ as they thought fit. And what can the moſt skilfull Men in the
“ Scripture do with ſuch Men, who deny or affirm what they pleaſe? C. 17.
“ Therefore ſuch kind of Diſputes tended to no good at all, where
“ either ſide charged the other with forging and perverting the
“ Scriptures, and ſo the Controverſie with them, was not to be ma- C. 18.
“ naged by the Scriptures, by which either none, or an uncertain
“ Victory was to be obtained.

2. “In this Diſpute about the ſenſe of Scripture, the true ancient
“ Faith is firſt to be enquired after, for among whom that was, there
“ would appear to be the true meaning of Scripture. And for
“ finding out the true Faith, we are to remember, that, Chriſt ſent C. 19.
“ abroad his Apoſtles to plant Churches in every City, from whence
“ other Churches did derive the Faith, which are called Apoſtolical C. 20.
“ from their agreement in this common Faith at firſt delivered by
“ the Apoſtles; that the way to underſtand this Apoſtolical Faith C. 21.

“ is to have Recourſe to the Apoſtolical Churches; for it is unreaſonable
“ to ſuppoſe that the Apoſtles ſhould not know the Doctrine
C. 22. “ of Chriſt, (which he at large proves) or that they did not deliver
C. 23. “ to the Churches planted by them the things which they knew;
C. 24. “ or that the Churches miſunderſtood the Doctrine, becauſe all the
C. 25. C. 26. “ Chriſtian Churches were agreed in one common Faith: And there-
C. 27. “ fore there is all the reaſon to believe that ſo univerſal conſent
C. 28. “ muſt ariſe from ſome common Cauſe, which can be ſuppoſed to
“ be no other than the common delivery of it by all the Apoſtles.
“ But the Doctrines of the Hereticks were novel and upſtart; and
C. 29. “ we muſt ſay all the former Chriſtians were baptized into a falſe
“ Faith, as not knowing the true God or the true Chriſt, if *Marcion*
C. 30. “ and *Valentinus* did deliver the true Doctrine, but that which is
“ firſt is true and from God, that which comes after is foreign and
“ falſe. If *Marcion* and *Valentinus*, *Nigidius* or *Hermogenes* broach
“ new Opinions, and ſet up other Expoſitions of Scripture than the
“ Chriſtian Church hath received from the Apoſtles times, that with-
“ out any farther proof, diſcovers their Impoſture.

3. Two ſenſes directly contrary to each other cannot proceed from
the ſame Apoſtolical Perſons. This *Tertullian* likewiſe inſiſts upon
to ſhew, that although they might pretend Antiquity, and that as far
as the Apoſtolical Times, yet the contrariety of their Doctrine to
that of the Apoſtles would ſufficiently manifeſt the Falſhood of it.
For ſaith he, “ the Apoſtles would never contradict each other or
C. 32. “ themſelves; and if the Apoſtolical Perſons had contradicted them,
“ they had not been joyned together in the Communion of the ſame
“ Faith; which all the Apoſtolical Churches were. But the Doctrines
“ broached by theſe Men, were in their Seeds condemned by the
“ Apoſtles themſelves; ſo *Marcion*, *Appelles*, and *Valentinus* were
C. 33. “ confuted in the *Sadducees*, and firſt Corrupters of Chriſtianity.
“ But the true Chriſtians could not be charged by their Adver-
“ ſaries with holding any thing contrary to what the Church re-
“ ceived from the Apoſtles, the Apoſtles from Chriſt, and Chriſt
C. 36. “ from God. For the Succeſſion of the Churches was ſo evident,
C. 37. “ and the *Chairs* of the *Apoſtles* ſo well known, that any one might
“ ſatisfie his curioſity about their Doctrine, eſpecially ſince their
“ authentick Epiſtles are ſtill preſerved therein. But where a di-
“ verſity of Doctrine was found from the Apoſtles, that was ſuf-
“ ficient evidence of a falſe ſenſe that was put upon the Scriptures.
Thus *Tertullian* lays down the Rules of finding out the ſenſe
of controverted places of Scripture, without the leaſt inſinuation
of any Infallibility placed in the Guides of the Church for determining
the certain ſenſe of them.

But leaſt by this way of *preſcribing* againſt *Hereticks*, he ſhould ſeem to decline the Merits of the cauſe out of diſtruſt of being able to manage it againſt them, he tells us therefore elſewhere he would ſet aſide the ground of *Preſcription*, or juſt Exception againſt their pleading, (for ſo *Preſcription* ſignifies in him) as againſt *Marcion* and *Hermogenes* and *Praxeas*, and refute their Opinions upon other grounds. In his Book againſt *Marcion*, he firſt lays down *Marcion's Rule*, as he calls it, *i. e.* the Sum of his Opinion, which was making the Creator of the World, and the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt two diſtinct Gods, the one nothing but Goodneſs, and the other, the Author of

Evil: which Opinion he overthrows from Principles of Reaſons, becauſe there cannot be "two infinitely great, and on the ſame grounds Tertull. c.
"he makes two he may make many more, and becauſe God muſt be Mar. l. 1.
"known by his Works, and he could not be God that did not cre- c. 2. C. 4, 5, 6.
"ate the World; and ſo continues arguing againſt *Marcion* to the C. 11, 12.
"end of the firſt Book. In the ſecond he vindicates God the Creator "from all the Objections which *Marcion* had muſtered againſt his "Goodneſs. In the third he proves that Chriſt was the Son of God "the Creator; firſt by Reaſon and then by Scripture, and lays down "two Rules for underſtanding the prophetical Predictions relating to L. 3 c. 5.
"the manner of expreſſing future things as paſt, and the ænig"matical way of repreſenting plain things: Afterwards he proves in "the ſame manner from Scripture and Reaſon, that Chriſt did truly "aſſume our Nature and not meerly in Appearance; which he de- C. 8. 9.
"monſtrates from the Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt and from the "evidence of Senſe; and makes that ſufficient Evidence of the Truth "of a body that it is the object of three Senſes, of ſight, and touch "and hearing. Which is the ſame way of arguing we make uſe of againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and if *Marcion* had been ſo ſubtle to have uſed the Evaſions thoſe do in the *Roman* Church, he might have defended the putative Body of Chriſt in the very ſame manner that they do the being of Accidents without a Subſtance. "In the fourth Book L. 4. c. 4.
"he aſſerts againſt *Marcion* the Authority of the Goſpel received C. 5.
"in the Chriſtian Church above that which *Marcion* allowed, by the "greater Antiquity and the univerſal Reception of the true Goſpels; "and after refutes the Suppoſition of a twofold Chriſt, one for the Jews C. 7. &c.
"and another for the Gentils from the comparing of Scriptures to"gether, which he doth with great diligence and anſwers all the Ar"guments from thence, brought by *Marcion*, to prove that Chriſt was "an Enemy to the Law of *Moſes*. In his Fifth and laſt Book he "proves out of the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, allowed by *Marcion*, that he "preached no other God than the Creator, and that Chriſt was the "Son of God the Creator; which he doth from the Scope and Cir"cumſtances of the places without apprehending the leaſt neceſſity of calling in any infallible Guides to give the certain Senſe and meaning of them.

Againſt *Hermogenes*, he diſputes about the Eternity of Matter; Tertull. adverſus Hermog. c. 19.
the Controverſy between them he tells us was concerning the Senſe of ſome places of Scripture, which relate to the Creation of things; *Tertullian* proves "that all things were made of nothing, becauſe it is "not mention'd out of what they were made; *Hermogenes* proves "they were made out of Matter; becauſe it is not ſaid they were "made of nothing. To determine therefore the Senſe of theſe pla"ces *Tertullian* ſhews from Reaſon the Repugnancy of the Eterni"ty of matter to the Attributes of God: He compares ſeveral Places C. 20. 21. 22.
"of Scripture together, he reaſons from the manner of the Expreſſi"ons and the Idiom of Scripture. I adore, ſaith he, the Fulneſs of "the Scripture which ſhews me both the Maker and the thing made; "but the Goſpel likewiſe diſcovers by whom all things were made. "But the Scripture no where ſaith that all things were made out of "matter. Let the Shop of *Hermogenes* ſhew where it is written; and "if it be not written let him fear the Woe denounced to thoſe who "add or take from what is written. He examins the ſeveral Places

“ in diſpute, and by proving that Senſe which *Hermogenes* put upon them
“ to be repugnant to Reaſon, (as he ſhews to the end of that Book) he
“ concludes his Senſe of Scripture to be falſe and erroneous.

Againſt *Praxeas*, he diſputes whether God the Father took our Nature
Tertull. adverſus Praxeam. c. 20. upon him, and the Arguments on both ſides are drawn from the
Scriptures; but *Tertullian* well obſerves, “ that they inſiſted upon two
“ or three Places of Scripture, and would make all the reſt though
“ far more to yield to them. Whereas the fewer Places ought to be
“ underſtood according to the Senſe of the greater number. But this
“ ſaith he, is the Property of all Hereticks, becauſe they can find but
“ few Places for them, they defend the ſmaller number againſt the
“ greater: Which is againſt the nature of a Rule, wherein the firſt
“ and the moſt, ought to overſway the latter and the fewer. And
therefore he ſets himſelf throughout that Book to produce the far
greater Number of Places of *Scripture*, which do aſſert the Diſtinction
between the Father and the Son; and conſequently that it could not
be the Father who ſuffered for us.

Hitherto we find nothing ſaid of an infallible Guide to give the
certain Senſe of Scripture, when the faireſt occaſion was offered, by
thoſe who diſputed the moſt concerning the Senſe of Scripture in the
Age wherein they lived, *viz.* by *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*.

Clem. Alexand. Strom. 7. I now proceed to *Clemens* of *Alexandria* who in his learned *Collections*,
propoſes that Objection, againſt Chriſtianity, that there were
many Hereſies among Chriſtians, and therefore Men could believe nothing.
To which he anſwers, “ That there were Hereſies among the
“ Jews and Philoſophers; and that Objection was not thought ſufficient
againſt *Judaiſm* or Philoſophy, and therefore ought not to be
“ againſt Chriſtianity. Beſides the coming of Hereſies was foretold,
“ and what ever is foretold muſt come to paſs. The *Phyſitians*, ſaith
“ he, differ in their Opinions, yet Men do not neglect to make uſe
“ of them, when they are ſick. Hereſies ſhould only make Men more
“ careful what they chooſe. Men ought thereby to endeavour the
“ more to find out Truth from Falſhood; as if two Sorts of Fruit be
“ offered to a Man real, and waxen; will a Man abſtain from both,
“ becauſe one is Counterfeit, or rather find out the true from the
“ apparent? When ſeveral ways offer themſelves for a Man to go in,
“ he ought not therefore to ſit down and not ſtir a ſtep further;
“ but he uſes the beſt means to find out the true way and then walks
“ in it. So that they are juſtly condemned who do not diſcern the
“ true from the falſe; for they who will, ſaith he, may find out
“ the Truth. For either there is Demonſtration or not; all grant
“ Demonſtration, or Evidence, who do not deſtroy our Senſes; if
“ there be Demonſtration there muſt be Search and Enquiry made;
“ and by the Scriptures we may demonſtratively learn how Hereſies
“ fell off, and that the exacteſt Knowledge was to be found in the
“ Truth and the antient Church. Now the true Searchers will not
“ leave till they find Evidence from the Scripture. To this end, he
“ commands the Exerciſe of Mens Reaſon and Underſtanding, impartiality
or laying aſide opinion, a right Diſpoſition of Soul, for when
“ Men are given over to their Luſts they endeavour to wreſt the
“ Scriptures to them. But he eſtabliſhes the Scripture as the only
“ Principle of Certainty to Chriſtians, and more credible than any
“ Demonſtration: which ſo have taſted are called Faithful, but thoſe

“ who are verſed in them are the truly knowing Men. The great Objection now is, *that Hereticks make uſe of Scripture too:* But they, ſaith he, reject what they pleaſe, and do “ not follow the Body and Contexture of Prophecy; but take ambiguous Expreſſions and apply them to their own Opinions; and a few ſcattered Phraſes, without regarding the Senſe and importance of them. For in the Scriptures produced by them, you may find them either making uſe of meer Names, and changing the Significations of them; never attending to the Scope and Intention of them. But Truth, ſaith he, doth not lye in the Change of the Signification of Words (for by that means all Truth may be overthrown) but in conſidering what is proper and perfectly agreeable to our Lord and Almighty God, and in confirming every thing which is demonſtrated by the Scripture out of the ſame Scriptures. Wherein *Clemens Alexandrinus* lays down ſuch Rules as he thought neceſſary to find out the certain Senſe of Scripture, *viz.* by conſidering the Scope and Coherence of the Words, the proper Senſe and Importance of them, the comparing of Scripture with Scripture, and the Doctrine drawn from it with the Nature and Properties of God, all which are excellent Rules, without the leaſt Intimation of the neceſſity of any infallible Interpreter to give the certain Senſe of doubtful Places.

After this time a great Diſpute aroſe in the Church about the rebaptizing *Hereticks*, managed by the *Eaſtern* and *African* Biſhops againſt *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome*. Here the Queſtion was about the Senſe of ſeveral Places of Scripture, and the Practice of the Apoſtles; as appears by the *Epiſtles* of *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*; both Parties pleading Scripture and Tradition for themſelves. But no ſuch thing as an Infallibility in Judgment was pleaded by the *Pope*, nor any thing like it in the leaſt acknowledged by his Adverſaries, *who charge* him, (without any reſpect to his infallible Guideſhip,) *with Pride, Error, Raſhneſs, Impertinency, and contradicting himſelf.* Which makes *Baronius* very tragically exclaim: and although he makes uſe of this as a great Argument of the prevalency of Tradition, becauſe the Opinion of *Stephen* obtained in the Church; yet there is no Evidence at all that any Churches did ſubmit to the Opinion of *Stephen* when he declared himſelf, but as appears by *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria's* Epiſtles, the Controverſie continued after his time; and if we look into the Judgment of the Church in following Ages, we ſhall find that neither *Stephens* Opinion, nor his Adverſaries were followed; (for *Stephen* was againſt rebaptizing any *Hereticks*, and the others were for rebaptizing all, becauſe one Baptiſm was only in the true Church:) For in the nineteenth Canon of the Council of *Nice* the *Samoſatenian Baptiſm is pronounced null*; and the Perſons who received it are to be new baptized; and the firſt Council of *Arles* decrees, that *in caſe of Hereſie Men are to receive new Baptiſm but not otherwiſe:* The ſecond Council of *Arles* puts a Diſtinction between Hereticks; decreeing *that the* Photinians *and* Samoſatenians *ſhould be baptized again; but not the* Bonoſiaci *nor the* Arians, *but they were to be received upon renouncing their Hereſie without Baptiſm.* Which ſeems the harder to underſtand ſince the *Bonoſiaci* were no other than *Photinians*. The moſt probable way of ſolving it is, that theſe two latter Sorts did preſerve the form of Baptiſm entire, but the *Photinians* and *Samoſatenians* altered it: which St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, is a thing to be believed. So *Gennadius* reports it, that thoſe who were baptized without Invocation of

Cyprian. Epiſt. 74. Firmil. inter epp. Cyprian. 75.

Baron. Annal. ad A. D. 258. n. 36. n. 52. Euſeb. l. 7. c. 5.

Concil. Arelat. 1. c. 8. Concil. Arelat. 2. c. 17.

Aug. de hæreſ. cap. 44.

the *Bleſſed Trinity*, were to be baptized upon their Reception into the Church (not rebaptized becauſe the former was accounted null) of theſe he reckons not only the *Paulianiſts* and *Photinians*, but the *Bonoſiaci* too and many others. But St. *Baſil* determines the caſe of Baptiſm, not from the *form* but from the *Faith* which they profeſſed; a Schiſmatical Baptiſm he ſaith, was allowed, but not *Heretical*, by which he means ſuch as denyed the Trinity; and therein he ſaith, St. *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* were to blame, becauſe they would allow no Baptiſm among Perſons ſeparated from the Communion of the Church. The *Council* of *Laodicea* decreed, *that the* Novatians, Photinians, *and* Quarto-decimans *were to be received without new Baptiſm, but not the* Montaniſts, *or* Cataphryges: but *Binius* ſaith there was one Copy, wherein the *Photinians* were left out; and then theſe Canons may agree with the reſt; and *Baronius* aſſerts *that the greater Number of* M. S. Copies leave out *Photinians*. And withal he proves, that the Church did never allow the Baptiſm of the *Photinians*, though it did of the *Arians*; by which we ſee that the Church afterwards did not follow that which *Stephen* pretended to be an Apoſtolical Tradition, *viz. that no Hereticks ſhould be rebaptized:* and from hence we may conclude that the *Pope* was far from being thought an *infallible Guide* or *Interpreter of Scripture*, either by that, or ſucceeding Ages; when not only ſingle Perſons that were eminent Guides of the Church (ſuch as the *African* and *Eaſtern* Biſhops were,) oppoſed his Doctrine, and ſlighted his Excommunications, but ſeveral Councils called both in the Eaſt and *Africa*, and the moſt eminent *Councils* of the *Church* afterwards (ſuch as the firſt of *Arles* and *Nice*) decreed contrary to what he declared to be an *Apoſtolical Tradition.*

Genad. de Eccl.dogmat. c.52. Baſil. Epiſt. Can. 1. ad Ancphloch.

Concil. Laodicen. c. 7. 8.

Baron. Annal Tom 4. in Append.

In the ſame Age we meet with another great Controverſie about the *Senſe* of *Scripture*, for *Paulus Samoſatenus* openly denyed the *Divinity of Chriſt*, and aſſerted the Doctrine of it to be repugnant to *Scripture*, and the antient apoſtolical Tradition. For this *Paulus* revived the Hereſie of *Artemon*; whoſe Followers, as appears by the Fragment of an antient Writer againſt them in *Euſebius*, (ſuppoſed to be *Caius*) pleaded that the Apoſtles were of their Mind, and that their Doctrine continued in the Church till the time of *Victor*, and then it began to be corrupted. Which ſaith that Writer would ſeem probable, if the holy Scriptures did not firſt contradict them; and the Books of ſeveral Chriſtians before *Victors* time. So that we ſee the main of Controverſie did depend upon the Senſe of Scripture which was pleaded on both ſides. But what Courſe was taken in this important Controverſie to find out the certain Senſe of Scripture? Do they appeal to any infallible Guides? Nothing like it. But in the *Councils* of *Antioch*, in the Writings of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* and others ſince, they who oppoſed the *Samoſatenian* Doctrine endeavoured with all their Strength to prove that to be the true Senſe of Scripture, which aſſerted the Divinity of Chriſt. It is great Pity the Diſpute of *Melchion Paulus* is now loſt, which was extant in *Euſebius* his time; but in the Queſtions and Anſwers between *Paulus* and *Dionyſius*; (which *Valeſius* without reaſon ſuſpects ſince St. *Hierome* mentions his Epiſtle againſt *Paulus*) the Diſpute was about the true Senſe of Scripture which both pleaded for themſelves. *Paulus* inſiſts on thoſe Places, which ſpeak of the human Infirmities of Chriſt, which he

Epiphan. hæreſ. 65. Euſebii Eccleſi.hiſtor.l.5. c. 28.

Valeſ. not ad Euſeb. l. 7. c. 30.

ſaith prove that he was meer “ Man and not God; the other anſwers that theſe things were not inconſiſtent with the Being of the Divine Nature, ſince Expreſſions implying human Paſſions are attributed to God in Scripture: But he proves from multitude of Scriptures, and Reaſons drawn from them, that the Divine Nature is attributed to Chriſt, and therefore the other places which ſeem repugnant to it, are to be interpreted in a ſenſe agreeable thereto. The ſame Courſe is likewiſe taken by *Epiphanius* againſt this Hereſie: who ſaith, “ the Chriſtians way of anſwering Difficulties was not from their own Reaſons, but from the ſcope and conſequence of Scripture: And particularly adds, that the Doctrine of the Trinity was carefully delivered in the Scriptures, becauſe God forſaw the many Hereſies which would ariſe about it.

Epiphan. hæreſ. 64. Sect. 5.

Sect. *6.*

But never any Controverſie about the ſenſe of Scripture diſturbed the Church more, than that which the *Arians* raiſed; and if ever any had reaſon to think of ſome certain and infallible way of finding out the ſenſe of Scripture the Catholick Chriſtians of that Age had. I ſhall therefore give an account of what way the beſt Writers of the Church in that time took to find out the ſenſe of Scripture in the controverted places. Of all the Writers againſt them *Athanaſius* hath juſtly the greateſt Eſteem, and *Petavius* ſaith that God inſpired him with greater skill in this Controverſie, than any others before him. The Principle he goes upon in all his Diſputes againſt the *Arians*, is this, *that our true Faith is built upon the Scriptures*, ſo in ſeveral places of his Conference with the *Arian* and in the beginning of his Epiſtle to *Jovianus* and elſewhere. Therefore in the entrance of his *Diſputations* againſt the *Arians*, he adviſeth all that would ſecure themſelves from the “ impoſture of Hereticks, to ſtudy the Scriptures; becauſe thoſe who are verſed therein ſtand firm againſt all their Aſſaults; but they who look only at the words, without underſtanding the meaning of them are eaſily ſeduced by them. And this Counſel he gives, after the Council of *Nice* had decreed the *Arian* Doctrine to be *Hereſie*; and although “ he ſaith, other ways may be uſed to confute it; yet becauſe the Holy Scripture is more ſufficient than all of them, therefore thoſe who would be better inſtructed in theſe things, I would adviſe them to be converſant in the Divine Oracles. *But did not the* Arians *plead Scripture as well as they? How then could the Scripture end this Controverſie, which did ariſe about the ſenſe of Scripture?* This Objection, which is now made ſo much of againſt the Scriptures, was never ſo much as thought of in thoſe Days; or if it were, was not thought worth anſwering; for they did not in the leaſt deſert the proofs of Scripture, becauſe their Adverſaries made uſe of it too. But they endeavoured to ſhew that their Adverſaries Doctrine had no ſolid Foundation in Scripture, but theirs had, *i. e.* that the *Arians* perverted it, becauſe they did not examine and compare places as they ought to do, but run away with a few words, without conſidering the ſcope and deſign of them; or comparing them with Places plainer than thoſe were which they brought. Thus when the *Arians* objected that place, *my Father is greater than I*, *Athanaſius* bids them compare that with other places, ſuch as *My Father and I are one*, and *who being in the form of God thought it no robbery to be equal with God*; and *by him all things were made*, &c.

Athanaſ. cont. Arian. Orat. 1. p. 287.

Atha. Cont. Arian. diſput. p. 116 *&c.*

&c. When *Arius* objected, *to us there is but one God of whom are all things*, he tells him, he ought to conſider the following words, *and oue Lord Jeſus Chriſt by whom are all things*; from whence when *Arius* argued *that Chriſt was only Gods Inſtrument in creating things*, *Athanaſius* then bids him compare this place with another, where it is ſaid *of whom the whole Body*, &c. Not barely Eph 4 16. δι' ȣ̃ but ἐξ ȣ̃. When the *Arians* objected, Chriſts ſaying, *all things are delivered to me from my Father*, *Athanaſius* oppoſes that place of St. *John* to it, *by him all things were made*. Thus when they objected ſeveral other places, he conſtantly hath recourſe to *John* 1. 1, 2, 3. to *Phil.* 2. 7. 1 *John* 5. 20. and others which he thought the plaineſt places for Chriſts eternal Divinity; and by theſe he proves that the other were to be interpreted, with a reſpect to his Human Nature, and the State he was in upon Earth. So that the greateſt Defender of the Doctrine of the Trinity againſt the *Arians* ſaw no neceſſity at all of calling in the Aſſiſtance of any infallible Guides, to give the certain ſenſe of Scriptures in theſe doubtful places; but he thought the Scripture plain enough to all thoſe who would impartially examine it; and for others who wilfully ſhut their Eyes, no Light could be great enough for them. Indeed, when the *Arians* called in the help of any of the Ancient Writers to juſtify their Doctrine, then *Athanaſius* thought himſelf concerned to vindicate them; as particularly *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*. But, as he ſaith, *if they can produce Scripture or Reaſon for what they ſay, let them do it; but if not, let them hold their peace:* Thereby implying, that theſe were the only conſiderable things to be regarded: Yet he ſhews at large, that they abuſed the Teſtimony of *Dionyſius*, who although in his Letters againſt *Sabellius*, he ſpake too much the other way, yet in other of his Writings he ſufficiently cleared himſelf from being a Favourer of the *Arian* Hereſie. And although *Athanaſius* doth elſewhere ſay, *that the Faith which the Catholick Church then held, was the Faith of their Fore-fathers, and deſcended from the Apoſtles*; yet, he no where ſaith, that without the help of that Tradition, it had been impoſſible to have known the certain ſenſe of Scripture, much leſs without the infallible Interpretation of the Guides of the preſent Church.

Athan. de ſent. Dionyſii C. Arian. p. 549.

Athan. Orat. 1. C. Arian. ad Adelp. C. Paul. Samoſat. ep. ad Scropi.

St. *Hilary* in his Diſputes againſt the ſame Hereticks, profeſſes in the beginning, “That his Intention was to confound their rage “and ignorance out of Writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles: “And to that end deſires of his Readers that they would con“ceive of God not according to the Laws of their own Beings, “but according to the Greatneſs of what he had declared of him“ſelf. For he is the beſt Reader of Scripture, who doth not “bring his ſenſe to the Scripture, but takes it from it, and doth “not reſolve before-hand to find that there, which he concluded “muſt be the ſenſe before he reads. In things therefore which “concern God, we muſt allow him to know himſelf beſt, and give “due Reverence to his Word. For he is the beſt witneſs to him“ſelf who cannot be known but by himſelf. In which words he plainly aſſerts that the Foundation of our Faith muſt be in the Scriptures, and that a free and impartial mind is neceſſary to find out the true ſenſe of Scripture. And after he had ſaid in the ſecond Book, that Hereſies ariſe from miſunderſtanding the Scripture, and charged in his fourth Book the *Arians* particularly with it, he proceeds

Hilar. de Trinit. l. 1.

ceeds to anſwer all the places produced by them out of the Old and New Teſtament, by comparing ſeveral places together, and the antecedents and conſequents, and by theſe means proving that they miſtook the meaning of Scripture. So in the beginning of his ninth Book rehearſing the common places, which were made uſe of by the *Arians*, he ſaith, "they repeated the words alone, without enquiring into "the meaning, or Contexture of them; whereas the true ſenſe of "Scripture is to be taken from the Antecedents and Conſequents: "their fundamental miſtake being the applying thoſe things to his "Divine Nature, which were ſpoken of his Human: Which he makes good by a particular examination of the ſeveral places in Controverſie.

Hil. l. 9.

The ſame Courſe is taken by *Epiphanius*, *Phœbadius* and others of the ancient Writers of the Church, who aſſerted the Eternal Divinity of Chriſt againſt the *Arians*. *Epiphanius* therefore charges them with mangling and perverting the ſenſe of Scripture; underſtanding figurative Expreſſions literally, and thoſe which are intended in a plain ſenſe figuratively.

Epiphan. hæreſ. 69. ſ. 50.

So that it is obſervable in that great Controverſie which diſturbed the Church ſo many Years, which exerciſed the wits of all Men in that time to find out a way to put an end to it, after the Guides of the Church had in the Council of *Nice* declared what was the Catholick Faith: Yet ſtill the Controverſie was managed about the ſenſe of Scripture, and no other ways made uſe of for finding it, than ſuch as we plead for at this Day. It is a moſt incredible thing, that in a time of ſo violent Contention, ſo horrible Confuſion, ſo ſcandalous Diviſions in the Chriſtian Church, none of the Catholick Biſhops ſhould once ſuggeſt this admirable Expedient of Infallibility. But this *Palladium* was not then fallen down from Heaven, or if it were, it was kept ſo ſecret, that not one of the Writers of the Chriſtian Church in that buſie and diſputing Age diſcovered the leaſt knowledge of it. Unleſs it be ſaid that of all Times it was then leaſt fit to talk of *Infallibility* in the *Guides* of the *Church*, when they ſo frequently in Councils contradicted each other. The *Synodical Book* in the new Tomes of the Councils, reckons up thirty one ſeveral Councils of Biſhops in the time of the *Arian* Controverſie, whereof near twenty were for the *Arians*, and the reſt againſt them. *If the ſenſe of Scripture were in this time to be taken from the Guides of the Church*, what ſecurity could any Man have againſt *Arianiſm?* Since the Councils which favoured it, were more numerous than thoſe which oppoſed and condemned it. Yea ſo mean was the Opinion which ſome of the greateſt Perſons of the Church at that time had of the *Guides* of the *Church* met together in *Councils*, that St. *Gregory Nazianzen* declares *he had not ſeen a good Iſſue of any one of them; but they rather increaſed miſchief than removed any; becauſe of the Contention and Ambition which ruled in them, therefore he reſolved to come no more at any of them.* What? Had St. *Gregory* ſo mean an Eſteem of the *Guides of the Chriſtian Church* to think, that *Ambition and Contention* ſhould ſway them in their Councils and not the Spirit of God, which certainly rules not where the other do? Yet this he declares to be his mind upon conſideration and experience in that time, and if he had lived to thoſe bleſſed Days of the Councils of latter Ages, with what Zeal and Rhetorick would he have

Concil. General. Tom. 2. p. 84.

Greg. Nazian. ep. 55.

ſet them forth? Never was any Anſwer more jejune to this Teſtimony than that of *Bellarmin, viz.* that forſooth *there could be no lawful Councils called in his time*; and why ſo I pray? Was there not a good Authority to call them? But if that had been the reaſon, he did not ſo little underſtand the way of expreſſing himſelf, to aſſign the cauſe of it to *Contention and Ambition*, if he mean quite another thing which he doth not in the leaſt intimate. And *what if he were afterwards preſent at the Council of* Conſtantinople? doth that ſhew, that his Mind was in the leaſt changed? But in this Epiſtle he declares, how little good was to be exſpected from a Council, and yet afterwards by the Emperours Command he might be preſent at one. St. *Auguſtin* in dealing with *Maximinus* the *Arian* expreſly ſets aſide *all Authority of the* Guides *of the Church, as to the ſenſe of Scripture in the Places controverted between them*; for he ſaith, *I will neither bring the Authority of the Council of* Nice, *neither ſhall you that of* Ariminum; *but we will proceed by Authorities of Scripture that are common to both of us, and by the cleareſt evidence of Reaſon.* It ſeems then St. *Auguſtin* was far from thinking that there could be no certainty of the ſenſe of Scripture, if the Authority of the *Guides* of the *Church* be ſet aſide. But by what means doth he then think, that Men may come to any certainty about the true meaning of Scripture? Of that he is beſt able to give us an account himſelf having written purpoſely on this Subject, in his Books of Chriſtian Doctrine, the ſubſtance of what he there ſays may be comprehended in theſe Rules.

Bellar. de Concil. Author. l. 2 c. 7.

Auguſt. C. Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.

1. “That the main ſcope of the Scripture is to perſwade Men to the Love of God and our Neighbour, without which, he ſaith, no Man doth truly underſtand it; but whoſoever interprets Scripture to the advancing of that, though he may be miſtaken as to the ſenſe of the words, yet his Errour is not dangerous.

Aug. de Doctri. Chriſtiana. l 1. c. 35, 36.

2. “That in order to the right underſtanding of Scripture Men muſt apply themſelves to it with Minds duly prepared for it; by a Fear of God, Humility, Prayer, Sincerity, and purity of Heart.

L. 2. c. 7

3. “That all thoſe things which are neceſſary to Salvation are plainly laid down in Holy Scriptures; this is in Terms aſſerted by him, as a fundamental Principle, that in thoſe things which are plainly ſet down in Scripture, all things are to be found which contain our Faith and Rule of Life. *i. e.* All things which are neceſſary to the Love of God and our Neighbour, and conſequently to the making us happy. And theſe things Men ought eſpecially to read the Scriptures for; and the more they find of them, the larger their underſtanding of Scripture is.

L. 2. c 9.

4. “That the obſcure places of Scripture are to be underſtood by the plain. For which end he requires frequent reading, and uſing ones ſelf to the language of Scriptures, and drawing Examples from plain places to illuſtrate difficult, and thoſe which are certain to clear the doubtful. For, ſcarce any thing, ſaith he, is drawn out of the moſt difficult Places, but what is very plainly ſet down elſewhere.

Ib.

L. 3. c. 26

L. 2. c. 6.

5. “That in regard of the infinite variety of Latin Interpreters (which it ſeems were in his time) in matters of Doubt it was neceſſary to have recourſe to the Original Hebrew and Greek: The knowledge of which Tongues might therefore be neceſſary to the

L. 2. c. 10.

“ knowledge of Scripture, becauſe ſeveral words are preſerved untranſlated;
“ but thoſe being few the neceſſity is not ſo great on their
“ account, as the diverſity of Interpreters, for although thoſe who C. 11.
“ had tranſlated the Hebrew into Greek might be reckoned up, the
“ Latin Interpreters could not. Which diverſity of Tranſlations doth
“ rather help than hinder the underſtanding of Scripture, if the
“ Readers of it be not negligent; for ſome doubtful Places are cleared
“ by the difference of readings.

6. “ Where the Ambiguity lyes in proper Words, the clearing of
“ it depends on the Circumſtances of the Place; in ſo much that he L. 3. c. 4.
“ determines, that it is a very rare and difficult thing to find ſuch
“ an ambiguity in the Words of Scripture, which may not be cleared
“ from the Intention of the Writer, or comparing places, or
“ ſearching the Original Language.

7. “ Men muſt carefully diſtinguiſh between proper and figurative
“ Expreſſions; for to underſtand figurative Expreſſions literally is to L. 3. c. 5.
“ ſubject our Underſtanding to carnal Conceptions of things: and that
“ is, ſaith he, a miſerable Slavery of Mind, to take Signs for things;
“ ſuch Signs he tells us under the Goſpel are the two Sacraments
“ of Baptiſm and the Lords Supper. The great difficulty herein, lies C. 9.
“ in the finding out the difference between proper and figurative Expreſſions,
“ for which he lays down this Rule, if the Words of Scripture
“ command what is good and forbid what is evil, it is no figurative C. 15. 16.
“ Expreſſion; but if it forbids what is good, or command any
“ thing that is evil, it muſt be figuratively underſtood. For which
“ he inſtances in thoſe Words of our Saviour, *unleſs ye eat the Fleſh*
“ *and drink the Blood of the Son of Man ye ſhall have no Life in you.*
“ Which ſeeming to command ſomething evil, muſt be figuratively
“ underſtood of communicating in the Paſſion of Chriſt, and calling
“ to mind that his Fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.

8. “ There is no danger in different Senſes being given of the ſame
“ Place of Scripture, if every one of thoſe Senſes appear by other
“ Places to be agreeable to Truth: This being ſuppoſed that the Perſon
“ do ſincerely enquire after the Senſe of the Author; For, ſaith L. 3 c. 26.
“ he, that divine Spirit might eaſily foreſee how many ſeveral Senſes
“ thoſe Words are capable of, which being agreeable to other Parts of
“ Scripture, though not the particular Meaning of thoſe Words, the
“ Miſtake cannot be dangerous therein.

9. “ Where ſuch a Senſe is given which cannot be proved by other
“ certain Teſtimonies of Scripture, it muſt be made manifeſt to be the
“ Senſe by clear Evidence of Reaſon. But he rather approves the way L. 3. c. 28.
“ of proving the Senſe of Scripture by other Places of Scripture,
“ where the Interpretation is doubtful. So that the way in doubtful
Places “ which he preſcribes is this, either to draw ſuch a Senſe
“ from them as hath no diſpute concerning it's being a true Propoſition,
“ or if it have, that it be confirmed by other Places of Scripture.

Beſides theſe, he lays down the ſeven Rules of *Ticonius* the *Donatiſt*, which are not of that conſequence to be here repeated; that which I take notice of is, that St. *Auguſtin* thought the Rules he gave ſufficient for underſtanding the meaning of Scripture in doubtful Places; but he doth not in the leaſt mention the *Infallibility* of the *Guides of the Church* as a neceſſary means for that end. But he doth

aſſert

aſſert in as plain terms, as I have done, *that Scripture is plain in all Neceſſaries to Salvation to any ſober Enquirer*, and whatever Conſequences are charged upon me for making that a Fundamental Principle, muſt reflect as much upon St. *Auguſtin* as me; and I do not fear all the Objections can be made againſt a Principle ſo evident to reaſon, and ſo agreeable not only to St. *Auguſtin*, but the Doctrine of the Catholick Church both before and after him.

Vincent. Lerin. Commonitor p. 4.

The next after St. *Auguſtin* who hath purpoſely writ of this Argument about the Senſe of Scripture is *Vincentius Lerinenſis:* about four years after St. *Auguſtin's* Death, and three after the Council of *Epheſus*, who ſeems to attribute more to the *Guides of the Church* than St. *Auguſtin* doth, yet far enough ſhort of *Infallibility*. He ſaith, "That every Man ought to ſtrengthen his Faith againſt Hereſie by two things, firſt by the Authority of the divine Law, and then by the Tradition of the Catholick Church: which Tradition he makes neceſſary, not by way of Addition to the Scripture, for he allows the Perfection and Sufficiency of that for all things; but only to interpret Scripture by giving a certain Senſe of it, there being ſuch different Opinions among Men about it. For all the Hereticks whom he there names had different Senſes of Scripture, as *Novatianus*, *Sabellius*, *Donatus*, *Arius*, *Macedonius*, *Photinus*, &c. But then he bounds this Tradition within the Compaſs of the univerſal Conſent of Antiquity, as well as the preſent Church; or as he expreſſeth it, within thoſe things which were believed *every where*, *always*, and *by all Perſons*. That we may therefore conſider how far theſe Rules of *Vincentius* will ſerve for explaining the Senſe of Scripture, we are to take notice of the Reſtrictions he lays upon them.

1. That they are to be taken together, and not one of them ſeparate from the reſt. As for inſtance, that of *Univerſality* in any one Age of the Church, being taken without the *conſent* of *Antiquity*, is no ſufficient Rule, to interpret *Scripture* by. For *Vincentius* doth ſuppoſe that any one Age of the Church may be ſo over-run with Hereſie, that there is no way to confute it, but by recourſe to Antiquity. "For in the caſe of the *Arian* Hereſie, he grants that almoſt the whole Church was overſpread with it, and there was then no way left but to prefer the Conſent of Antiquity before a prevailing Novelty. In ſome caſes the univerſal Conſent of the preſent Church is to be relyed upon againſt the Attempts of particular Perſons, as in that of the *Donatiſts*; but then we are to conſider, that *Antiquity* was ſtill pleaded on the ſame ſide that *Univerſality* was, and ſuppoſing, that all the Antient Church from the Apoſtles time had been of the ſame mind with the *Donatiſts*, the greater Number of the ſame Age oppoſing them, would have been no more cogent againſt them, than it was afterwards for the *Arians*. It is unreaſonable to believe, that in a thing univerſally believed by all Chriſtians from the Apoſtles times the Chriſtian Church ſhould be deceived; but it is quite another thing to ſay, that the Church in any one or more Ages ſince the Apoſtles times may be deceived; eſpecially if the Church be confined to one certain Communion excluding all others, and the Perſons in that Church have not Liberty to deliver their Opinions, for then it is impoſſible to know what the Judgment of the whole Church is. And ſo *Univerſality* is not thought by *Vincentius* himſelf to be alone

ſufficient to determine the Senſe of Scripture; ſuppoſing that *Univerſality* to be underſtood according to the Honeſty of the Primitive times *for a free and general Conſent* of the Chriſtians of that Age in which a Man lives; but ſince the great Diviſions of the Chriſtian World, it is both a very hard matter to know the Conſent of Chriſtendom in moſt of the controverted Places of Scripture, and withal the Notion of *Univerſality* is debauched and corrupted, and made only to ſignify the Conſent of one great Faction, which is called by the Name of the *Catholick Church*, but truly known by the Name of *Roman*.

2. That great Care and Judgment muſt be uſed in the applying thoſe Rules; for,

1. The Conſent of Antiquity is not equally evident in all matters in Diſpute, and therefore cannot be of equal Uſe.

1. There are ſome things wherein we may be certain of ſuch a Conſent, and that was in the *Rule of Faith*, as *Vincentius* and moſt of the Antient Writers call it, *i. e.* the ſummary Comprehenſion of a Chriſtians Duty as to matters of Faith, which was not ſo often called the *Symbol* as the *Rule* of *Faith*, that I mean which was delivered to Perſons, who were to be baptized and received into the Church, this the Antient Church univerſally agreed in as to the Subſtance of it. And as to this *Vincentius* tells us his Rule is eſpecially to be underſtood. "For, ſaith he, this Conſent of Antiquity is not to be ſought for in "all queſtions that may ariſe about the Senſe of Scripture, but only, "or at leaſt chiefly in the Rule of Faith: or as he elſewhere explains "himſelf, alone or chiefly in thoſe Queſtions which concern the Fundamentals of the Catholick Doctrine: which were thoſe contained "in the Rule of Faith, delivered to all that were to be baptized. Suppoſe Men now ſhould ſtretch this Rule beyond the Limits aſſigned it by *Vincentius*, what ſecurity can there be from him that it ſhall be a certain Rule, who confined it within ſuch narrow bounds? Not that I think, his Rules of no uſe at all now; no, I think them to be of admirable Uſe and great Importance to Chriſtianity, if truly underſtood and applyed. *i. e.* When any Perſons take upon them to impoſe any thing upon others as a neceſſary matter of Faith to be believed by them, we can have no better Rules of Judgment in this caſe than thoſe of *Vincentius* are, *viz. Antiquity*, *Univerſality* and *Conſent*; and whatſoever cannot be proved by theſe Rules ought to be rejected by all Chriſtians. To make this plain, the Antient *Creeds* we allow on both ſides to have been univerſally received by the Catholick Church; but now the *Church* of *Rome* adds new Articles to be believed, we deſire to put the whole matter upon this Iſſue: Let the Popes Supremacy, the *Roman* Churches Infallibility, the Doctrines of Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, *&c.* be proved by as univerſal Conſent of Antiquity as the Articles of the Creed are, and then let them charge us with *Hereſie* if we reject them. But we ſay the Meaſure of Hereſie in the Antient Church was the rejecting the *Rule* of *Faith* univerſally received among Chriſtians, this *Rule* of *Faith*, we ſtand to, and ſay no other can be made upon any pretence whatſoever, as *Vincentius* at large proves; but whatever things are obtruded on the Belief of Chriſtians, which want that *univerſal Conſent* of *Antiquity*, which the *Rule of Faith* had, we are bound by *Vincentius*, from plain Scripture, *to ſhun them as prophane Novelties and Corruptions of the Chriſtian Faith.* Theſe Rules therefore are not barely allowed,

Commonit. 1. c. 39.

Commonit. 2. c. Antepenult.

Vincent. Commonit. 1. art. 26 ad. 35.

ed, but pleaded for by us, in the teſt of Articles of Faith, as to which *Vincentius* tells us, if not the *only*, yet the *chief* Uſe of them is.

Petav. dogm. Theol. Tom 2. in præfat. L. 1. c. 8. ſect. 2.

Hier. Apol. 2. c. Ruffin.

2. But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be not, concerning the expreſs Articles of this Rule of Faith, but concerning the Senſe and Meaning of them, how then are we to find out the Conſent of *Antiquity?* For they might all agree in the Words, and yet have a different Notion of the things. As *Petavius* at large proves, that there was an Antient Tradition for the Subſtance of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and yet he confeſſes that moſt of the Writers of the Antient Church did differ in their Explication of it from that, which was only allowed by the Council of *Nice:* And he grants, that *Arius* did follow the Opinion of many of the Antients in the main of his Doctrine, who were guilty of the ſame Error that he was before the matter was throughly diſcuſſed. Here now ariſes the greateſt difficulty to me in this point of *Tradition*; the Uſefulneſs of it, I am told, is for explaining the *ſenſe* of *Scripture:* but there begins a great Controverſie in the *Church* about the Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, I deſire to know whether *Vincentius* his Rules will help us here? It is pleaded by St. *Hierome* and others, "That the Writers of the Church "might err in this matter, or ſpeak unwarily in it before the matter "came to be throughly diſcuſſed; if ſo, how comes the Teſtimony of *erroneous* or *unwary Writers* to be the *certain means* of giving the *Senſe* of *Scripture?* And in moſt of the Controverſies of the Church, this way hath been uſed to take off the Teſtimony of Perſons, who writ before the Controverſie began, and ſpake differently of the matter of debate. I do not deny the Truth of the Allegation in behalf of thoſe Perſons; but to my Underſtanding, it plainly ſhews the Incompetency of *Tradition* for giving a certain Senſe of Scripture, when that Tradition is to be taken from the Writers of the foregoing Ages: and if this had been the only way of confuting *Arius*, it is a great Queſtion how he could ever have been condemned, if *Petavius* or St. *Hierome* ſay true? But ſince a General Council have determined the contrary to the Opinion of theſe Writers before, which Council hath been received by the univerſal Church, I will not deny that they had better Opportunities of knowing what the Senſe of the Antient Church was, when ſo many Writings were extant which are now loſt, than we can have at this diſtance; and therefore we yield all Submiſſion to a *Council* of that Nature and Proceeding in that manner which that of *Nice* did; who did not meerly determine that Controverſie by the number of Writers on their ſide before them, but by comparing the Opinions afterwards with the *Rule* of *Scriptures*; and in this regard we acknowledge a great Reverence due to the Decrees of ſuch General Councils as that was. Therefore next to the Rule of Faith we allow a great Veneration to the Determinations of lawful general Councils univerſally received; which *Vincentius* himſelf pleads for: But ſuppoſing no general Councils or ſuch which are not allowed, or received for ſuch; we are yet to enquire into the ways of finding out Catholick Tradition, which may interpret Scripture. For this end he propoſes another means which is, *The gathering together the Opinions of thoſe Fathers alone; who living holily, wiſely and conſtantly in the Faith and Communion of the Catholick Church have dyed in that Faith, or elſe for it.* But ſtill

C. 39.

with this reſerve, *That what either all or many of them manifeſtly, frequently and conſtantly, as it were by a Council of them, have confirmed by their receiving, holding, and delivering of it, that ought to be held for undoubted, certain and firm; but whatſoever any one though holy and learned, though a Biſhop, Confeſſor or Martyr, hath held againſt the Opinion of others that ought not to be looked on as the Judgment of the Church, but as his own private Opinion, and therefore not to be followed.* Which Words I ſhall not examine with all the Severity that ſome have done, for then the proving theſe Conditions to have been obſerved by any one Perſon would require more Pains, and be leſs capable of Reſolution than the matter it ſelf is; but I ſay, that in moſt of the Controverſies this day in the Chriſtian World, it may be much more ſatisfactory to examine the Merits of the cauſe than the Integrity of the Witneſſes, theſe Conditions being ſuppoſed. And yet after all this, we muſt not miſunderſtand him, as though this way would ſerve to confute all Hereſies; For he tells us yet farther.

2. “ This Courſe can only hold in ſome new and upſtart Hereſies, C. 37.
“ *i. e.* in caſe of the Pretence of ſome new Revelation when Men
“ pretend to ſome ſpecial Grace without human Induſtry to diſcover
“ ſome Divine Truth, not known before; but in caſe of ancient and
“ inveterate Hereſies, he ſaith we have no way to deal with them, but
“ either only by Scripture, or elſe by plain Decrees of General Councils, C. 39.
“ for when Hereſies have been of long continuance, then, ſaith
“ he, we may have ground to ſuſpect they have not dealt fairly with
“ the Teſtimonies of ancient times. And thus we ſee what *Vincentius* hath offered towards the Reſolution of this great Queſtion, *how we may be ſure of the certain Senſe of Scripture in controverted places*; wherein is nothing contained but what we are willing to ſtand to; and very far from the leaſt Suppoſition of any Infallibility in the preſent Guides of the Church for that end.

Thus far I have taken the Pains to ſearch into the Opinion of the Primitive Church in this important Controverſy; which I might carry yet farther, if it were at all needful. The Subſtance of what is delivered by them is this, that if any Controverſy ariſe in the Church concerning the Senſe of Scripture, if the Perſons do not allow the Scripture, then we are to proceed by the beſt means we can have without it, *viz.* The Tradition of Apoſtolical Churches from the beginning; if they do allow the Scripture, then we are to examine and compare Places of Scripture with all the Care and Judgment that may be. If after all this, the Diſpute ſtill continues, then if it be againſt the Antient Rule of Faith univerſally received, that is a ſufficient Preſcription againſt any Opinion; if not againſt the Rule of Faith in expreſs Words, but about the Senſe of it, then if Ancient General Councils have determined it which had greater Opportunities of knowing the Senſe of the Apoſtolical Church than we, it is reaſonable we ſhould yield to them; but if there have been none ſuch, then the unanimous Conſent of Fathers is to be taken, ſo it be in ſome late and upſtart Hereſies, which Men pretend to have by Revelation or ſome ſpecial Grace of God. Now either all theſe means were ſufficient or not to find out the Senſe of Scripture, if not, then the Antient Church was wholly defective, and wanted any certain way of finding out the Senſe of Scripture; if theſe were ſufficient, then there is no neceſſity of Infallibility in the Guides of the Church to give us a certain Senſe of Scripture : which was the thing to be proved.

§. 14. **St. Auguſtin's** *Teſtimony examined.* p. 85. But *N. O.* towards the Concluſion of his Book produces St. *Auguſtin* for the Churches Infallibility, in delivering the Senſe of Scripture in obſcure Places ; which being contrary to what I have already ſaid concerning him, muſt be examined before I conclude this Diſcourſe about the Senſe of Scripture.

Aug. c. Creſcon. l. 1. c. 33. *The Place is out of his Anſwer to* Creſconius *concerning the obſcure Point of Rebaptization ; in theſe Words, ſince the holy Scripture cannot deceive, let whoſoever is in Fear of being deceived by the Obſcurity of this Queſtion, conſult the ſame Church about it, which Church the holy Scripture doth without all Ambiguity demonſtrate. And before, the Truth of the Holy Scriptures is held by us in this matter, when we do that which hath pleaſed the univerſal Church, which the Authority of the Scripture does commend,* &c. *All which is falſe and ſaid to no purpoſe,* ſaith N. O. *if the Scripture be not clear in this, that this Church can determine nothing in ſuch important Conteſts contrary to the Verity of the Scriptures, and that we ought to give Credit to what ſhe decides ; for then it would not be true, what he ſays the Truth of the ſame Scripture in this matter is held by us : and he who is in Fear of being deceived by the Obſcurity of this Queſtion, is no way relieved in following the Sentence of the Church.* To which I anſwer,

That St. *Auguſtin* doth not ſuppoſe, that Men cannot attain to any Certainty of the Senſe of Scripture in this matter without the Churches Infallibility, for, he ſaith, in the Chapter preceding, *that in this matter we follow the moſt certain Authority of Canonical Scriptures* ; but he puts the caſe, *that no certain Example could be produced out of Scripture*, then he ſaith, *they had the Truth of the Scriptures when they do that which pleaſed the univerſal Church,* &c. For the explaining St. *Auguſtins* meaning, we are to conſider, that there were two Controverſies then on foot in the Church with the *Donatiſts*, the one concerning *Rebaptization*, the other concerning the *Church* ; the former he looks upon as more intricate and obſcure, by reaſon not only of the Doubtfulneſs of Scripture, but the Authority of about ſeventy Biſhops of *Africa*, who had determined for it, among whom St. *Cyprian* was chief, which we ſee in all his Diſputes with the *Donatiſts* on this Subject he is very much perplexed with ; therefore St. *Auguſtin* finding that Controverſie very troubleſome, was willing to bring it to that Iſſue, that what the Catholick Church after ſo much diſcuſſing the Point had agreed upon ſhould be received as the Truth. By this means the Diſpute would be brought to that other Queſtion, which he thought much more eaſie, *viz.* Which was the true Church, the Catholick or the *Donatiſts* : but by no means doth St. *Auguſtin* hereby intend to make the Churches Authority to reſolve all doubts concerning *Scriptures* ; but he thought it much eaſier to prove by Scripture which was the true Church, than whether Rebaptization were lawful or not. And accordingly his very next Words are, *but if you doubt whether the univerſal Church be that which the Scripture commends, I will load you with many and moſt manifeſt Teſtimonies of Scripture to that end.* Which is the Deſign of his Book of the *Unity of the Church* : wherein he ſhews, " That thoſe Teſtimonies of Scripture which ſpeak of the Univerſality of the Church, “are not to regard what *Donatus*, or *Parmentianus*, or *Pontius*, hath C. 10. ſaid; for neither, ſaith he, are we to yield to Catholick Biſhops themſelves, if they be at any time ſo much deceived as to hold what is contrary to Canonical Scriptures. By which it is evident that he ſuppoſed no Infalliblity in the *Guides* of the *Church*. And in terms he aſſerts, “that the Church is to be proved by nothing but C. 16. plain Scriptures, neither by the Authority of *Optatus*, or St. *Ambroſe*, or innumerable Biſhops, nor Councils, nor Miracles, nor Viſions and Revelations, (whatever *N. O.* thinks of them) now St. *Auguſtin* ſuppoſing there was much leſs Ambiguity in Scripture in the Controverſie of the *Church* than in that of Rebaptization, he endeavours to bring them to a Reſolution in the other point for the clearing of this: and ſo he only purſues the Method laid down in the *Books of Chriſtian Doctrine*, to make uſe of plainer Places of *Scripture* to give Light to the darker. And when they were convinced by Scripture that the Catholick Church was the true Church of Chriſt, he doth not Queſtion but they would follow that which was the Sentence of the Catholick Church. But here lyes the main difficulty, *on what account the Sentence of the Church was to be followed?* In order to the Reſolution of it, we muſt take notice of theſe things.

1. That all the Proofs which St. *Auguſtin* brings for the *Church* do relate only to the *Extent* and *Univerſality* of it, and not to any *Infallibility* that is promiſed to it; as will eaſily appear to any one that will read his Diſcourſes on that Subject againſt the *Donatiſts*.

2. That he aſſerts no Infallibility in the higheſt Authority of the Church; which in many Places of his *Books* of *Baptiſm* againſt the *Donatiſts* he makes to be a *Plenary* or *General Council*; *whoſe Authority*, he ſaith, *was to be preferred before that of St.* Cyprian, *or any particular Councils either in his time, or before it*; which he calls the *Authority and Decrees of the univerſal Church*. So that we ſee, he reſolves all the Authority of the Church in this matter into that of a *General Council*: (whether that of *Arles*, or *Nice* is not to my purpoſe to enquire) and we ſhall then ſee what his Opinion is of the Churches Infallibility by that which he delivers of *General Councils*; as well as any other Church Authority compared with the Scriptures, in theſe remarkable Words. *Who knows not that the ſacred Canonical Scripture is contained within it's certain bounds, and is ſo far to be preferred before all later Writings of Biſhops that there can be no doubt or diſpute at all made, whether that be true or right which is contained therein; but all later Writings of Biſhops which have been or are written, ſince the Canon of Scripture hath been confirmed, may be corrected, if in any thing they err from the Truth, either by the wiſer Diſcourſe of any more skilful Perſon, or the weightier Authority of other Biſhops, or the Prudence of more learned Men, or by Councils: And even Councils themſelves that are Provincial yield without diſpute to thoſe which are General, and called out of all the Chriſtian World; and of theſe General Councils the former are often amended by the latter, when by ſome farther Trial of things that which was ſhut is laid open, and that which was hidden is made known without any ſwelling of ſacrilegious Pride, or ſtiffneſs of Arrogancy, or Contention of Envy; but with holy Humility, Catholick Peace and*

Aug. de Baptiſ. c. Donat. l. 2. c. 1. c. 9. l. 4. c. 6. l. 2. c. 4. l. 3. c. 10. l. 6. c. 2.

De Bapt. c. Donat. l. 2. c. 31.

and Chriſtian Charity. Can any one that reads this excellent Teſtimony of St. *Auguſtin* delivered in this ſame matter, ever imagine he could ſo plainly contradict himſelf; as to aſſert the Churches Infallibility in one place, and deſtroy it in another? Would he aſſert *that all Councils how general ſoever may be amended by following Councils*, and yet bind Men to believe, that the Decrees of the former Councils do contain the unalterable Will of God? A leſſer Perſon than St. *Auguſtin* would never thus directly contradict himſelf, and that about the very ſame Controverſie, which words of his cannot be underſtood of *unlawful Councils*, of *matters of Fact or Practice*, but do refer to the great Queſtion then in debate about rebaptizing Hereticks; and hereby he takes off the great Plea, the Donatiſts made from the Authority of St. *Cyprian* and his Council, which they continually urged for themſelves.

3. He grants, that *the Arguments drawn from the Churches Authority are but human*, and that Satisfaction is to be taken from the De Baptiſ. l. 3. c 4. Scriptures in this Controverſie. "For mentioning the obſcurity of "this Queſtion, and the great Debates that had been about it before "the *Donatiſts* time among great and good Men, and diverſe Reſolutions of Councils and the ſettlement of it at laſt by a plenary "Council of the whole World; but leſt, ſaith he, I ſhould ſeem to make "uſe only of human Arguments, I produce certain Teſtimonies out of "the Goſpel, by which, God willing, I demonſtrate how true and agreeable to his Will the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church De Bapt. l. 2. c. 14. "is. And elſewhere he appeals not to the Judgment of Men, but to the Lords Ballance, *viz.* to his Judgment delivered in Scri- C. Creſcon. l. 2. c. 31, 32. pture, and in this ſame caſe when he was urged by the Authority of *Cyprian*, he ſaith, "There are no Writings they have not liberty "to judge of, but thoſe of Scripture, and by them they are to judge "of all others, and what is agreeable to them they receive, what "is not they reject, though written by Perſons of never ſo great "Authority. And after all this is it poſſible to believe that St. *Auguſtin* ſhould make the Churches decree in a General Council infallible? No: The utmoſt by a careful conſideration of his Mind in this matter that I can find, is; that in a Queſtion of ſo doubtful and obſcure a Nature as that was, which had been ſo long bandied in the Churches of *Africa*, and from thence ſpread over all the Churches of the Chriſtian World, it was a reaſonable thing to preſume that what the whole Chriſtian World did conſent in was the Truth, not upon the account of Infallibility, but the reaſonable ſuppoſition that all the Churches of the Chriſtian World, would not conſent in a thing repugnant to any Apoſtolical Doctrine or Tradition. And ſo St. *Auguſtins* meaning is the ſame with *Vincentius Lerinenſis* as to the univerſal Atteſtation of the Chriſtian Church in a matter of Tradition; being declared by the Decree of a General Council, and that Decree univerſally received, but only by the litigant Parties in C. Creſcon. Ib. de Bapt. C. Donat. L. 1. c. 18. L. 2. c 9. L. 3. c. 10. L. 4. c. 6, 7. L. 5. c. 4. L. 6. c. 2. *Africa*. To which purpoſe it is obſervable, that he ſo often appeals to the *univerſal conſent of Chriſtians* in this matter; *after it had been ſo throughly diſcuſſed and conſidered, by the moſt wiſe and diſintereſſed Perſons, and that Conſent declared by a plenary Council before himſelf was born*. So that if Authority were to be relyed upon in this obſcure Controverſie, he ſaith, the Authority of the Univerſal Church was to be preferred, before that of ſeveral Councils in *Africa*,

of the Biſhops, and particularly St. *Cyprian* who met in them. And whereas St. *Cyprian* had ſlighted Tradition in this matter, *Chriſt having called himſelf Truth and not Cuſtom*, St. *Auguſtin* replyes to "him; That the cuſtom of the Church having been always ſo, and "continuing after ſuch Oppoſition, and confirmed by a General Coun-"cil, and after examination of the Reaſons and Teſtimonies of Scri-"pture on both ſides, it may be now ſaid, that we follow what "Truth hath declared. L.4.c.7. Wherein we ſee with what modeſty and upon what grounds he declares his Mind, which at laſt comes to no more than *Vincentius* his *Rules* of *Antiquity*, *Univerſality and Conſent*. Eſpecially in ſuch a matter as this was, which had nothing but Tradition to be pleaded for it, *the Apoſtles having determined nothing of either ſide, in their Books*, as St. *Auguſtin* himſelf at laſt confeſſes in this matter. De Bapt. c. Donat. l. 5. c. 23. The moſt then that can be made of the Teſtimony alledged out of St. *Auguſtin* is this, that in a matter of ſo doubtful and obſcure a Nature wherein the Apoſtles have determined nothing in their Writings, we are to believe that to be the Truth, which the Univerſal Church of Chriſt agreed in thoſe Times, when the Conſent of the Univerſal Church was ſo well known by frequent diſcuſſion of the Caſe, and coming at laſt to a reſolution in a General Council. In ſuch a Caſe as this, I agree to what St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, and think a Man very much relieved by following ſo evident a Conſent of the Univerſal Church: Not by vertue of any *Infallibility*, but the unreaſonableneſs of believing ſo many, ſo wiſe, ſo diſintereſſed Perſons ſhould be deceived. Let the ſame Evidences be produced for the Conſent of the *Univerſal Church* from the *Apoſtolical Times* in the matters in Diſpute between our *Church* and that of *Rome*, and the Controverſie of *Infallibility* may be laid aſide; for ſuch an Univerſal Conſent of the Chriſtian Church I look upon as the moſt Authentick Interpreter of Holy Scripture in doubtful and obſcure Places. But let them never think to fob us off, with the Conſent of the *Roman Faction* for the *Univerſal Church*, nor of ſome *later Ages*, for a *Tradition from Apoſtolical Times*, nor of a *packed Company of Biſhops* for a *truly General Council*. And thus much may now ſerve to clear that important Controverſie about the ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful Places.

§. 15. *Of Church Authority.* The laſt thing to be conſidered is, whether the ſame Arguments which overthrow Infallibility, do likewiſe deſtroy all Church-Authority? For this is by *N. O.* frequently objected againſt me; for, he ſaith, *thus it happens more than once in theſe Principles laid down by me, that in too forward a Zeal in demoliſhing the one*, viz. *Church Infallibility, the other is alſo dangerouſly undermined*, viz. *Church-Authority*. And therefore out of his ſingular regard to the good of our Church, he ſaith, P. 50. *it concerns my Superiors to look to it, whether their Churches and their own Authority ſuffers no detriment from my Principles*, and, again, he ſaith, *my Principles againſt Infallibility conclude, the uſeleſsneſs of any Eccleſiaſtical Authority to teach Men, as of an infallible to aſſure Men of the truth of thoſe things, which by uſing only their own ſincere endeavour they may know without them.* And laſtly, he ſaith, P. 84. *my Principles afford no effectual way or means of ſuppreſſing or convicting any Schiſm, Sect or Hereſie, or reducing them either to ſubmiſſion of judgment or ſilence.* P. 93. And therefore he deſires *the prudent to conſider; whether the Authority of the Church of* England

P. 99. *is not much debilitated and brought into contempt, and daily like to want more and more by this new taken up way of its Defence.* My Anſwer is, that I have carefully examined and ſearched my Principles and find no ſuch Gun-powder in them for blowing up Authority either of Church or State. For all that I can diſcover, they are very innocent and harmleſs; and if all other Mens had been ſo, we had never heard ſo much Talk of this way, of undermining and blowing up. But is it not a pleaſant thing to ſee, all of a ſudden, what Zeal theſe Men diſcover for the preſervation of our Churches Authority? Alaſs good Men! It grieves them at the very heart, to ſee the Authority of our Church weakned and that by its own Members. What would not they do for the ſtrengthening and upholding of it? What pity it is, ſuch a Church ſhould not ſtand whoſe very Enemies take ſuch care for its preſervation: And are ſo ready to diſcover the plots of its own Children againſt it? But to be ſure there is miſchief intended when Enemies diſcover it; not by thoſe whom they accuſe, but by the honeſt Informers; who would be content to hold their peace, if they thought they could not ſow miſchief by pretending to diſcover it. It is a pretty Plot to make thoſe who deſign to defend our Church to be the underminers of it, and the moſt profeſſed Enemies its ſureſt Friends. But ſuch Plots are too fine to hold, and too thin not to be ſeen through. How is it I beſeech *N. O. that my Principles undermine all Church Authority?* Have I any where made the Church a meer ſhadow, and an inſignificant Cypher, a Society depending only on the pleaſure of Men for its Subſiſtence and Authority? This had been indeed to the purpoſe, but not the leaſt word tending that way can be drawn out of any Principles of mine. For I verily believe, that the Church is a Society inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf, and inveſted with Authority neceſſary for its Government and Preſervation. *But though I cannot deny ſuch an Authority, I may render it wholly uſeleſs.* I cannot conceive any ſuch malignant influence in any Principle of mine, but if there be, it muſt be from one of theſe things. 1. Either becauſe I deny Infallibility in the Guides of the Church. Or 2. Becauſe I ſay that the Scriptures are plain in things neceſſary to Salvation. Or 3. Becauſe I deny the Authority of the Church of *Rome*. Or 4. Becauſe I am not for ſuch an effectual way of ſuppreſſing Sects and Hereſies as is in uſe in the *Roman* Church. But I hope to make it appear, that none of theſe do in the leaſt tend to weaken, or bring into contempt the Church of *Englands* Authority, nor the juſt Authority of any Church in the World.

1. *Not the denyal of Infallibility.* This *N. O.* ſeems to ſuppoſe to be the very *Faux* in the *Gun-powder Plot*, the Inſtrument of ſetting all on Fire. But is there any thing peculiar to my Principles herein? Have not all who have written againſt the Church of *Rome* oppoſed the pretence of Infallibility? How then come my Principles to be of ſo miſchievous a Nature above others? But I pray, Sir, are Authority and Infallibility all one in your account? We ſuppoſe that Magiſtrates and Parents, and Maſters have all of them an unqueſtionable Authority, but I never heard yet of any Man that ſaid they were infallible: Or that there was no ground to obey them, if they were not. Why may we not then allow any Authority belonging to the Governours of the Church, and yet think it poſſible for them to be deceived?

ceived? Is this a ſufficient reaſon for any Man to caſt off his ſubjection to his Prince, becauſe it's poſſible he may require ſomething unlawful? Or to diſobey his Parents, becauſe they do not ſit in an infallible Chair? Or to ſlight his Maſter, becauſe he is not Pope? Theſe are ſtrange ways of arguing about matters of Religion, which are ridiculous in any other caſe. If the poſſibility of being deceived deſtroys no other Authority in the World, why ſhould it do that of the Church? The Magiſtrate does not looſe his Authority though we ſay we are to obey God rather than Men, and conſequently to examine whether the Laws of Men are not repugnant to the Laws of God, which implies that he may require what it is our Duty not to do. The Authority of Parents is not deſtroyed, becauſe in ſome Caſes we are bound to diſobey them, when they command Men to deſtroy or riſe up in Arms againſt their Soveraign. How comes it then to paſs, that all Church Authority is immediately gone, if we do but ſuppoſe a poſſibility of Errour in thoſe which have it? But it may be ſaid *it is their office to be Guides, and if we do not follow them abſolutely, we renounce them from being our Guides.* To which I anſwer, there are two ſorts of Perſons that ſtand in need of Guides, the Blind and the Ignorant; the blind muſt follow their Guides becauſe of an incapacity of ſeeing their way, the Ignorant for want of Inſtruction. Yet neither of theſe are bound to believe their Guides infallible, and to follow them at all Adventures. For even the Blind by their own ſad Experience of frequent falling into Ditches, or knocking their Heads againſt Poſts may have reaſon to queſtion, if not the skill, yet the ſincerity of their Guides, and though they muſt have ſome, may ſeek new ones. The Ignorant follow their Guides only upon the opinion of their Skill and Integrity; and when they ſee reaſon to queſtion theſe, they know of no obligation to follow their Conduct over Rocks and Precipices; if they are ſo careleſs of their own welfare, others are not bound to follow them therein. But we are not to preſume Perſons ſo wholly ignorant, but they have ſome general Rules by which to judge of the skill and fidelity of their Guides. If a Perſon commits himſelf to the care of a Pilot to carry him to *Conſtantinople*, becauſe of his ignorance of the Sea, ſhould this Man ſtill rely upon his Authority, if he carried him to find out the North Weſt paſſage? No: Though he may not know the particular Coaſts ſo well; yet he knows the Eaſt and Weſt, the North and South from each other. If a Stranger ſhould take a Guide to conduct him from *London* to *York*, although he may not think fit to diſpute with him at every doubtful Turning, yet is he bound to follow him when he travels all day with the Sun in his Face? For although he doth not know the direct Road, yet he knows that he is to go Northward. The meaning of all this is, that the ſuppoſition of Guides in Religion doth depend upon ſome common Principles of Religion that are or may be known to all, and ſome Precepts ſo plain, that every Chriſtian without any help may know them to be his Duty; within the compaſs of theſe plain and known Duties, lyes the capacity of Perſons judging of their Guides; if they carry them out of this beaten way, they have no reaſon to rely upon them in other things: If they keep themſelves carefully within thoſe Bounds, and ſhew great Integrity therein, then in doubtful and obſcure things they may with more ſafety rely upon them. But if they tell them they muſt put out their Eyes to follow them the bettter, or if they kindly allow them to keep their Eyes in their Heads, yet they muſt believe them againſt their Eye-ſight, if they perſwade them to break plain Commands of God, and to alter the Inſtitutions of Chriſt, what reaſon can there be that any ſhould commit themſelves to the abſolute Conduct of ſuch unfaithful Guides? And this is not to deſtroy all Authority of Faithful Guides, for they may be of great uſe for the direction of unskilful Perſons in matters that are doubtful and require skill to reſolve them, but it is only to ſuppoſe that their Authority is not abſolute, nor their Direction infallible. *But if we take away this infallible Direction from the Guides of the Church, what Authority is there left them?* As much as ever God gave them, and if they will not be contented with that, we cannot help it; and that it may appear how vain and frivolous theſe Exceptions are, I ſhall now ſhew what real Authority is ſtill left in the Governours of the Church, though Infallibility be taken away. And that lyes in three things.

1. An Authority of inflicting Cenſures upon Offenders; which is commonly called the Power of the Keys, or of receiving into, and excluding out of the Communion of the Church. This the Church was inveſted with by Chriſt himſelf, and is the neceſſary conſequence of the Being and Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Society, which cannot be preſerved in its Purity and Peace without it. Which Authority belongs to the Governours of the Church, and however the Church in ſome Reſpects be incorporated with the Commonwealth in a Chriſtian State, yet its Fundamental Rights remain diſtinct from it: Of which this is one of the chief to receive into, and exclude out of the Church ſuch Perſons which according to the Laws of a Chriſtian Society, are fit to be taken in or ſhut out.

2. An Authority of making Rules and Canons about matters of Order and Decency in the Church. Not meerly in the neceſſary circumſtances of Time and Place, and ſuch things, the contrary to which imply a natural Indecency; but in continuing and eſtabliſhing thoſe ancient Rites of the Chriſtian Church, which were practiſed in the early Times of Chriſtianity, and are in themſelves of an indifferent Nature. Which Authority of the Church hath been not only aſſerted in the Articles of our Church, but ſtrenuouſly defended againſt the trifling Objections of her Enemies, from Scripture, Antiquity and Reaſon. And I freely grant, not only that ſuch an Authority is in it ſelf reaſonable and juſt; but that in ſuch matters required by a lawful Authority (ſuch as that of our Church is) there is an advantage on the ſide of Authority, againſt a ſcrupulous Conſcience, which ought to over-rule the Practice of ſuch who are the Members of that Church.

Art. 20.

3. An Authority of propoſing matters of *Faith* and directing Men in Religion. Which is the proper Authority of Teachers, and Guides, and Inſtructers of others; which may be done ſeveral ways, as by particular Inſtruction of doubtful Perſons, who are bound to make uſe of the beſt Helps they can, among which that of their Guides is the moſt ready and uſeful, and who are obliged to take care of their Souls, and therefore to give the moſt faithful Advice and Counſel to them. Beſides this, there is a publick way of in-

ſtructing by Diſcourſes grounded upon Scripture to particular Congregations, aſſembled together for the Worſhip of God in places ſet apart for that end, and therefore called Churches. And thoſe who are duly appointed for this Work, and ordained by thoſe whoſe Office is to ordain, *viz.* the Biſhops, have an Authority to declare what the Mind and Will of God is, contained in Scripture in order to the Salvation and Edification of the Souls of Men. But beſides this, we may conſider the Biſhops and repreſentative Clergy of a Church as met together for reforming any Abuſes crept into the Practice of Religion or Errors in Doctrine; and in this caſe we aſſert that ſuch a Synod or Convocation hath the Power and Authority within it ſelf (eſpecially having all the ancient Rights of a Patriarchal Church) when a more general Conſent cannot be obtained to publiſh and declare what thoſe Errors and Abuſes are, and to do as much as in them lyes to reform them, *viz.* by requiring a conſent to ſuch Propoſitions as are agreed upon for that end, of thoſe who are to enjoy the publick Offices of teaching and inſtructing others. Not to the end that all thoſe Propoſitions ſhould be believed as Articles of Faith; but becauſe no Reformation can be effected, if Perſons may be allowed to preach and officiate in the Church in a way contrary to the deſign of ſuch a Reformation.

And this is now that Authority we attribute to the Governours of our Church, although we allow no Infallibility to them. And herein we proceed in a due mean between the Extreams of robbing the Church of all Authority of one ſide; and advancing it to Infallibility on the other. But we cannot help the weakneſs of thoſe Mens underſtandings, who cannot apprehend that any ſuch thing as Authority ſhould be left in a Church, if we deny Infallibility. Other Diſeaſes may be cured, but natural Incapacity cannot.

2. *Note, the Scriptures plain to all ſober Enquirers in matters neceſſary to Salvation.* This is that Principle which *N. O.* makes ſuch horrible Out-crys about, as though it were the Foundation of all the Hereſies and Sects in the World. *This,* he ſaith, *makes all Eccleſiaſtical Authority uſeleſs; for what need is there of Biſhops, Presbyters, or any Eccleſiaſtical Paſtors among Proteſtants, as to the office of teaching or expounding theſe Writings, if theſe in all neceſſaries are clear to all Perſons, who deſire to know the meaning of them:* P. 15. But not content with this modeſt charge in compariſon, in another Tereatiſe, this is made the very heighth of Fanaticiſm, in ſpight of Mother *Juliana* and their Legendary Saints: *becauſe,* forſooth, *this is to ground all our Religion upon our own Fancies, enquiring into the true ſenſe of* divine *Revelation;* and therefore, good Man, ſeems troubled at it, *that he can by no means in the World abſolve me from being not only a Fanatick, but a Teacher of Fanaticiſm.* *Fanaticiſm fanatically imputed to the Roman Church.* p. 93. P. 96. In earneſt, it was happily found out, to return this heavy charge back upon my ſelf with ſo much rage and violence; (for although *N. O.* be a modeſt Man, yet *S. C.* is a meer Fury) for not meerly *Fanaticiſm, pure putid Fanaticiſm follows from this Principle, Fanaticiſm without vizard or diſguiſe, and all this demonſtratively proved from this Principle, but all our Church is immediately gone with it;* P. 92. P. 89. Men may talk of dangerous Plots for undermining and blowing up of Towns and Forts and Parliaments, but what are all thoſe to the blowing up of a whole Church at once? For ſince that Train of my Principles hath been laid, nothing like the old

Church of *England* hath been ſeen. It is true, there are the ſame Biſhops, the ſame Authority, the ſame Liturgy and Ceremonies, the ſame Preachers and Officers that were; but what are all theſe to the *Church* of *England?* For *from hence it follows* (if we believe *S. C.*) P. 99. *that the Governours of our Church have no Authority to teach Truth, or to condemn Errors; and all the People are become Prophets, and all their Articles, Conſtitutions and Ordinances have been compoſed and enjoyned by an uſurped Authority.* Very ſad conſequences truly! But like deep Plots they lye very far out of ſight. For to my underſtanding, not one of theſe diſmal things follows any more from my Principles, than from proving that *S. C.* and *N. O.* both ſtand for the ſame Perſon. Which will eaſily appear to any one elſe that will but conſider. 1. The intention of thoſe Principles. 2. The juſt conſequence of them.

1. The Intention of thoſe Principles; which was plainly to lay down the Foundations of a Chriſtians Faith living in the Communion of our Church; (which is expreſſed in as perſpicuous Terms before them as may be;) and to ſhew that the *Roman Churches* Infallibility is no neceſſary Foundation of Faith. Now, this being the deſign of thoſe Principles, to what purpoſe ſhould I have gone about therein, to have ſtated the nature and bounds of the Authority of particular Churches? I no where in the leaſt exclude the uſe of all means and due helps of Guides and others for the underſtanding the ſenſe of Scripture; and I no where mention'd them; becauſe my buſineſs was only about the Foundation of Faith, and whether Infallibility was neceſſary for that or no? If I have proved it was not, I have gained my deſign; for then thoſe who deny the Church of *Romes* Infallibility may nevertheleſs have a ſure Foundation, or ſolid Principles to build their Faith upon. Now to what purpoſe in an account of the Principles of Faith ſhould I mention thoſe things, which we do not build our Faith upon, I mean the Authority of our Guides? For although we allow them all the uſefulneſs of Helps; yet thoſe are no more to be mentioned in the principles of reſolving Faith, than *Euclids* Maſter was to be mentioned in his Demonſtrations. For although he might learn his skill from him; yet the force of his Demonſtrations did not depend upon his Authority. I hope it now appears, how far I am from making *Church Authority uſeleſs*; but I ſtill ſay our Faith is not to be reſolved into it, and therefore is not to be reckoned as a Principle or Foundation of Faith. To that end it is ſufficient to prove, that Men in the due uſe of means, whom I call *ſober Enquirers*, may without any Infallible Church, believe the Scriptures, and underſtand what is neceſſary to their Salvation herein: If this may be, then I ſay it follows (*Prin.* 15.) that there can be no neceſſity ſuppoſed of any infallible Society of Men, either to atteſt or explain theſe Writings, among Chriſtians. Not one word that takes away the uſe of Authority in the Church, but only of Infallibility; *but it may be ſaid that although it might not be my intention, yet it may be the juſt conſequence of the Principles themſelves.*

Therefore I ſhall now prove that no Conſequence drawn from them can infer this. For what if all thoſe things which are neceſſary to Salvation are plain in Scripture, to all that ſincerely endeavour to underſtand them, doth it hence follow that there can be no juſt Authority in a Church, no uſe of Perſons to inſtruct others, muſt all the People become Prophets and no bounds be ſet to the Liberty of propheſying? Theſe are bad Conſequences; but the Comfort is, they are not true. If I ſhould ſay that the neceſſary Rules for a Mans Health are ſo plainly laid down by *Hippocrates*, that every one that will take the pains may underſtand them; doth this make the whole Profeſſion of Phyſick uſeleſs, or licenſe every Man to practiſe Phyſick that will, or make it needleſs to have any Profeſſors in that Faculty? When the Philoſophers of old did ſo frequently inculcate that the Neceſſaries for Life were few and eaſie; did this make all political Government uſeleſs, and give every Man power to do what he pleaſed? Men of any common Underſtanding would diſtinguiſh between the Neceſſaries of Life and civil Society; ſo would any one but *S. C.* or *N. O.* of the Neceſſaries to Salvation, and to the Government of the Church; For Men muſt be conſidered firſt as Chriſtians, and then as Chriſtians united together: as in civil Societies they are to be conſidered firſt as Men, and then as *Cives*; to ſay, that a Man hath all that is neceſſary to preſerve his Life as a Man, doth not overthrow the Conſtitution of a Society, although it implies that he might live without it: ſo when Men are conſidered barely as Chriſtians no more ought to be thought neceſſary for them as ſuch, but what makes them capable of Salvation; but if we conſider them as joyning together in a Chriſtian Society, then many other things are neceſſary for that end: For then there muſt be Authority in ſome and Subjection in others, there muſt be Orders and Conſtitutions, whereby all muſt be kept within their due bounds, and there muſt be Perſons appointed to inſtruct the Ignorant, to ſatisfie the doubting, to direct the unſkilful, and to help the weak. It belongs to ſuch a Society not barely to provide for Neceſſity, but Safety, and not meerly the Safety of particular Perſons but of it ſelf; which cannot be done without prudent Orders, fixing the bounds of Mens Imployments, and not ſuffering every Pretender to Viſions and Revelations to ſet up for a new Sect, or which is all one a new Order of religious Men. How comes it now to paſs that by ſaying that Men, conſidered barely as Chriſtians, may underſtand all that is neceſſary to their Salvation, *I do overthrow all Authority of a Church and make all Men Prophets?* Do I in the leaſt mention Mens teaching others, or being able themſelves to put a difference, between what is ſo neceſſary and what not; or doth *S. C.* ſuppoſe that all that underſtand what is neceſſary to Salvation have no need to be ruled and governed? If he thinks ſo, I aſſure him I am quite of another Opinion, and do make no queſtion but that Government ought to be preſerved in a Church, though the Neceſſaries to Salvation be known to all in it; and ſo I ſuppoſe doth any one elſe that in the leaſt conſiders what he ſays. By this we ſee, that *S. C*'s Recrimination of *Fanaticiſm* on our Church, by vertue of this Principle is as feeble as the Defence he hath made for his own, of which he may hear in due time. But if there be any *Fanaticiſm* in this Principle, we have the Concurrence of the greateſt and wiſeſt Perſons of the Chriſtian Church in it: Two of them eſpecially have in terms ſaid as much as I have done, St. *Auguſtin* in his Books of Chriſtian Doctrine already mentioned; and St. *Chryſoſtome* in as plain Words as may be. Πάντα σαφῆ καὶ εὐθέα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς. Πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα. *All things are plain and right in the holy Scriptures; all neceſſary things are manifeſt.* Let *S. C.* now charge all the dreadful Conſequences of this Principle on St. *Chryſoſtome*, and tell him that he deſtroyed all Church Authority, and laid the Foundation for the Height of *Fanaticiſm*? Nay St. *Chryſoſtome*, goes much higher than I do, for he ſaith τίς γὰρ χρεία ὁμιλητοῦ; ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ῥαθυ-

Chryſoſt. in 2. ad Theſſ. Hom. 3.

ῥαθυμίας αὕτη ἡ χρεία γέγονε. Διὰ τί γὰρ ὁμιλίας χρεία; πάντα σαφῆ, &c. If I had made the Guides of the Church ſo uſeleſs as St. *Chryſoſtome* ſeems to do in theſe Words, what paſſionate and hideous Outcrys would *S. C.* have made? And by this let the Skill or Ingenuity of *S. C.* be tryed, who ſays, *that I cannot find out one ſingle ſhort Sentence in Antiquity to ſupport the main Pillar of my Religion*, which he ſuppoſes this Principle to be; and for the finding out the Senſe of Scripture without the Help of Infallibility, I have produced more out of Antiquity in this Diſcourſe, than either he or his whole Party will be able to anſwer. C.Sp.1.67.

3. Not *the denying the Authority of the Church of* Rome. Which I muſt do till I ſee ſome better Proofs for it, than I have ever yet done. But how doth this, *deſtroy all Authority in a Church?* can there be none, but what is derived from *Rome?* I do not think, I do in the leaſt diminiſh the Kings Authority, by denying that he derives it from the *Cham* of *Tartary*, or the *Great Mogol:* although they may challenge the Lordſhip of the whole Earth to themſelves: and may pretend very plauſible Reaſons that it would be much more for the Quiet and Conveniency of Mankind to be all under one univerſal Monarch, and that none have ſo fair a pretence to it, as they that have challenged the Right of it to themſelves: and yet for all this, I do verily believe the King hath an unqueſtionable Right to his Kingdom, and a juſt Authority over all his Subjects. The time was when the firſt of *Geneſis* would ſerve to prove the Popes Title, und *the Suns ruling by day* was thought a clear Argument for his Supremacy; but the World is now altered, and all the Wit and Subtilty that hath been ſince uſed hath not been able to make good that crackt Title of univerſal Paſtorſhip, which the Biſhops of *Rome* have taken to themſelves. But although we diſown the Popes Authority as an unjuſt Uſurpation, we aſſert and plead for the Authority of the Church and the Biſhops who are placed therein, who derive their Power to govern the Church from Chriſt and not from the Pope. And I dare appeal to any Perſon, whether the aſſerting the Biſhops deriving their Authority from Chriſt or from the Pope, be the better way of defending their Power? We are not now diſputing what Authority were fit to be entruſted in the Popes hands, ſuppoſing all other Differences compoſed, and that things were in the ſame State wherein they were in the times of the Four General Councils; in which caſe, it ought to be conſidered, how far it might be convenient to give way to ſuch an Authority ſo apt to grow extravagant, and which hath been ſtretched ſo very far beyond what the Canons allowed, that it hath challenged Infallibility to it ſelf; but the thing at preſent under debate, is, whether the diſallowing the *Papal Hierarchy*, doth overthrow all Authority in the Epiſcopal; which is in effect to ask, whether there be any other Power beſides the Popes in the Church? for if there be any other, the denying the Popes Authority over us cannot in the leaſt diminiſh the juſt Authority of Biſhops.

The only conſiderable Queſtion in this caſe, is, whether the rejecting that *Hierarchy* which was in being at the time of the Reformation, doth not make way for the Peoples rejecting the Authority of our Biſhops, and conſequently no Authority in the Church can be maintained, unleſs we again yield to the *Papal* Authority. This I ſuppoſe to be N. O's meaning, when he tells us *by Church Authority* he means *that Superior and more comprehenſive Body of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy; which in any Diſſent and Diviſion of the Clergy, according* Preface to Principles conſidered.

according to the Church Canons ought to be obeyed. And any particular Church divided from this more univerſal cannot with the leaſt pretence of Reaſon challenge Submiſſion from her Subjects, ſince ſhe her ſelf (and particularly the Church of England) *refuſed the ſame to all the Authority extant in the World, when ſhe ſeparated her ſelf.* To this I anſwer,

That the Church of *England* in reforming her ſelf did not oppoſe any juſt Authority then extant in the World. It is to no purpoſe to make ſuch loud Clamours about our Churches refuſing Submiſſion to all the Authority then extant in the World, unleſs there be better Evidence produced for it, than we have yet ſeen. For it is very well known that the Diſpute was then concerning the Popes Supremacy over our Church, which we have all along aſſerted to have been a notorious Encroachment upon the Liberties of our Church. And the Popes Uſurpations were ſo injurious both to the Eccleſiaſtical and civil Government, that thoſe who adhered to the Religion of the *Roman* Church yet agreed to the rejecting that Authority which he challenged in *England*. Which is ſufficiently known to have been the beginning of the Breach, between the two Churches. Afterwards, when it was thus agreed that the Biſhop of *Rome* had no ſuch Anthority as he challenged, what ſhould hinder our Church from proceeding in the beſt way it could for the Reformation of it ſelf? For the Popes Supremacy being caſt out as an Uſurpation, our Church was thereby declared to be a *free Church*, having the Power of Government within it ſelf. And what Method of proceeding could be more reaſonable in this caſe, than by the Advice of the Governors of the Church, and by the concurrence of civil Authority to publiſh ſuch Rules and Articles, according to which Religion was to be profeſſed and the Worſhip of God ſettled in *England?* And this is that which *N. O.* calls *refuſing Submiſſion to all the Authority then extant in the World*; was *all the Authority then extant*, ſhut up in the Popes Breaſt? Was there no due Power of governing left, becauſe his unjuſt Power was caſt off, and that firſt by Biſhops, who in other things adhered to the *Roman* Church? *But they proceeded farther and altered many things in Religion againſt the Conſent of the more univerſal Church:* It is plain ſince our Church was declared to be *free*, they had a Liberty of enquiring and determining things fitteſt to be believed and practiſed; this then could not be her Fault. *But in thoſe things they decreed, they went contrary to the Conſent of the univerſal Church:* Here we are now come to the Merits of the Cauſe; and we have from the Beginning of the Reformation defended, that we rejected nothing but Innovations, and reformed nothing but Abuſes. *But the Church thought otherwiſe of them.* What Church I pray? The Primitive and Apoſtolical: That we have always appealed to and offered to be tryed by. The truly Catholick Church of all Ages? That we utterly deny to have agreed in any one thing againſt the Church of *England*. But the plain Engliſh of all is, the Church of *Rome* was againſt the Church of *England*, and no wonder, for the Church of *England* was againſt the Church of *Rome*; but we know of no Fault we are guilty of therein; nor any Obligation of Submiſſion to the Commands of that Church. And *N. O.* doth not ſay, that we oppoſed the whole Church, but *the more univerſal Church*, *i. e.* I ſuppoſe the greater Number of Perſons at that time. But doth he undertake to make this good, that the greater Number of Chriſtians then in the World, did oppoſe the *Church* of *England*? How doth he know that the *Eaſtern*, *Armenian*, *Abyſſin* and *Greek Churches* did agree with the *Church* of *Rome* againſt us? No: that is not his meaning; but by *the more univerſal Church*, he fairly underſtands no more but the *Church* of *Rome*. And that we did oppoſe the Doctrine and Practiſes of the *Church* of *Rome* we deny not; but we utterly deny that to be the *Catholick Church*, or that we oppoſed any lawful Authority in denying Submiſſion to it. *But according to the Canons of the Church we are to obey, in any Diſſent or Diviſion of the Clergy, the Superior and more comprehenſive Body of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy.* What he means by this, I do not well underſtand, either it muſt be the Authority of the Pope and Councils of the *Roman Church*, or a General Council of all the *Catholick Church*. For the firſt, we owe no Obedience to them, for the ſecond, there was no ſuch thing then in the World, and therefore could not be oppoſed. And *for the Canons of the Catholick Councils* before the Breaches of Chriſtendom, no Church hath been more guilty of a Violation of them, than the *Church* of *Rome*, ſince *the Rules of the Fathers* have been turned into *the Royalties of St.* Peter. We are no Enemies to the Antient Patriarchal Government of the Chriſtian Church, and are far more for preſerving the Dignity of it, than the *Roman* Church can be: For we ſhould think it a happy State of the Chriſtian Church, if all the Patriarchs did enjoy their Antient Power and Privileges, and all Chriſtendom would conſent to a truly free and general Council; which we look on as the beſt Expedient on Earth, for compoſing the differences of the Chriſtian World, if it might be had. But we cannot endure to be abuſed by meer Names of titular Patriarchs, but real Servants and Penſionaries of the Popes, with Combinations of intereſted Parties inſtead of General Councils, with the Pleaſure of Popes inſtead of Antient Canons. Let them reduce the Antient Government of the Church within its due bounds; let the Biſhop of *Rome* content himſelf with the Privileges he then enjoyed; let Debates be free and Biſhops aſſemble with an equal Proportion out of all Churches of Chriſtendom; and if we then oppoſe ſo general a Conſent of the Chriſtian Church, let them charge us *with not ſubmitting to all the Authority extant of the World.* But ſince, the State of Chriſtendom hath been ſo much divided, that a truly General Council is next to an impoſſible thing, the Church muſt be reformed by it's Parts, and every *free Church*, enjoying the Rights of a Patriarchal See, hath according to the Canons of the Church a ſufficient Power to reform all Abuſes within it ſelf, when a more general Conſent cannot be obtained. By this we may ſee how very feeble this Charge is *of deſtroying all Church Authority* by *refuſing Submiſſion to the* Roman *Hierarchy:* and how very pitiful an Advantage can from hence be made by the diſſenting Parties among us, who decry that Patriarchal and Antient Government as Antichriſtian which we allow as Prudent and Chriſtian. But of the difference of theſe two caſes, I have ſpoken already.

4. But yet N.O. ſaith, *my Principles afford no effectual way or means*
P. 98. *in this Church of ſuppreſſing or convicting any Schiſm, Sect or Hereſie, or reducing them either to Submiſſion of Judgment or Silence:* Therefore my Principles are deſtructive to all Church Authority. To which I anſwer,

1. That the Deſign of my Principles was to lay down the Foundations of Faith, and not *the means of ſuppreſſing Hereſies.* If I had laid down the Foundations of Peace and left all Perſons to their own Judgments without any regard to Authority, this might have been juſtly objected againſt me; but according to this way, it might have been objected to *Ariſtotle* that he was an Enemy to civil Government, becauſe he doth not lay down the Rules of it in his *Logick*, or that *Hippocrates* favoured the *Chymiſts* and *Mountebanks*, becauſe he ſaith not a Word of the *Colledge of Phyſitians.* If I had ſaid any thing about the Authority of particular Churches, or the ways of ſuppreſſing Sects; then how inſultingly had I been asked; What is all this to the Foundations of Faith? excellent Proteſtant Principles of Faith! They begin now to reſolve Faith into the Authority of their own Church: or elſe to what end is this mentioned, where nothing is pretended to but laying down the Foundations on which Proteſtants do build their Faith? But although there be no way of eſcaping impertinent Objections, yet it is ſome Satisfaction to ones ſelf to have given no Occaſion for them.

2. I would know what he underſtands by his *effectual means of ſuppreſſing Sects or Hereſies.* We are ſure the meer Authority of their Church hath been no more *effectual means*, than that of ours hath been; but there is another means they uſe which is far more *effectual*, viz. the *Inquiſition.* This in truth is all the *effectual means* they have above us; but God keep us from ſo Barbarous and Diabolical a means of ſuppreſſing Schiſms; the *Sanbenites* have not more pictures of Devils upon them, than the Inquiſition it ſelf hath of their Spirit in it; however that Gracious Pope *Paul* IV. attributed the ſettling of it in Spain *to the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*; not that Holy Ghoſt certainly, that came down from Heaven upon the Apoſtles; but that which was conveyed in a Portmantue from *Rome* to the Council of *Trent.* But if this be *the effectual means* he underſtands, I hope he doth not think it any credit to the Anthority of their Church, that all who diſpute it muſt endure a moſt miſerable Life or a moſt cruel Death. All the other means they are but probable; but this, this is the moſt *effectual.* How admirably do Fire and Faggots end Controverſies! No general Council ſignifies half ſo much as a Court of Inquiſition; and the Pope himſelf is not near ſo good a Judge of Controverſies as the Executioner, and *Dic Eccleſiæ* is nothing to *take him Goaler.* Theſe have been the kind, the tender, the primitive, the Chriſtian means of ſuppreſſing Sects and Hereſies in the *Roman* Church! O how compaſſionate a Mother is that Church, that takes her froward Children in her hands to daſh their Brains againſt the Stones! *O how pleaſant a thing it is for Brethren* to be deſtroyed for lack of *Unity! How beautiful upon the ſeven Mountains are the Feet of thoſe who ſhed the Blood of Hereticks!* Never were there two Men had a more Catholick Spirit, than *Diocleſian* and *Biſhop Bonner.* Men may talk to the Worlds End of Councils and Fathers and Authority of the Church, and I know not what inſignificant Nothings; come, come, there is but one *effectual means*, which the good *Cardinal Baronius* ſuggeſted to his Holineſs, *ariſe Peter, kill and eat.* Let the Hereticks talk of the kind and merciful Spirit of our Saviour who rebuked his Diſciples ſo ſharply for calling *for Fire from Heaven upon the Samaritans*, and told them *they did not know what Spirit they are of:* let them diſpute never ſo much againſt the Cruelty and Unreaſonableneſs of ſuch a way of

Jacob Simanca Enchir. judic. viol. Relig. Tit. 68. n. 18.

Luk. 9. 55.

of confuting them; let them muſter up never ſo many Sayings of Fathers againſt it; yet when all is done, whatever becomes of Chriſtianity, it was truly ſaid of *Paul* IV. *that the Authority of the* Roman *See depends only upon the Office of the Inquiſition.* And that we may think, he was in good earneſt when he ſaid it, *Onuphrius* tells us it was part of the Speech he made to the Cardinals before his Death. Was not this think we, a true Vicar of Chriſt? A Man of an Apoſtolical Spirit? that knew the moſt *effectual means* of ſuppreſſing Hereſies and Schiſms and advancing the Authority of the *Roman* See. And that we may not think their Opinion is altered in this Matter, one of the late Conſulters of the Inquiſition hath determined that the Practice of the *Roman* Church in the Office of the Inquiſition is *reaſonable, pious, uſeful, and neceſſary*; Which he proves by the Teſtimony of their greateſt Doctors. And by which we may eaſily judge what *N. O.* and his Brethren think to be the moſt *effectual means of ſuppreſſing Sects and Hereſies*, with the want of which we are contented to be upbraided. But ſetting this aſide we have as many reaſonable means, and I think many more of convicting Diſſenters, than they can pretend to, in the *Roman* Church.

Onuphr. vit. Pauli 4.

Del. *bene de officio Inquiſit. part.* 1. *dub.* 162. *Petit.* 5. *n.* 8.

3. It is very well known that we do endeavour, as much as lyes in us, to reclaim all Diſſenters; but God never wrought Miracles to cure incorrigible Perſons, and would not have us to go out of the way of our duty to ſuppreſs Sects and Hereſies. The greateſt Severities have not effected it, (which made one of the Inquiſitors in *Italy* complain) that after Forty Years experience, wherein they had deſtroyed above One Hundred Thouſand Perſons for Hereſie, (as they call it) it was ſo far from being ſuppreſſed or weakened, that it was extremely ſtrengthened and increaſed. What Wonder is it then, if Diſſenters ſhould yet continue among us, who do not uſe ſuch barbarous ways of ſtopping the Mouths of Hereticks with burning Lead, or ſilencing them by a Rope and Flames? But we recommend as much as they can do to the People the Vertues of *Humility, Obedience, due Submiſſion to their Spiritual Paſtors and Governors, and that they ought not to uſurp their Office, and become their own Guides:* Which *N. O.* in his Concluſion blames us for not doing. Yet we do not exact of them a blind Obedience, we allow them to underſtand the Nature and Doctrine of Chriſtianity, which the more they do, we are ſure they will be ſo much the better Chriſtians and the more eaſily governed. So that we have no kind of Controverſy about Church Authority it ſelf, but what it is, and in what manner, and by whom to be exerciſed; but ſurely *N. O.* had little to ſay, when from laying down the Principles of Faith, he charges me with this moſt abſurd Conſequence, of deſtroying all Church Authority.

Ger. Beſdragi Epiſto A Cardinal Piſan.

I have thus far conſidered the main Foundations upon which *N. O.* proceeds in Oppoſition to my Principles, there is now very little remaining which deſerves any Notice: And that which ſeems to do it, has about Negative Articles of Faith, and the Marks of the true Church, I ſhall have occaſion to handle them at large in the following Diſcourſe.

A

A
Second Diſcourſe,
In Vindication of the
Proteſtant GROUNDS *of* FAITH,
Againſt the Pretence of
Infallibility in the *Roman* Church:
In ANSWER to
The *Guide* in *Controverſies*, by *R. Holden*; *Proteſtancy* without *Principles*; and *Reaſon* and *Religion*, or the *Certain Rule of Faith*, by *E. Warner*.
WITH A
Particular Enquiry into the Miracles of the *Roman Church*.

196:l.g.

To the RIGHT HONOURABLE
ANTHONY *Earl of* Shaftsbury, *Lord High Chancellor of* England, *&c.*

My Lord,

I HOPE it will not be thought unſeaſonable to make an Addreſs of this Nature to your *Lordſhip* in the Beginning of Term, ſince the great *Cauſe* at preſent in your Court (as one of late pleaſantly ſaid) is that between the *King* and the *Pope*, between our Church and the Church of *Rome*. And while ſo many Witneſſes are daily ſworn of the King's and the Church's ſide; it may not be improper to lay open to your Lordſhip the *Nature* and *Merits* of the *Cauſe*.

A *Cauſe*, My Lord, which was at firſt ſet on foot by Ambition, carried on by Faction, and muſt therefore be maintain-

353

ed by the like means; but can never hope to prevail among us again, till *Subjection* to a *Foreign Power* can be thought our *Intereſt*, and to part at once with *Reaſon* and *Religion* be eſteemed our *Honour*. It is a *Cauſe* much of the nature of ſome others depending before Your *Lordſhip*, more vexatious than difficult; and managed by ſuch Advocates, who being retained in the Cauſe, though they have nothing material to ſay for it, yet are aſhamed to be ſilent. Who are always diſputing about an end of Controverſies, but at the ſame time do their utmoſt to encreaſe and perpetuate them; and are ready to foment our Differences that they may make uſe of them to their own Advantage.

While we have ſuch reſtleſs Adverſaries to deal with, part of our danger lies in being too ſecure of the *Goodneſs* of our Cauſe: And methinks there can be little ſatisfaction in lying ſtill or quarrelling with each other, when we know our *common* Enemies to be at work undermining of us. But whatever repoſe others enjoy, my Adverſaries ſeem to deal with me as ſome do with thoſe whom they ſuſpect of Witchcraft; they think by pinching me ſo often, and keeping me from taking reſt, to make me ſay at laſt as they would have me. But the comfort is, as long as I am ſecure of my Senſes, I am of my Religion againſt theirs: If I once loſe them or my Underſtanding, I know not whether it may be my fortune to be carried to *Rome*, or ſome more convenient place. And in my opinion they deal with thoſe under their care, as if they believed them not to be in their right Senſes; for they keep them always in the dark, and think nothing more dangerous than to let in Light upon them. Wherein I cannot deny but conſidering the nature of their Cauſe, they take the moſt effectual courſe to maintain it: For it not being capable of enduring a ſevere Tryal, nothing can preſerve its Reputation, but *Ignorance* and *Credulity*; which are therefore in ſo great Eſteem among them, that if it were a Cuſtom to Canonize Things as well as Perſons, we might find thoſe ſacred Names in their Litanies; and Addreſſes as ſolemn made to them, as ever were to Faith and Vertue among the elder and wiſer *Romans*.

I need not go far for an Inſtance of their deſign to advance, even in this inquiſitive Age, the Honour of theſe two great Pillars of their Church; For if your Lordſhip ſhall be pleaſed to caſt your Eye on the *following Diſcourſe*, eſpecially that

Part which concerns the *Miracles of the Roman Church*, you will find ſufficient Evidence of it almoſt in every Page. When I firſt engaged in this Controverſie, I could hardly believe what I now ſee, that they would ever have brought it to this iſſue with me, *viz.* *That they would renounce all claim to Infallibility, if they did not produce as great Miracles wrought in their Church to atteſt it, as ever were wrought by Chriſt or his Apoſtles.* The Boldneſs of which Aſſertion, and the pernicious Influence of it upon Chriſtianity it ſelf, hath made me take the more pains in the Examination of it. Which I have done with ſo much care in conſulting their own approved *Authors*, that I hope at laſt they will grow aſhamed of that groundleſs Calumny, that I do not deal Fairly in the citing of them. A Calumny ſo void of Proof, that I could deſire no better Argument of a baffled Cauſe, than ſuch impertinent Clamours. But if impudent Sayings will ſerve their turn, they need never fear what can be written againſt them. Do they indeed think me a Man ſo void of common ſenſe, as to expoſe my ſelf ſo eaſily to the Contempt of every one that will but take pains to compare my Citations? Have I the Books only in my own keeping? or are they ſo rare that they cannot get a ſight of them? How then come they to know them to be falſe quoted? But alas! they are Men of buſineſs, and have not leiſure to ſearch out, and compare Books, and therefore the ſhorteſt way is to ſay, that *without doubt they are all falſe*. Their Numbers certainly are not ſo ſmall, nor their Buſineſs ſo great, but they might have ſpar'd ſome to have undertaken this task, particularly, if I had been faulty: and in my mind it had been of ſome conſequence to have freed their Church from thoſe heavy Imputations of *Fanaticiſm, and deſtroying the neceſſity of a good life*, from the Teſtimony of their own Authors. But if theſe could not move them, I deſire them not to ſpare me in this preſent Subject of *Miracles*, wherein I profeſs to rely on the Teſtimony of their own Writers; if they ſhew me any wilful Miſtakes therein, I will endeavour to give them publick Satisfaction.

Were I not well aſſured, *My Lord*, of the Strength of my Evidence, as well as of the Goodneſs of my Cauſe, I ſhould never have appeared in it before a *Perſon* of ſo ſharp and piercing a Judgment as Your *Lordſhip*. But I have the rather preſumed to offer this Diſcourſe into your *Lordſhip*'s hands, and to ſend it abroad under the protection of your Name, 355.

not only thereby to acknowledge the particular Favours I have received from Your *Lordſhip*; but to thank You on a more publick Account, I mean, for your late generous owning the *Cauſe* of our *Religion* and *Church* in ſo critical a time, which not only gives a preſent Luſtre to Your Name, but will preſerve it with Honour to Poſterity. I am,

My Lord,

Your Lordſhip's moſt Obliged
and Faithful Servant,

Edward Stillingfleet.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

An Anſwer to the Guide in Controverſies about Infallibility, and the Reſolution of Faith.

The ſtate of the Controverſie about Infallibility and the Reſolution of Faith.

Sect. 1. THERE are two great Pleas for the neceſſity of Infallibility in the Roman Church; one to make an end of Controverſies, the other to lay a ſufficient Foundation for divine Faith. Having therefore fully examined the former Plea in the foregoing Diſcourſe, I ſhall now proceed to the latter; with a particular reſpect to thoſe Adverſaries, who have undertaken the Defence of the Cauſe of the Church of *Rome* againſt me in this Controverſie. And becauſe all this Diſpute refers to the Principles of Faith, I ſhall undertake to ſhew,

1. That the Principles laid down by them are falſe and fallacious.
2. That the Proteſtant Principles defended by me are ſound and true.

1. For the better examination of their Principles, I ſhall give a brief Account of the Riſe and State of this Controverſie about the Grounds of Faith. The Archbiſhop's Adverſary in conference with him, asked *how he knew the Scripture to be the Word of God*, hoping thereby to drive him to the neceſſity of owning *the infallible Teſtimony of the preſent Roman Church:* But he fail'd ſo much of his end, that the Archbiſhop fully proved, “that ſuch a Teſtimony could not be the Foundation of that Faith, whereby we believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God; and that there are ſufficient Grounds for Faith without it. One of the great Arguments whereby he diſproved that way of reſolving Faith, was, that it was impoſſible to avoid a vicious Circle, in proving the Church's Infallibility by Scripture, and the Scripture by the infallible Teſtimonies of the Church. This Difficulty, which hath puzled the greateſt Wits of the Roman Church, his Anſwerer thought to avoid by ſaying, *that the Church's Infallibility was not primarily proved by the Scripture, but by the Motives of Credibility which belong to the Church, in the ſame manner that* Moſes *and the Prophets, Chriſt and his Apoſtles were proved to be infallible.* Which bold Aſſertion obliged me in a large Diſcourſe to ſhew theſe three things. 1. That this way of reſolving Faith was manifeſtly unreaſonable. 2. That ſuppoſing it true, he could not avoid the Circle by it. 3. That it was falſe, and built on no other ground but a daring Confidence.

1. The firſt I proved. 1. Becauſe an Aſſent is hereby required beyond all proportion or degree of Evidence; the Aſſent required being infallible, and the Evidence only probable and prudential Motives. 2. Becauſe hereby they muſt run into all the Abſurdities they would ſeek to avoid; it being impoſſible to give a better account of Faith by the Infallibility of the Roman Church, than we can do without it; both ſides acknowledging that thoſe Motives of Credibility do hold for the

Scriptures which are by us denied to belong to their Church ; and if Faith as to the Scriptures be uncertain if it rely on them, much more muſt it be ſo as to the Church's Infallibility. If divine Faith as to the Scriptures can reſt upon Motives of Credibility, there can be no neceſſity of the Church's Infallibility to a divine Faith ; if it cannot, how come thoſe Motives to be a ſufficient ground for ſuch Faith as to the Church? For the Church's Infallibility being the reaſon as to them of believing the things contained in the Scripture, it ought to be believed with a Faith equally divine with that whereby we are to believe the Scriptures which are the Inſtrument of conveying the Matters of Faith to us. Beſides, this leaves every Man's Reaſon to be Judge in the choice of his Religion ; becauſe every Man muſt ſatisfie himſelf as to the credibility of thoſe Motives. And after all, this way of reſolving Faith by the Church's Infallibility, doth unſettle the very Foundations of Faith laid by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, who all ſuppoſed a rational certainty of the Motives of Faith to be a ſufficient Foundation for it ; but the pretence of Infallibility doth overthrow the evidence of Senſe and Reaſon, and put the whole tryal of the Truth of Chriſtianity upon the pitiful Proofs which they bring for the Church of *Rome*'s Infallibility. And when they have brought Men to it, they cannot aſſure them what that Church is, which they attribute this Infallibility to ; who in that Church are the proper Subjects of it ; what kind of Infallibility it is ; nor when the Church doth define infallibly : So many things are to be believed without reaſon, both as the Perſons who are to define, and the manner of their Definitions.

2. Suppoſing this way true, the Circle ſtill remains : which I proved by three things. 1. From the nature of the Faith they enquire for a reſolution of, which is not Human, but Divine Faith. For the Queſtion was not, whether by another kind of Aſſent they could not eſcape the Circle ; but whether they could do it in the reſolution of divine Faith or not? Either then the Church's Infallibility is not to be believed with a divine Faith, or there may be a divine Faith without an infallible Teſtimony, or this divine Faith of the Church's Infallibility muſt be built on the Scripture, and ſo the Circle returns. 2. From the Perſons whoſe Faith is to be reſolved ; the way of reſolving Faith being a different thing from proving a matter of Faith to an Adverſary : Granting then, that to thoſe who deny the Church's Infallibility, but allow the Scriptures, they may prove the one by the other ; yet this ſignifies nothing to the Reſolution of their own Faith, which is the thing enquired after : and yet even in proving to Adverſaries the Church's Infallibility from Scripture, they cannot avoid the Circle, when the Queſtion returns about the ſenſe of thoſe Places ; for then they muſt run to the Church ; becauſe the Church, which is infallible, hath delivered this to be the ſenſe of them. 3. From the nature of that Infallibility which they attribute to the Church ; which being not by immediate divine Revelation, but by a ſupernatural Aſſiſtance promiſed in Scripture, it is impoſſible to prove this Infallibility, but by firſt proving the Truth of that Scripture wherein theſe Promiſes are contained, and ſo the Circle ſtill returns ; for they believe the Scriptures infallible, becauſe of the Church's Teſtimony, and they believe the Church infallible, becauſe of the Promiſes of her Aſſiſtance recorded in Scripture.

3. It is falſe that there are the ſame Motives of credibility as to the Church's Infallibility, which there were for the Infallibility of *Moſes* and the Prophets, Chriſt and his Apoſtles: which *T. C.* therefore very wiſely declined to prove, and only ſaid, it was ſufficient to ſhew how he had eſcaped the Circle.

Sect. 2. This is a brief Account of that part of the Reſolution of Faith which hath been ſince aſſaulted by two ſeveral Adverſaries, but in different ways. The firſt of them is, *The Guide in Controverſies*; who ingenuouſly confeſſeth *the Queſtion about the Reſolution of Faith upon their Principles to be intricate*; ſo any one might eaſily gueſs by the intricacy and obſcurity of his Anſwer to it. I ſhall endeavour to bring it to as much clearneſs as poſſibly I can; that I may the better repreſent the force and conſequences of it. The ſubſtance of what he ſaith may be reduced to theſe Propoſitions.

The Principles of the Guide in Controverſies. Guide in Controv. *diſc.* 3. *Ch.* 10. *Sect.* 123.

1. *That the Church may be conſidered two ways.* 1. *As a Society already manifeſted by divine Revelation (whether written or underwritten) to be infallibly aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt.* 2. *As a Society of Men whoſe Teſtimony is to be received upon prudential Motives.* Sect. 126.

2. *That the Church being conſider'd in the former of the two Acceptions; the infallible Authority and Teſtimony thereof is not only an Introductive into, but one of the Articles of divine Faith; and that ſo many as believe the Church's Infallibility in this ſenſe, may ſafely reſolve their divine Faith of other Articles of their Belief into its delivering them as ſuch.* Sect. 127.

3. *That whatever this infallible Authority of the Church be, it is not neceſſary that every one for attaining a divine and ſaving Faith, be infallibly certain of this infallible Authority; or, as he elſewhere expreſſeth it, that it is not neceſſary for divine Faith, that it ſhould always have an external rationally-infallible ground, or motive thereto (whether Church-Authority or any other) on his part that ſo believes: or that he have ſome extrinſical motive or proponent of which he is infallibly certain that it is infallible.* Ibid. Sect. 135.

4. *There are two ſorts of Faith to be reſolved, divine and human, or infuſed and acquiſite: the one is always built upon divine Revelation, the other needs no more than prudential Motives, or ſuch as are ſufficiently credible, or morally infallible; on which an acquired or human Faith ſecurely reſts.* Sect. 143. -153. 148.

5. *That there muſt be particular ultimate divine Revelation (which may not be to all the ſame, but to ſome one, to ſome another,* viz. *either Scripture or Church's Teſtimony, or Apoſtolical Tradition, or Miracles) beyond which he can reſolve his divine Faith, no further; for proving or confirming which Revelation, he can produce no other divine Revelation, but there muſt end; unleſs a Proceſs be made* in infinitum, *or a running round.* Sect. 144. 145.

6. *Divine Faith, as to ſuch ultimate particular divine Revelation, cannot be grounded meerly on God's Veracity; but that God hath ſaid this particular thing which we believe (namely, that the Teſtimony of the Church, or Apoſtles, or Scriptures, is true) which muſt either be grounded (that it may be the ultimate Foundation of a divine Faith) on ſome other divine Revelation, and ſo* in infinitum; *or elſe I muſt reſt there with an immediate Aſſent to it.* Sect. 145.

7. *The internal efficient of all divine Faith is the Power or Grace of the Holy Ghoſt illuminating the Underſtanding, that the prime Verity cannot lye in whatever thing it reveals; and alſo that the particular Articles of our* Sect. 146.

Faith, are its Revelations; and perſwading and operating in the Will ſuch a firm adherence unto theſe Articles, as many times far exceeds that of any human Science or Demonſtrations.

Sect. 147. 8. *The ultimate Reſolutions of a Chriſtian's Divine Faith, as to the extrinſical prime motive, ground, reaſon or principle thereof, that equals in certainty the Faith built upon it, can be no other than that particular divine Revelation which is firſt made known to him, or from which in building his Faith he proceeds to the reſt; as to the internal Efficient, it is into the Grace of the Holy Spirit.*

Sect. 148. 9. *The Motives of Credibility, or the rational Evidence of the truth of Chriſtianity, do ſerve indeed antecedently for an Introductive to, (or after it is introduced) for a Confirmative of this divine Faith,* i.e. *to make it credible or acceptable to human reaſon (my own or others) that this Faith is true, and no way liable to Error, that I am aſſured in it by the holy and no ſeducing Spirit; but not to conſtitute it in the Notion of Faith divine; becauſe the Faith ſo ſtiled is ſuppoſed to reſt always on an higher ground,* viz. *Revelation divine.*

Sect. 153. 10. *That the Infallibility of the Church grounded on Divine Revelation, and believ'd by a divine Faith, is a main Ground and Pillar of a Catholick's Faith for any other Articles thereof, that are eſtabliſhed by the ſame Church's Definitions, where the Scriptures or Tradition Apoſtolick are to him doubtful. Of which ground and aſſurance of ſuch Points (believed by Catholicks from the Church's infallible Authority) the Proteſtants Faith is deſtitute.*

Thoſe Principles conſidered.

Sect. 3. Theſe are the Principles upon which this Guide in Controverſies undertakes to clear this intricate Queſtion, and to free their Reſolution of Faith from the Danger of a Circle; I have but two ſmall things to object againſt this way. 1. That it gives up the Cauſe in diſpute. 2. That notwithſtanding it doth not avoid the main Difficulties.

1. That it gives up the Cauſe in diſpute: which was, whether the infallible Teſtimony of the Church be the neceſſary Foundation of divine Faith? For upon occaſion of the ſuppoſed Neceſſity of this Infallibility, the Queſtion was firſt ſtarted; this Infallibility being aſſerted to be neceſſary by *T. C.* and was the thing I chiefly oppoſed in the Diſcourſe of the Reſolution of Faith. Now this the Guide in Controverſies freely yields to me, and conſequently the main Foundation of Faith aſſerted by my Adverſary is deſtroyed: as plainly appears by the third Propoſition, wherein he affirms *that an external Infallible Proponent is not neceſſary to divine Faith.* But this he doth not barely affirm, but, he ſaith, it is copiouſly proved by many Learned Catholicks: and to this purpoſe he cites Cardinal *Lugo*, ſpeaking of Divine Faith, who ſaith,

Lugo *de Virtute Fid. diſp.* 1. *Sect.* 12. *p.* 247.

“ that the Infallibility of the Church cannot be the firſt ground of Divine Faith; becauſe this infallible Authority of the Church by Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, is it ſelf an Article of divine Faith. And Experience tells us, that all Children or adult Perſons firſt coming to the Faith, do not apprehend, much leſs infallibly believe, this infallible Authority in the Church before any other Article of Faith. And in the Law of Nature, and under the Law of *Moſes*, the Church's Propoſition was not neceſſary in order to Faith; but the Inſtruction of Parents was ſufficient in one, and the Doctrine of *Moſes* and the Prophets in the other, before their Prophecies were re-

“ ceived by the Church. He cites *Eſtius* likewiſe ſpeaking of this divine and Salvifical Faith, *that it is not material to Faith what* Medium *God makes uſe of to beſtow this Gift of Faith upon Men: many having believed that knew nothing of the Church's Infallibility.* He cites *Layman* aſſerting that it often comes to paſs, *that other Articles of our Faith are explicitly believed before that of the Church's Infallibility; and withal this Infallibility of the Church depends upon the Promiſe of the Spirit; therefore Men muſt firſt believe that there is a Spirit of God, and conſequently the Holy Trinity. Farther,* ſaith he, *it is plain that the Primitive Chriſtians did believe with divine Faith, not for the Authority of the Church, which either was not founded yet (when St.* Peter *believed Chriſt to be the Son of the living God) or had not defined any Doctrines of Faith.* Again he denies *the Church's Authority to be the formal Principle or Motive of Faith;* and that for this very good reaſon, *becauſe this infallible Authority of the Church is one of the things to be believed.* Nay, he cites Father *Knot* himſelf in his Reply to *Chillingworth,* affirming *Chriſtians may have a true Infallible Divine Faith, of which Faith they have only a fallible Proponent, nor are infallibly certain thereof,* i. e. as to the Proponent. I now appeal to the indifferent Reader, whether the main thing contended for by me, *viz.* that the infallible Teſtimony of the Church is not neceſſary in order to Faith, be not here fully granted to me?

Eſti. in 3. *ſent*, 23*d*. *Sect.*131.

Paul Layman. *Theolog. mor.* 2. *l. tr.* 1. *c.* 5.

Knot's Anſwer to *Chillingworth, p.* 358.

2. But yet the Account of Faith here given, is very far from clearing the chief Difficulties of it, as will appear by theſe two things. 1. That this Reſolution of Faith is very unſatisfactory in it ſelf. 2. That it is liable to the Abſurdities which he ſeeks to avoid by it.

1. That the Reſolution of Divine Faith laid down by him, is very unſatisfactory in it ſelf: the Principles of which are theſe; 1. That Divine Faith muſt reſt upon Divine Revelation. 2. This Divine Revelation upon which Faith is built, is that which is firſt made known to the Perſon, and from which he proceeds to other Matters of Faith. 3. This Divine Revelation is not one and the ſame to all; but to ſome the Authority of the Scriptures, to ſome the Authority of the Church, to ſome Apoſtolical Tradition. 4. Divine Faith muſt reſt upon this Revelation with an immediate Aſſent to it, without enquiring further; for if there be any furrher Proceſs, there muſt be ſo *in infinitum*, or a Circle. 5. That the Holy Ghoſt doth illuminate the Underſtanding of him that believes, both as to the Veracity of God, and the Truth of his Revelation; and cauſes ſuch a firm Adherence of Faith, as many times far exceeds that of any Humane Science or Demonſtrations. But in this way I can neither be ſatisfied, 1. What that particular Divine Revelation is, which this Divine Faith doth reſt upon? Nor 2. How this Faith can equally reſt in ſeveral Perſons upon ſeveral Ways? Nor 3. How it can reſt with an immediate Aſſent upon any Way? Nor 4. Wherein this way differs from reſolving Faith into the Teſtimony of the Spirit.

Sect. 4. I cannot underſtand what that particular divine Revelation is, into which, as into its prime extrinſical Motive, Faith is here reſolved. The thing enquired after, is the reaſon of believing the truth of what God hath publickly revealed to Mankind, as we ſay he hath done the Doctrines of Chriſtianity; the ultimate Reſolution of divine Faith, I am told, is that particular divine Revelation which was firſt made known to a Man: Is this particular divine Revelation the ſame with God's publick and general Revelation, or diſtinct from it? If it be the ſame, it can

Of particular divine Revelation as the ground of Faith.

offer no reaſon for my Faith, unleſs the ſame thing may be proved by it ſelf ; if it be different, then God makes uſe of particular divine Revelations to Men different from his publick, into which they are to reſolve their Faith. Suppoſe then the Queſtion be thus put, Why do you believe that Chriſt ſhall come to Judge the Quick and the Dead ? The general Anſwer is, becauſe God that cannot lye, hath revealed it: But then the Queſtion returns, on what ground do you believe this Revelation to have been from God with ſuch a divine Faith as muſt reſt upon divine Revelation ? for ſuch you aſſert to be neceſſary. To this the *Guide in Controverſies* anſwers, *that the ultimate Reſolution of a Chriſtian's divine Faith, is into that particular divine Revelation firſt made known to him.* What particular divine Revelation, I beſeech him, is that on which I ground the divine Faith of this Propoſition, that the Doctrine of Scripture is God's Revelation ? For of that we enquire. It cannot be underſtood of the rational Evidence of the Truth of the divine Revelation; for that is aſſerted by him not to be a ſufficient Foundation for divine Faith, which muſt reſt upon nothing ſhort of divine Revelation: I would gladly be informed and directed by this *Guide in Controverſies*, ſince I muſt believe God's Revelation with a divine Faith, and this divine Faith muſt reſt upon a divine Revelation ; what that particular divine Revelation is on which I am to believe with divine Faith, the truth of God's publick and general Revelation ? I have endeavoured to find out what his meaning herein is; but I confeſs I cannot: ſometimes he ſeems to deny any Reſolution at all of this divine Faith into any further Principles, and quotes *Layman* with Approbation, who ſaith, “That “the formal Reaſon of believing what God ſaith, is his Veracity; but “but that God hath revealed ſuch things to us, cannot be any further “reſolved, or proved by divine Faith. In the next Section he ſaith, “That divine Faith doth not reſolve into an extrinſical, even mo“rally infallible Motive thereof, either as the formal Cauſe, or always “as the applicative Introductive, or Condition of this divine Faith. From whence it follows, that this divine Faith may be where there is neither infallible nor prudential Motive ; *i. e* it may be, where no account at all can be given of it ; for all Motives muſt be of one ſort or other ; and yet this divine Faith doth reſt upon a particular divine Revelation, of which, ſince no account can be given, it is unreaſonable to expect it. But I will try yet further by an Inſtance of his own. The Queſtion put by him, is, Why he believes the things contained in the Goſpel of St. *Matthew* to be divinely revealed ; he anſwers, “That he reſolves “his Faith of the Truth of thoſe Contents, not into the Church's ſay“ing they are true, although he believe all that true the Church ſaith; “but into divine Revelation : becauſe God by his Evangeliſt delivereth “them for Truth. Again he ſaith, “When he believes that all contained “in St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel is true, becauſe the Church tells him it is ſo, “and then believes that the Church telleth him true, becauſe God hath “revealed in ſome part of his Wotd, that the Church in this ſhall not err. Here his Faith, he ſaith, “is ultimately reſolved again, not into the “Church's Authority, but the divine Revelation concerning the Church. This looks like ſomething at firſt hearing, if one do not preſs too far in the Examination of it; but being throughly ſearched into, how profound ſoever it may ſeem, it is ſcarce tolerable Senſe upon his own Principles. For it is agreed now on all hands, that in the Queſtion of the Reſolution of Faith, the Enquiry is not why we believe what God reveals, but why we believe this to be a divine Revelation; and the Queſtion is now put particularly concerning the Doctrine contained in St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel: His Principles are, *That this muſt be believed by divine Faith, and that this Faith muſt reſt upon divine Revelation.* I now enquire upon what particular divine Revelation he doth build this Act of divine Faith, *that St.* Matthew's *Goſpel contains the Word of God?* He anſwers, firſt, *Though he believes it to be true, becauſe the Church ſaith it is ſo; yet his Faith is not reſolved into the Church's Teſtimony, but into divine Revelation?* What *divine Revelation* doth he mean? that which is in queſtion? viz. *That St.* Matthew'*s Goſpel is divine Revelation?* If ſo, then he doth not believe it, becauſe the Church ſaith it; but if he doth believe it becauſe of the Church's Teſtimony, then it cannot be on the account of God's delivering it for Truth by the Evangeliſt. For doth he believe it becauſe the Evangeliſt ſaith ſo, or not? If he doth, then he doth not believe it becauſe the Church ſaith it: If he doth not believe it becauſe the Evangeliſt ſaith it, then he muſt believe it becauſe the Church ſaith it, and ſo his Faith muſt be reſolved into the Church's Teſtimony; which, if it be a divine Faith, muſt according to his own Principles, ſuppoſe that the Church's Teſtimony is a divine Revelation, and the formal Object of divine Faith. The ſame Abſurdity lies in the other Anſwer. "He believes, he ſaith, that all contained in St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel is true becauſe the Church telleth him ſo; and then believes that the Church tells him true, becauſe God hath revealed in ſome part of his Word, that the Church in this ſhall not err. And yet his Faith is not reſolved into the Church's Authority, but the divine Revelation concerning the Church. This Anſwer muſt be underſtood either of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel being proved by ſome other part of Scripture, and then I grant the Circle is avoided; but that doth not anſwer the preſent Difficulty, which is concerning the ground of believing, not ſome one part of divine Revelation, but the whole: Or elſe it muſt be underſtood of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel being proved by ſome part of it ſelf. And then he reſolves his Faith thus: He believes what St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel ſaith concerning the Church, becauſe he believes St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel to be true, and believes St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel to be true with a divine Faith, becauſe the Church tells him ſo. Can any thing now be more plain than that, he muſt reſolve his Faith into that Authority upon which he believed St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel to be true, which himſelf confeſſeth to be that of the Church? Only if a Man can be ſo fooliſh to believe, firſt the Truth of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, becauſe the Church ſaith it, and at the ſame time believe the Church to ſay true, becauſe St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel ſaith ſo, that Man's Faith is to be reſolved into nothing but the dancing of Fairies, which have put him into ſuch a Circle that he can never find the way out of. But if he mean any thing elſe, I know not what to impute ſuch an abſurd way of proceeding to; unleſs it be to a thorough Intoxication of School Divinity, which confounds all true Notions and diſtinct Conceptions of Things; and makes Men have ſuch ſwimming Brains, that all things turn round with them.

The Reſolution of divine Faith muſt agree to all.

Sect. 5. 2. But ſuppoſing I could underſtand what this particular divine Revelation meant, into which this divine Faith muſt be reſolved; why may not one particular way ſerve all Mankind for it? Muſt there be ſeveral, and all equal Foundations of divine Faith? I can eaſily ſatisfie my ſelf of the reaſon of aſſerting it, but not of the reaſon of the thing in this way of reſolving Faith. The true reaſon of aſſerting it, was the plain Evidence that many Perſons had a true divine Faith, without knowing any thing of the Church's Infallibility: This made ſome Men in the Church of *Rome* confeſs that it was not always neceſſary; but leſt on the other ſide they ſhould ſeem hereby to forego the *Palladium* of that Church, they do withal ſay, that ſometimes Faith may begin there: and ſo run into the very ſame Abſurdities that the others do. For if one Man can reſolve his Faith well ſo, why not an hundred, why not a thouſand, why not all Chriſtians? If all cannot do it without running into a Circle, neither can one: for the Proceſs of Faith is alike in all. Not that the ſame means are uſed to all Perſons; for it is evident that Men believe upon different grounds; but what is abſurd if a thouſand do it, is equally abſurd if but one do it. Although the *Guide in Controverſies* doth not ſuppoſe it neceſſary for Men to reſolve their Faith into the Church's Infallibility; yet he doth ſuppoſe that ſome Men may do it. Well then, we will put the caſe that any one Perſon doth reſolve his Faith concerning God's Revelation into the Church's Infallibility as the ground of his divine Faith; I deſire to be informed by this *worthy Guide*, whether he doth not run into the ſame Abſurdities, which all would do if they proceeded that way? *i. e.* whether it be any more poſſible for one to free himſelf from a Circle, than for all? Is not the reaſon aſſigned by *Cannus*, and *Layman*, and *Lugo* this, *viz. becauſe the Church's Infallibility is one of the things to be believed as revealed by God, and therefore cannot be the ground of Faith to any*? And will not this reaſon exclude any one Perſon from doing it, that reſolves his Faith as he ought to do? So that if this hold in any one, being drawn from the reaſon of the thing, and not from the circumſtances of Perſons, it muſt equally hold againſt all Perſons, and conſequently no one Perſon can reaſonably eſtabliſh his Faith as to God's Revelation upon the Church's Infallibility.

Of immediate Aſſent.

Sect. 6. 3. I am far from underſtanding this way of *immediate Aſſent* to the divine Revelation. I grant the reaſon againſt proceeding further to be very good; for *the Guide* could ſee no paſſage that way, but over Rocks and Precipices; and therefore finds out a ſhorter cut, by aſſerting an immediate aſſent to the divine Revelation. But to what divine Revelation doth he mean? *The Authority of Scripture, Church's Infallibility, Apoſtolical Tradition*, or any of theſe? It is all one to me which it is, for it is equally unreaſonable, to all, or any of them. For I look upon Faith as an Act of the Mind, which muſt always have a Reaſon moving it to aſſent. Even in ſelf-evident Propoſitions where the Aſſent is moſt immediate, yet there is the greateſt and cleareſt reaſon for it, *viz.* the evidence of the thing, which makes the Underſtanding never heſitate or doubt, but yield a firm Aſſent upon the firſt Apprehenſion, and proportionable to the reaſon and evidence of the thing, or of the Motive inclining to aſſent, ſo is the readineſs and firmneſs of it. But to aſſert an Aſſent to Faith ſo immediate, of which no Motive or Reaſon can be aſſigned proportionable to it, is a thing repugnant to the nature of our reaſonable Faculties; and it is to make one of the nobleſt Acts of our Underſtandings a meer blind and bruitiſh Aſſent. All that we enquire for, is a ſufficient reaſon to move our Minds to believe in the Act of divine Faith, which is ſeen in all the Acts of human Faith. For no Man can reaſonably believe what another ſaith, or that he hath ſaid ſo, but he is able to give an account of both of them. And it would be very ſtrange that in the moſt weighty Matters of Faith, on which Mens eternal Happineſs and Miſery depend, they ſhould be obliged to aſſent in ſuch an immediate manner, that they can have no good account to give of their divine Faith. *Yes*, ſaith the *Guide*, *an Account may be given to make this Aſſent appear prudent by the Motives of Credibility* : But that is not the thing we enquire for; but a ſufficient Foundation for divine Faith: And as to this he aſſerts, that our Faith doth immediately reſt upon divine Revelation without proceeding to another Revelation for the ground of it. But how then can this divine Faith have a divine Revelation for its ground? It may have it for its material Object, which comes not under our conſideration; but only the formal Object or Motive of that Faith as to this Revelation. We will ſuppoſe the Church's Infallibility to be the Matter believed; I demand a reaſon why this is to be believed? The Anſwer is, *becauſe God hath revealed it in his Word.* There the Queſtion returns, what reaſon have you to believe that to be the Word of God? Here the *Guide* cries out, *ſtand there*; if you proceed a ſtep further you are loſt. For if you ſay upon another Revelation, then that upon another, and ſo without End. But, ſay I, you tell me I muſt believe this to be God's Word with a divine Faith; and this divine Faith muſt reſt upon a divine Revelation as its formal Cauſe: aſſign me that, or you overthrow the nature of divine Faith. What divine Revelation is there for this Faith to reſt upon? *None*, ſay you, *but here it muſt ſtop.* If ſo, then it is certain by your own Principles this either can be no divine Faith, or elſe divine Faith doth not always need a divine Revelation. So that this way of reſolution of Faith overthrows it ſelf, and needs no other Oppoſition but of one Part to another.

Of the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.

Sect. 7. 4. It may be all this may be cleared by the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt ſupplying the want of another Revelation, by its illuminating and confirming the Mind. So the Tragœdians of old call'd down the Gods upon the Stage, when they could extricate themſelves by no other Means. Not that I do in the leaſt doubt the Efficiency of the divine Spirit in the Act and Exerciſe of Faith; or that God by ſecret and unexpreſſible ways may ſtrengthen and increaſe Grace in the Hearts of Men, which thereby become better aſſured of the things they believe. But the Queſtion now is, whether our Faith, as to the Motive and Reaſon of it, can, or ought to be reſolved into the Illumination of the Holy Ghoſt? And in truth, after all his Turnings and Windings, *the Guide* ſits down at laſt in the groſſeſt way of reſolving divine Faith into the Teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt. For he ſaith, *that doth illuminate the Underſtanding that the prime Verity cannot lye in whatever thing it reveals* ; *and alſo that the particular Articles of our Faith are its Revelations.* Was ever any thing more fully ſaid to this purpoſe by the higheſt Calviniſts or Enthuſiaſts? Have the Diſputants of the Church of *Rome* hitherto charged them with a Circle in this Reſolution of Faith, equal with theirs between the Church and Scripture; and hath the very *Guide in Controverſies* found no way to eſcape one Whirlpool, but by falling into another? But ſince I ſee no reaſon to believe this *Guide in Controverſies* to be infallible, any more than the Pope himſelf, I hope I may have leave to ask him ſome few Queſtions. Doth he in earneſt believe that our aſſurance of God's Veracity, and the Truth of his Revelations, do flow from the immediate Illumination of the Spirit of God? I would fain know then, 1. Why he troubles himſelf about any other Reſolution of Faith? For by this way he reſolves Faith in all the parts of it. If you ask the firſt Queſtion, why you believe that to be true which God reveals; The Anſwer is ready, *the Holy Ghoſt illuminates my Mind in the Belief of this.* If you again ask, Why you believe theſe particular Articles to be God's Revelations; the Anſwer is already given, *the ſame Holy Ghoſt illuminates my Mind in that too.* What need Church-Infallibility, Apoſtolical Tradition, Motives of Credibility, or any other way; the Work is compleatly and effectually done without the Aſſiſtance of any of them? 2. Is not this to tell Unbelievers that we can give them no ſatisfaction as to the grounds of our divine Faith? It is true, he grants ſomething may be ſaid for a dull kind of *humane and acquiſite Faith*, which others are capable of underſtanding: But for *divine Faith*, that depends upon ſuch ſecret and private Illuminations, which no Perſon can at all judge of, but he that hath them; nor he very well, unleſs another Revelation aſſures him, that theſe are the Illuminations of God's Spirit, and not the Deceptions of his own. Eſpecially ſince it is a Principle in the *Roman* Church, that no Man can attain any abſolute Certainty of Grace without a particular Revelation from God. See then what a Wilderneſs this *Guide* hath led us into! We are to believe that what God hath revealed is true, and that he hath revealed theſe things from the Illumination of the Holy Ghoſt: but we cannot certainly know that we have ſuch an Illumination without another Revelation to diſcover that; and ſo we muſt run on without end, or turn back again the ſame way we went, to believe Illumination by Revelation, and Revelation by Illumination. 3. How can he poſſibly give himſelf any good account of his Faith in this manner? For ſince the fundamental Principle of Faith is the Veracity of God, and the Belief of God's Veracity is here attributed to the Illumination of the Holy Ghoſt; we may ſee how excellent a *Guide* this is, that thus ſtumbles in a plain way, or muſt of neceſſity go forward and backward. For I deſire him to ſatisfie me according to this Reſolution of Faith, in this Queſtion, why he doth believe whatſoever God ſaith is true? His Anſwer is, *becauſe the Holy Ghoſt by his inward Illumination aſſured me ſo.* But then I ask again, why he is aſſured of the truth of what the Holy Ghoſt enlightens him? His Anſwer muſt be, if he ſpeaks at all to the purpoſe, *becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is God, and cannot ſpeak any thing but truth.* So that the very Veracity of God is proved by the Spirit's Illumination, and the Spirit's Illumination by God's Veracity. But there is yet another Principle which Faith ſtands upon, which is, that God hath revealed the things we believe. Here again I ask, why he believes theſe Articles are God's Revelations? his Anſwer is, *the Holy Ghoſt, by enlightening my Mind, hath aſſured me of it.* But then I ask, how he is ſure with a divine Faith, which in this caſe is neceſſary, that there is a Holy Ghoſt, and that this is the Illumination of the Holy Ghoſt? Here he muſt return again to divine Revelation, wherein the Promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt is made.

Judge now, Reader, whether this be not an admirable *Guide in Controverſies*; and whether he hath not given a very ſatisfactory Account of the Reſolution of Faith?

The Abſurdities of theſe Principles

Sect. 131.

Sect. 8. Beſides that this way is thus unſatiſfactory in it ſelf, I have this further Charge againſt it, that other ways are liable only to the ſingle Abſurdities of their own particular Opinions: But this blind Guide hoping to clear himſelf of one great Abſurdity, hath not only run into it the very way he ſeeks to eſcape it, but into many more beſides. If there be any thing abſurd in the *Calviniſts* Reſolution of Faith, he hath taken in that: If there be any thing abſurd in reſolving Faith by the Infallibility of the Church, he is liable to that too; becauſe though he doth not think it neceſſary, he allows it to be good. And laſt of all, that which he looks upon as the Advantage of their Faith above ours, plungeth him unavoidably in as bad a Circle as may be. And that is, *That the Infallibility of the Church being once believed by a divine Faith from the Revelation of it in Scripture, it is a ground of Faith to him in all Controverſies that ariſe concerning the Senſe of Scripture.* I am not now to examine the Falſeneſs of the Pretence (which hath been done already and may be more afterwards) that which at preſent I am to ſhew, is, that it is impoſſible for him in his Reſolution of Faith concerning the Senſe of Scripture to avoid the Circle. Let us ſee how he attempts it. *Suppoſe I be asked,* ſaith he, *concerning ſome Article of Faith defined by the Church, though the ſame Article doth not appear to me clearly delivered in the Scriptures, why with divine Faith I believe it to be divine Revelation? I anſwer, becauſe the Church, which is revealed by the Scriptures to be perpetually aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt, and to be infallible for ever in Matters delivered by her, hath delivered it to me as ſuch. If again, why with a divine Faith I believe theſe Scriptures in general, or ſuch a ſenſe of thoſe Texts in particular, which are pretended to reveal the Church's Infallibility to be divine Revelation? I anſwer as before, becauſe Apoſtolical Tradition hath delivered them to be ſo: Which Apoſtolical Tradition related or conveyed to me by the Church, I believe with a divine Faith by the internal Operation of the Holy Spirit, without having at all any further divine Revelation, from which I ſhould believe this Revelation to be divine.* This is the utmoſt Progreſs of divine Faith with him. I know not how much Faith there may be in this way, I am ſure there is not the leaſt ſhadow of Reaſon. For if a Stop be made at laſt by the internal Operation of the Holy Spirit, what need ſo much ado to come thither? Might not the ſame Anſwer have ſerv'd as well to the firſt and ſecond Queſtion as to the third? When you were asked, why with a divine Faith you believe ſuch a Senſe of Scripture to be divine Revelation? Might not you have hindred all further Proceeding, by ſaying, I believe it with a divine Faith by the internal Operation of the Holy Spirit, without having at all any further divine Revelation. But if you thought it neceſſary to aſſign another divine Revelation for the Foundation of that Faith, by the Church's Infallibility, why will not the ſame reaſon hold for the laſt Act? Which muſt have as good a Foundation as the other; or elſe how comes it to be a *divine Faith* as well as the other? But the Subtilty of all this is, you have it ſeems, by your Office of *Guide*, the opening of the Gate, and you hold it open ſo long as to let through all your Friends; for Infallibility and Tradition muſt by any means be let through; and when theſe are paſſed, down falls the Gate in ſo rude a manner, as is enough to cripple any other that endeavours to get Paſſage. Can any Man poſſibly aſſign a Reaſon why the Operation of the Spirit ſhould not have as great Force, before the Church's

Infallibility be let in? But this it is to be a *Guide in Controverſies*, to direct Infallibility, Tradition and the Holy Ghoſt to know their diſtance and to keep their due places; and it is a great ſavour that the Holy Spirit is allowed to bring up the rear and to make all ſure, but by no means to offer to go before Infallibility or Tradition. For theſe are capable of doing better ſervice afterwards than the Holy Ghoſt is ever like to do them; the greateſt uſe of it being to make good a Paſs, that nothing follow to diſturb the March of Infallibility and Tradition. But if I may be ſo bold once more to preſume to ask this wonderful Guide; when the Diſpute is about the ſenſe of Scripture, why he doth believe ſuch a particular ſenſe which doth not appear clearly to him in Scriptures, to be the infallible ſenſe of it, or to be divine Revelation? His anſwer is, *becauſe the Church, which is revealed in Scriptures to be infallible, hath delivered this to him as the ſenſe of it.* Very well; this is an Anſwer I underſtand, though I ſee no reaſon for it. But I proceed; why do you believe this Infallibility to be the ſenſe of thoſe places which ſpeak of the Church, ſince to me they are far from appearing to be clearly delivered in thoſe Scriptures? Remember you believe this with divine Faith, and this divine Faith muſt have divine Revelation; the Queſtion then is, upon what divine Revelation do you believe the Infallibility of the Church to be promiſed in Scripture? He Anſwers, *upon Apoſtolical Tradition.* Is this Apoſtolical Tradition the ſame with the Scriptures, or different from it? If the ſame, what greater clearneſs can there be in this than in the Scriptures? If different, what divine Revelation is your Faith of the Infallibility of that built upon? He ingenuouſly confeſſes *none at all, for then there muſt be a Proceſs* in infinitum, *or a Circle.* And yet his Principle is, that divine Revelation is neceſſary to divine Faith; but there can be none here by his own confeſſion, without a Proceſs *in infinitum*, or a Circle; which is to acknowledge the abſurdity of his own way as far as a Man can deſire. Well, but how comes this Apoſtolical Tradition to be known to him? *By the Church*, he ſaith; but may the Church be deceived in delivering Apoſtolical Traditions? *No*, he ſaith, *ſhe was infallible:* but do you believe her infallible with divine Faith? *Yes*, he ſaith, *that muſt be done:* then at laſt there muſt be a divine Revelation again for this Infallibility, and ſo the the Circle returns. *No*, he ſaith, *at laſt, he believes the Church's Teſtimony infallible only with a humane and acquiſite Faith upon prudential motives; but he believes the Apoſtolical Tradition related by the Church with a divine Faith.* Was there ever ſuch a perplexed *Guide in Controverſies?* The Infallibility of the Church is ſometimes to be believed with a *divine Faith*, and ſometimes not; and yet when it is not to be believed with a divine Faith, it is the Foundation of the divine Faith of Apoſtolical Tradition; for he aſſigns no other ground or reaſon for it beſides the Infallible Teſtimony of the Church. *But this Infallibility*, he ſaith, *may be known two ways; by Promiſes of Scripture, or prudential Motives*; not to diſpute now the poſſibility of proving the Church's Infallibility by prudential Motives; (which I ſhall do at large afterwards) the thing I now enquire after is, ſince the Apoſtolical Tradition muſt be believed by divine Faith, and the belief of it comes by the Church's Infallibility; whether any other Infallibility can ſecure ſuch a Faith beſides the Infallibility by Promiſe; for the Infallibility aſſerted being a ſecurity from error by divine Aſſiſtance, and that Aſſiſtance only ſuppoſed to be promiſed in Scripture, there can be no other Infallibility here underſtood but that; which Infallibility, by his own Aſſertion, muſt be believed by divine Faith, which divine Faith muſt reſt upon divine Revelation; and ſo he believes the ſenſe of Scripture becauſe of the Church's Infallibility, and the Church's Infallibility by Apoſtolical Tradition, and Apoſtolical Tradition by the Church's Infallibility, and the Church's Infallibility by the ſenſe of Scripture. See now what an admirable *Guide in Controverſies* we have met with! And with what skill and dexterity he hath eſcaped the Circle. And ſo I take my leave of this GUIDE, finding nothing in him further material about Infallibility, which I have not anſwered in the foregoing Diſcourſe. The Conſiderator urging ſo much the very ſame things, and frequently in the ſame words, that I now think he either was the ſame perſon, or made very bold with him.

CHAP. II.

The Principles of E. W. *about the Certainty of Divine Faith, laid down and conſidered.*

The Principles of *E. W.* laid down.

Sect. 1. Having met with ſo little ſatisfaction from the *Guide in Controverſies*, I now betake my ſelf to the *Rule*; no *Fancies*, *Toys*, *Trifles*, or *Fallible Gloſſes*, I aſſure you; for thoſe *E. W.* cries out upon almoſt in every page of his worthy Work; but *Reaſon and Religion*, or *The Certain Rule of Faith*. What can any Man deſire more? Unleſs it be to ſee Mr. *Stillingfleet* joyned in the Title page with *Atheiſts*, *Heathens*, *Jews*, *Turks*, *and all Sectaries*. And that he might own a greater obligation to him, than all that Rabble; he diſpatches them all, after a faſhion, in 30 Pages, and ſpends above 600 upon him. O what a peſtilent Heretick is this *Stillingfleet!* that deſerves ſo many Laſhes beyond *Atheiſts*, *Heathens*, *Jews*, or *Turks!* If he had been any one of thoſe, he might have been gently uſed; for never were they fairlier dealt with by any Man that undertook them. But he is not ſo much their Friend to thank him for this kind uſage: and *E. W.* thinks he will have enough to do to defend himſelf. I confeſs I think ſo too, if either of his Books againſt me, were to be thrown at my head; for they are very thick and as heavy as is poſſible. And to my great comfort, I never yet ſaw two ſuch bulky Books, whoſe Subſtance might be brought into a leſs compaſs; for ſetting aſide Tautologies and tedious Repetition, frequent Excurſions and impertinent Digreſſions, the Pith and Marrow of both his Books lies in this one word Infallibility. But it is time to fall to my buſineſs, for fear of more *Advertiſements*; and Infallibility being the main deſign of his Books, that ſhall be the Subject of my preſent Debate with him. And becauſe this *E. W.* is a great pretender to *Principles*; the method I ſhall proceed, in ſhall be, firſt to conſider his Principles, and then to defend my own. For which I ſhall chiefly make uſe of his laſt Book, it being in effect but another Edition of his former; the other as I ſuppoſe, being diſpoſed of to better purpoſes than to be read; for I never heard of one Perſon in *England* that read it over. However, what there is material in it, different from the laſt, as to the preſent Controverſie, I ſhall upon occaſion take notice of.

The two main Principles he builds upon, are theſe.

1. That without an Infallible Church, there can be no Certainty of Faith.

2. That the Roman Catholick Church is this Infallible Church.

If he can prove theſe two, he ſhall not need any more to eſtabliſh their Religion, or to overthrow ours. And I will ſay that for his praiſe that he hath brought the Controverſie into a narrow compaſs; for he confeſſes it is endleſs to diſpute out of Scripture and Fathers, ſince witty Men by their *fallible Gloſſes* can turn and winde them which way they pleaſe; but there is nothing ſo ſtiff and inflexible as a ſtanding infallible Oracle in the Church; which being once believed, all Controverſie is at an end. But we may as ſoon hope to ſee all other Controverſies ended by dry Blows, as this *Principle* proved to the ſatisfaction of any reaſonable Man.

The main Proofs for the neceſſity of the Church's Infallibility, which he inſiſts upon, are theſe. 1. *That there can be no Divine Faith without it.* 2. *There can be no Certainty as to the Canon, or Edition, or Senſe of Scripture.* 3. *There can be as little Certainty as to the ſenſe of the Fathers, or the Primitive Church.*

1. *That there can be no divine Faith without it.* This he frequently inſiſts upon in both his Books; and with ſo much vehemency, as *to make the deniers of Infallibility to overthrow all Faith and Religion:* Which being a Charge of the higheſt nature, ought to be made good by the cleareſt Evidence. Whether that which *E.W.* produces, be ſo, I ſhall leave any one to judge, when I have given an Account of his Principles as to this matter. In his firſt Book, called *Proteſtancy without Principles*, he begins with this Subject; and lays down theſe Aſſertions, upon which all his Diſcourſe is built.

1. *That God's infallible Revelation requires an infallible Aſſent of Faith; or an infallible Verity revealed to us, forcibly requires an anſwerable and correſpondent infallible Aſſent of Faith in us: the contrary* he calls *wild Doctrine; this ſubjective Infallibility,* as he calls it, *he offers very wiſely to prove from thoſe places of Scripture, which ſpeak of the aſſurance which Chriſtians had of the truth of their Religion.*

2. *This infallible Aſſent of Faith doth require infallible Teachers; for infallible Belivers and infallible Teachers are Correlatives.* And in the ſecond Chapter, he goes about to prove it, *becauſe; if Chriſt's infallible Doctrine be only fallibly taught, no Man hath certainty what it is; and ſeeing what is fallible, may be falſe, Chriſt's Doctrine may not be taught at all; which is infallible, and cannot be falſe; and he that ſhould abjure this fallible Doctrine, doth not deny therein Chriſt's Doctrine, and cannot be upon that account an Heretick*, But to make Faith Infallible, he aſſerts, *That every Preacher ſent by the infallible Church, as a Member conjoyned with it, is infallible in his Teaching: and, on the contrary, whoſoever renounces an Infallible Society, cannot teach with certainty Chriſt's infallible Doctrine. From whence* he ſaith, *follows an utter ruine of Chriſtian Religion.* In his third Chapter he further proves, *That if the Church were fallible in her Teaching, God would oblige us to believe a falſity; becauſe God commands Men to hear the Church; and if the Church may err, then Men are obliged to believe a falſe Doctrine taught by her. And no other means ſhort of this Infallibility, would be inſufficient for preſerving Chriſtian Religion in the World.* In the fourth Chapter he comes to *a particular conſideration of divine Faith, and from*

Diſc. 1. c. 2. p. 24, 27.

thence proves the neceſſity of Infallibility. Faith, ſaith he, *requires two things eſſentially, an Object which is God's Revelation, and a Propoſition of this Object; by Vertue of which the elicit Act of Faith follows in a Believer, and intellectually lays as it were hold, both on God's Revelation and the thing revealed.* Now to prove the neceſſity of ſuch an infallible Propoſition in order to divine Faith, he lays down ſome abſtruſe Propoſitions.

1. *That God's infallible Revelation avails nothing in order to Faith, unleſs Chriſtians by their Faith lay hold on the certainty thereof, or own it as infallible and the aſſured ground of their Aſſent.*

2. *That the meaſure and degrees of certitude in the Aſſent are according to thoſe which the Proponent gives to the Revelation. If he teaches doubtfully, the Aſſent is doubtful; if probably, the Aſſent is probable; if infallibly, the Aſſent is infallible:* the reaſon which he gives of this, is, *becauſe an Object receives its light from the Propoſal, as an Object of ſight doth from the light of the Air. As long therefore,* ſaith he, *as the Infallibility of a Revelation ſtands remote from me, for want of an undoubted Application made by an infallible Proponent, it can no more transfuſe certainty into Faith than Fire at a great diſtance warm; that is, no more than if it were not certain in it ſelf, or not at all in Being.*

3. *From hence,* he ſaith, *it follows, that Proteſtants can only doubtfully gueſs at what they are to believe, and conſequently never yet had, nor can have divine, certain and infallible Faith, becauſe they cannot propoſe Faith infallibly.* Hence he proceeds Chapter fifth and ſixth, *to diſprove Moral Certainty, as inſufficient in order to Faith; and deſtroying,* as he ſaith, *The very Being and Eſſence of Divine and ſupernatural Faith; becauſe the ſole and adequate Object of divine and ſupernatural Faith is God's infinite Veracity actually ſpeaking to us; but this Veracity, (when it is duly propoſed) transfuſeth more certainty into the elicit Act of Faith, than any Moral Certainty derived from inferiour Motives can have. For all Moral Certainty is at leaſt capable of Falſity, and may deceive us: God's infallible Veracity cannot be falſe, nor deceive, if Faith reſt upon that Motive; and if it reſt not there, it is no Faith at all. Nay, he aſſerts, that ſupernatural Faith is more certain and infallible, than all the Metaphyſical Sciences which nature can give us;* For which he can give this plain reaſon, *Becauſe the infinite Veracity of God which only ſupporteth Faith with greater force, energy, and neceſſity, transfuſeth into it, a ſupereminent Infallibility; ſupereminent,* he ſaith, *and above all the Certainty, which the Principles of Nature can afford.* This is the ſubſtance of *E. W*'s. Principles of Faith in his firſt Book: Which is ſomewhat more enlarged in the ſecond. In one Chapter he deſigns to prove *if the Roman Church be not infallible, there is no true Faith in the World;* the reaſon of which in his own eaſie terms, is this, *For the meer poſſibility of deceiving Chriſtians in one Article, impoſſibilitates the Belief of all ſhe propoſeth.* In another Chapter, *That ſhe is not only infallible, but that the Adverſaries of her Infallibility deſtroy the very Eſſence of Chriſtian Religion.* And in the next, *That divine Faith in this preſent ſtate of things neceſſarily requires a Church infallible, becauſe the Infallibility of Faith neceſſarily requires not only an Infallible Revelation, but an infallible Proponent. Ruin one or the other Infallibility, Faith can be no more but an uncertain Aſſent, and conſequently can be no Faith at all;* This reaſon he diverſifies into many ſhapes, and repreſents it in different words; but it comes in at every turn. So in the next Chapter he proves *the Catholick Church God's infallible Oracle, becauſe Infallibility once taken away,*

Diſc. 2. *c.* 5.

Diſc. 2. *c.* 14.

C. 15.

C. 16.

no Man can have aſſurance ſo much as of one Chriſtian Verity; the reaſon is,
no Man can be aſſured of what is fallibly taught: Becauſe what is ſo taught,
may by vertue of the Propoſition be falſe; but a Doctrine ſo far removed
from infallible Certainty, for want of a due application of its Infallibility,
comes not near to the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, which was applied,
taught and propoſed infallibly: And in the ſame Chapter he ſaith, *It is*
C. 16. n. 14. *utterly impoſſible, that an infallible Verity as revealed, though fallibly propoſed,*
ſhould have influence upon Faith, or work in Believers a moſt firm
C. 18. n. 4. *Aſſent.* Not long after, he aſſerts, *That Infallibility being taken away,*
no Man can tell, but that Chriſtian Religion is a Fiction; for theſe are his
words: *A feigned and fallible Religion are near Couſin Germans. The*
one is a Fiction, the other at leaſt may be ſo, and for ought any Man can
N. 12. *know, is no better*: And in the ſame Chapter he ſaith, *That without Infallibility*
Religion is meer Scepticiſm: Becauſe all other means, Infallibility
being ſet aſide, may be equally pleaded by Hereticks, (*as* Arians *and ſuch like,*)
as by any other. To the ſame purpoſe in the following Chapter, where
he propoſes that which he calis *the laſt Proof of the Church's Infallibility,*
C. 19. n. 3. which is ſtill the very ſame over and over; (for he out-does the *Cook* of
Brunduſium in ſerving up the ſame Meat in ſeveral Dreſſes) viz. *That the*
denyal of it overthrows Chriſtian Religion; be pleaſed to obſerve his conciſe
way of reaſoning. *If the Infallibility of revealed Doctrine be loſt*
as it were in the way between God and us; If the Revelation appear not as
it is in it ſelf infallible, when we Aſſent to it by Faith; that is, if it be
not infallibly conveyed and applied to all by an unerring Proponent, as it
ſubſiſts in its firſt Cauſe, infinitely infallible, Faith periſhes, we are caſt
upon pure Uncertainties, and may juſtly doubt whether ſuch a Doctrine, ſeparated
from that other Perfection of Infallibility, be really true or no. In
Diſc. 3. c. his third Diſcourſe we meet with *a convincing Argument*, as he calls it,
N. 2. *for Infallibility. If all Authority imaginable, whereupon Faith can depend,*
conveyed or delivered theſe Verities both as infallible Truths and infallibly,
and I Aſſent to the Doctrine with a Belief not infallible, but only
morally certain, I leave by my fallible moral Aſſent the true infallible
teaching and conveying Oracles of Chriſtian Doctrine, and believe upon a
meer fanſied Authority, which was never impowered to convey God's Verities
to any. Before I come to examine theſe things, it will be neceſſary,
to lay down his Notion of *Faith* in his own Terms, *viz. That it eſſentially*
C. 8. n. 10. *tends obſcurely to its own Object*; (no matter for underſtanding it,
but the words ſound well together) *and by this Faith we lay hold upon*
the moſt ſupream and all-comprehending Infallibility proper to God alone.
N. 14. But withal we are to take notice of a twofold Certitude in Faith; the
one a Certitude of Infallibility ariſing from the ſupernatural Principles
which concur to the very Act of Belief; and theſe being not liable to Error, can
never Operate but when the divine Revelation really is, and implies not
only the meer Truth of the Act, but moreover an infallible determination to
Truth: The other a Certitude of Adheſion not grounded on Evidence, but upon
moſt prudent Motives propoſed to Reaſon, (which clearly diſcover'd) the
Will by her pious Affection commands and determines the intellectual Faculties
to aſſent indubitably. After all which he concludes, that the plain
C. 16. 11. and eaſie Reſolution of Faith, *is into God's Veracity as ſpeaking to Men by*
an infallible Church. Thus I have laid together ſo many Parcels of
E. W's. rambling Diſcourſe, as were neceſſary in order to the examination
of it. And indeed I cannot compare his reaſoning to any thing

better than his own pretty Notion of Faith: for juſt as he ſaith, Faith *eſſentially tends obſcurely to its Object*, ſo his Principles do to his Concluſion.

But that I may proceed with the greater clearneſs, I muſt premiſe theſe two things:

Some things premiſed to the State of the Queſtion.

1. *Sect.* 2. That the Queſtion is not concerning the neceſſity of any *internal Aſſiſtance of the divine Grace*, but of an *external infallible Proponent* in order to divine Faith. So that whatever certainty of Faith is derived from the Spirit of God, is no ways pertinent to our preſent debate. I do not deny that a truly divine Faith, doth ſuppoſe a divine and ſupernatural Aſſiſtance; I do not deny, that the Holy Ghoſt may confirm Mens Minds to ſuch a degree of Certainty, which may exceed the rational grounds they are able to give to others of their Faith. But I ſay, all this is very far from the purpoſe. For I had expreſly laid down the Caution before, that our Queſtion in the Reſolution of Faith, did not relate to the workings of the divine Spirit on our Minds of which no ſatisfactory account can be given to others; but to the external Motives and Grounds of Faith, whether they muſt be infallible or not? To what purpoſe is it then, for *E.W.* to talk *of a Certitude of Infallibility*, as he calls it, *ariſing from the ſupernatural Principles which concur to the very Acts of Belief; and theſe not liable to error, can never Operate, but when the divine Revelation really is?* Granting all this to be true; yet what doth this prove, concerning the neceſſity of an *external infallible Proponent*, ſuch as the *Church* is? All that can hence follow, is, that thoſe whom the Spirit of God enables to believe, cannot believe a Falſhood; but what then? Hath he proved that the ſupernatural Principles of Faith do never Operate, but where the Church infallibly propoſes? No, this he never attempts, either not underſtanding what was fit to be proved, or knowing it impoſſible to be done. But if the infallible Certainty of Faith doth depend upon inward Illumination and divine Concurrence; the Infallibility of Faith may be had without an external infallible Proponent. And ſo all his firſt Principles ſignify nothing to his purpoſe: for ſuppoſing an infallible Aſſent of Faith neceſſary to an infallible Revelation; yet that doth not prove the neceſſity of infallible Teachers, unleſs it can be had no other way. But here he tells us, *That infallible Certainty is derived from ſupernatural Principles concurring to the Act of Faith*; which he here elſewhere calls, *The interior Illuſtration of Grace imparted to a Soul*, which he ſaith, *is wholly neceſſary to make Faith certain*; and after ſaith, *we come to an abſoute Certainty of Faith, upon this interiour ſacred Language of God, or his internal Illumination; the neceſſity of which* he proves *from Scripture and Fathers.* But when he hath done all, he hath moſt effectually confuted himſelf; For *if this inward Illumination, can*, as he ſaith, *ſupply the Inefficacy of external Motives*; How comes the Infallibility of an external Proponent to be neceſſary in order to that certainty of Faith which may be obtained, by divine Grace making up what is wanting in the outward Motives? Did ever any Man ſhew more kindneſs to his Adverſary in helping him with Weapons to deſtroy himſelf, than this *E.W.* doth? When after a moſt tedious Endeavour to prove the neceſſity of an external Infallible Proponent, in order to the certainty of Faith; he ſets down theſe words: *Now what we aſſert in this particular, is, that the infallible Certainty of Faith comes from this interior Illumination, as it more lively ſets forth the formal Object aſſented to, or helps to a clearer Propoſal of the di-*

Rational Account, *part* 1. *c.* 7. *Sect* 1.

Reaſon and Religion, *Diſc.* 3. *c.* 9. *N.* 4. p. 562. *N.* 6, 7.

N. 9.

N. 11.

vine Myſteries. Doth the infallible Certainty of Faith indeed come from *this interior Illumination*? What then becomes of the neceſſity of an Infallible Church? We often hear of the great Aſſiſtance the *Jeſuits* have in Writing their Books; I ſhould rather have thought ſome Enemy of *E.W's.* had put in theſe things to overthrow all he had ſpent ſo many impertinent words about before. But leſt ſuch Expreſſions ſhould be thought to have dropt from him unawares, obſerve with what care he ſums up the whole Progreſs of Faith in this State.

N. 12. Firſt, *A natural Propoſition of the Myſteries precedes; this begets a natural Apprehenſion of their Credibility; after ſome conſideration there may ariſe an imperfect Judgment of Credibility: But ſhould the Will offer as yet to incline the Mind to aſſent only upon what appears hitherto, it could not move to a Faith which is an Aſſent* ſuper omnia, *or moſt certain. Therefore the Illuſtration, or powerful Invitation of Grace (by which, as I ſaid, the Object appears another way more clearly) is infuſed, whereof the Soul is recipient. The Will now after other Preparatives, thus ſtrengthened a new, commands boldly the Underſtanding to Aſſent upon the ſafeſt Principles imaginable,* viz. *upon God's infallible Revelation accompanied with divine Light, which makes Faith to grow higher in Certainty, than all the Reaſon, or Knowledge in this Life can ariſe to. For, as* St. Thomas *obſerves, humane Knowledge derives its Certainty from Man's natural Reaſon, which may err; but Faith hath its Infallibility,* ex lumine divinæ ſcientiæ, *from the Light of divine Wiſdom, which cannot deceive, and therefore is moſt certain.*

Who, upon reading theſe words, would not have thought this *E.W.* more converſant in *Calvin's Inſtitutions*, than *Aquinas*'s *Sums*? For in all this Reſolution of Faith, how can a Man edge in the neceſſity of an infallible Church in order to the certainty of Faith? I will not ſay *E.W.* was wholly inapprehenſive of this Snare he had brought himſelf into; but he takes the worſt way imaginable to get out of it. *N.* 13, 14, 15. For to ſhew the difference between this way and that of *Hereticks*, he makes *the exterior humane Propoſition of Divine Revelation neceſſarily preceding the true Light of Faith; which cannot be made but by one that makes the Propoſition good by a Miracle, or ſome ſupernatural Wonder; but no Proteſtant is able to do thus much.* And is any *Papiſt*, think we? I would with all my Heart ſee ſome of the Miracles wrought by their Preachers to convince me; I profeſs the greateſt readineſs of Mind to be perſuaded by them, in caſe they do but work ſuch Miracles as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did. But of this Subject at large afterwards. At preſent it may ſuffice to take notice, 1. That no Propoſition of Faith is ſuppoſed ſufficient by *E.W. but where the Proponent doth work Miracles:* and therefore we may ſafely queſtion the Church's Propoſition till we ſee ſuch Miracles wrought by her, as were by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. *N.* 15. 'For thus '*ſaith he*, Chriſt our Lord, ſent by his Eternal Father, thus the Apoſtles, 'ſent by Chriſt and the Church ever ſince (all ſhewing Wonders above 'the force of Nature) proved their Miſſion; and withal evinced that 'God only impowered them to teach as they did. And becauſe the poor Proteſtant doth not pretend to Miracles, therefore *the Light he pretends to is a meer* Ignis fatuus, *vain, and void of all reality.* I muſt ſay that of my Adverſary, that he puts the Controverſie upon the faireſt Iſſue that can be deſired. For if their Church work ſuch Miracles as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did to atteſt their divine Commiſſion, the evidence from thence to believe her Infallibility, ought to over-rule the Opinions of ſuch who ſay ſhe hath erred; in Caſe the Doctrine atteſted by Chriſt and his Apo-

ſtles and that of the Roman Church do not directly contradict each other. 2. Although this exterior Proponent prove himſelf ſo Commiſſioned, yet by the Progreſs of Faith laid down by *E.W.* this is not enough to beget an infallible Certainty of Faith. He ſaith, " after the exteri-
" our Propoſition only a natural Apprehenſion of their Credibility ſuc-
" ceeds; then a Judgment of Credibility; then the inclination of the
" Will; but yet no infallible Certainty till the Illuſtration of divine
" Grace comes. So that it evidently follows according to *E.W.* that an infallible Proponent cannot beget an infallible Aſſent of Faith; but that doth ariſe from the inward Illumination of the Mind by the Holy Ghoſt. Which I have already ſhewed doth lay Men open to all the Abſurdities the higheſt *Calviniſts* were charged with in reſolving Faith; and is withal impertinent to our Diſpute; which relates to the neceſſity of an External infallible Proponent in order to the Certainty of Faith. But ſurely the *Jeſuits* are not ſo bereft of all their Subtilty as to comply with their greateſt Adverſaries without ſome advantage to be gained by it. Yes, *E.W.* will ſhake Hands with ſome old Enemies, the better to aſſault ſome later Proteſtants, *who ſeem to attribute*, he ſaith, *no other Certainty to the very Act of Faith, than what is Moral; which Doctrine*, he ſaith, *if it be defenſible it's impoſſible to declare, how Faith it ſelf or the Illuſtration previous, can proceed from the Holy Ghoſt. For did the Spirit of God work with a Soul, when it believes, the Certainty of Faith would without all doubt, go beyond that Aſſurance, which is only Humane, Moral and fallible.* I think that I eſcape well, that *E. W.* hath not Tranſcribed a great part of *Bradwardin de Causâ Dei* againſt me; for I plainly ſee, he takes me for an Abſolute Free-Willer, and a Denier of the Grace of God. It is true indeed, I ſet aſide the Conſideration of divine Grace in this Matter; but I aſſure him, not that I queſtioned the Truth or Neceſſity of it; but becauſe it was not pertinent to this Buſineſs. For to what purpoſe ſhould we argue about that, which can only ſerve for the ſatisfaction of thoſe which have it? and leave Men entagled in the ſame Difficulties they object to others? But the Queſtion was plainly put by me concerning the *outward Inducements* to Faith; *viz.* whether an infallible Teſtimony of the Church were neceſſary in order to it? or whether a Certainty ſhort of that, which I called Moral, were ſufficient for divine Faith? Not oppoſing this *Moral Certainty* to the *concurrence of divine Grace*, but to an *External infallible Proponent*. I took it then for granted on both ſides, that the Grace of Faith doth not come meerly from *our ſelves*, but that *it is the Gift of God*; that wherever God doth immediately concur, he doth direct the Mind to the belief of what is certainly True, that there might be unaccountable ways, whereby an inward Certainty might be produced, and ſo firm an adherence to the Truth believed, which all the Arguments and Torments in the World could never ſhake, of which the Primitive Martyrs were undeniable Inſtances: But this internal Perſuaſion could be made no matter of Debate, nor any Argument to convince another, any further than the Effects of it did manifeſt that it came from God: Yet withal I did not queſtion, but Faith being an Act of the Mind of Man, which is rational and diſcurſive, had ſufficient grounds to proceed upon, and ſuch which without any Abſurdity might juſtifie Mens Belief to any prudent or conſiderative Men, and the ſevereſt Enquiries of a Man's own Mind. Now concerning theſe Grounds the Queſtion was put by me; taking in then the Efficiency of divine Grace, this is the

true State of the Controverſie, whether the Spirit of God may not by moral Arguments work in Men's Minds ſuch a certain Aſſent of Faith, as the Scripture requires for Salvation? or whether in order thereto, an infallible Teſtimony of the Church be neceſſary? But becauſe the inſerting the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt doth rather perplex the Controverſie, than explain it; ſince this was granted on both ſides, I thought it better to leave it out, and to manage the Diſpute as it ought to be, only concerning the neceſſity of an infallible Teſtimony of the Church, which is Aſſerted by my Adverſaries, and Denied by me.

2. The Queſtion is not, concerning that Foundation of *Faith* whereby *we believe what God ſaith to be true*; but that, *whereby we believe this to be revealed by God.* For thoſe two Propoſitions muſt be ſuppoſed to any particular Act of Faith, viz. *that whatever God ſaith is true: and that God hath ſaid this particular thing which I am bound to believe.* Concerning the firſt of theſe there is no diſpute between us; for God's Veracity, founded upon his infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs, is agreed to be the ultimate reaſon of our Aſſent to whatſoever God reveals. Only *E.W.* to uphold the *ſupernatural Certainty of Faith, will not have the Veracity of God to be the Foundation of Faith, as it is known by natural Reaſon; for if it were,* ſaith he, *Faith would at laſt be reſolved into one natural Principle, thus; I believe God to be the higheſt Veracity imaginable, not becauſe he ſaith ſo, but becauſe I know this great Truth ſcientifically.* Now, ſaith he, *no Science gives the laſt or leaſt Degree of intrinſick Certitude to Faith.* This is profound reaſoning: But which I dare ſay, no Faith can be built upon. For either I muſt be convinced of God's Veracity by natural Reaſon, from the Conſideration of the divine Nature and Attributes, or by Revelation from God; but if by God's Revelation, then ſee what an excellent way this *Scholaſtick Divine* hath found for reſolving Faith as to this Principle (for as it is a matter revealed, it is an immediate Object of Faith:) If you then ask him, why he believes any thing to be true which is revealed by God, his anſwer is, *becauſe he believes God's ſupream Verity, or that he neither can nor will deceive:* but if you ask him him again why he believes this Veracity of God, he anſwers, *becauſe God hath revealed it.* And is not this a likely Man to eſcape Circles, that makes them where any common Underſtanding would avoid them? But beſides, ſuppoſing God had never diſcovered his own Veracity in Scripture, I would fain know of *E.W.* whether there could have been any ſuch thing as divine Faith or no? if there could, then this Principle of God's Veracity muſt have been the Foundation of divine Faith as known by natural Reaſon. And ſuppoſing God's Veracity not to be embraced antecedently to a divine Revelation. For the greateſt Miracles cannot convince me of God's Truth, though they may of his Power; and they may perſuade me to believe that God ſent ſuch Men who work Miracles, but they cannot perſuade me to believe that all they ſay is true. For if God can deceive Men, he may imploy Men as his Meſſengers, and deceive the World by them: And if this Opinion be rooted in a Man's Mind, it is impoſſible he ſhould yield a firm Aſſent to any thing becauſe it is revealed by God. But *E. W.* ſaith, *Divines ſay ſo* as he doth. I ſuppoſe he means *School Divines* and then I grant they do a great many ſilly things beſides, wrapt up under the name of Subtilties. If any one hath a mind to try the Truth of what I ſay, he need do no more than read their unintelligible Subtilties about the Nature and Reſolution of Faith; which *Cardinal Lugo* himſelf

Proteſt. without Principles, *Diſc.* 1. *C.* 5. *n.* 10.

ſelf complains of; and ſaith *they make the Doctrine of the Schools hard and unintelligible*; and in this particular of believing God's Veracity on the account of divine Revelation, he ſaith, *it carries Men into an inexplicable Circle.* *Suarez* finding no better way to clear this difficulty, runs to a Myſtery in it; and *makes it a great Part of the Myſteriouſneſs of Faith, that although it doth not clearly ſee its Object, nor the things revealed, yet it receives it by its own Light; and this Act of Faith*, he ſaith is wholly Supernatural, he might have ſaid, unintelligible. But he gives an admirable Reaſon for it, which is, *that this intrinſecally follows from the nature of a divine Teſtimony, as it is altogether infallible, and can oblige to believe thoſe things which God ſpeaks, as infallible; for in ſpeaking any thing he thereby declares his own Veracity in what he affirms; for by this means he induces Men to believe the Truth of what he ſaith, and conſequently his own Veracity; a Man being obliged to believe the Teſtimony infallible, and therefore from the intrinſecal Nature of ſuch an Act of Faith and ſuch an Object, it follows that the ſame Teſtimony which ſuffices for Belief of the thing revealed, will likewiſe ſuffice to believe God's infallible Veracity in revealing.* This Reaſon I grant is very well accommodated to the Myſteriouſneſs of Faith; but I do not know how it would ſatisfie any Man that ſhould doubt of God's Veracity in all his Revelations: Which ought to be the more conſidered, ſince in the foregoing Section he names ſome of their own Writers, who aſſert *that there is no intrinſecal Evil in a Falſity, and God may, if he pleaſes, reveal one ſo as to oblige Mankind to believe it!* I would willingly know then how the Obligation on our Parts to believe what God ſaith, can ſatisfie any Man of the infallible Veracity of the Revealer? For all that there is in this Reaſon, is, that God cannot oblige Men to believe a Falſity, which it ſeems ſome of their own School-men would not yield to. *But is it not enough, that God hath declared he never will do it?* no: *Suarez* himſelf plainly refutes that, by ſaying, *that no Man can be certain that God doth not make uſe of his abſolute Power in thoſe Declarations:* And if he can tell a Lie, he may not perform his own Promiſe, and therefore God's ordinary Power cannot ſerve the turn, ſince by his abſolute Power he can act againſt it. *Cardinal Lugo*, although he ſaw all the Reaſon in the World to reject the former Opinion of *Suarez*, yet he aſſerts, *That the Aſſent to God's Veracity muſt be ſupernatural, and elicited from the habit of infuſed Faith:* Which is not eaſie to underſtand, ſince they all make this ſupernatural infuſed Faith, to be an obſcure inevident Aſſent, and himſelf grants this to be an evident Aſſent from natural Reaſon: But how the ſame Aſſent ſhould be evident and inevident, is a Queſtion fit to be debated among the School-men.

Lugo *de virtute Fidei Divinæ, Diſp.* 1. *Sect.* 7. *n.* 114.

Sect. 6. *n.* 82.

Suarez *de Fide Diſp.* 3. *Sect.* 6. *n.* 8.

Sect. 5 *n* 9.

Lugo *ib.*

Of the notion of Divine Faith.

Sect. 3. But all this Perplexity and Confuſion among Men of Wit and Subtilty, ariſes from their falſe Notion of *divine and ſupernatural Faith* which, as *E. W.* moſt Scholaſtically ſpeaks, *eſſentially tending obſcurely to its Object*, (like a blind Man running at Tilt) it makes them ſo much afraid of the leaſt Creviſe of Light or Evidence, leſt the *Meritoriouſneſs* of it be utterly deſtroyed. For it infinitely obliges God in their Opinion to believe without Evidence. Therefore though a *humane and acquiſite Faith*, ſuch as Hereticks may have, may be grounded on ſubſtantial Reaſon; yet this *ſupernatural and meritorious Faith*, much like a Mole, works without Light, and expects the more Wages for working in the dark. I confeſs this *Obſcurity of Faith* ſuits very well with their Diſcourſes about it; which, as *E. W.* ſpeaks, ſeems to have *transfuſed* its

Obſcurity into their Writings concerning it. But for us to whom they will only allow *a humane Faith*, I wiſh they would afford a little more *Evidence* for what they ſay; and not overthrow the fundamental ground of all certainty of Faith, by deriving the Perſwaſion of it from divine Revelation, and not from the natural Conceptions we have of God. But I cannot but commend one of their late School-men, who yields, *That the Veracity of God as it is the foundation of Faith, muſt be known by natural Light*; and to the Objection, that divine Faith muſt then be reſolved into a natural Aſſent; he anſwers. 1. *That natural Notices may be an inadæquate formal Object of Faith.* 2. *That Faith properly goes not beyond a Teſtimony; the other being rather an Act of Knowledge than Faith.* It is all one to me, ſo the things be granted, by what Name Men call it; That which I aim at, is, that the Veracity of God which is the Fouudation of our Aſſent to what God reveals, muſt be received antecedently to divine Revelation. And ſo the Principles of natural Religion muſt be ſuppoſed true, before it is poſſible for us to judge of revealed Religion; and among thoſe Principles we muſt allow of the Veracity of God, without which we cannot imagine any *firm Aſſent* to be given *to divine Revelation*: Which is that I underſtand by the Name of Faith. Wherein a divine Teſtimony being implied, that Aſſent which I give to any thing as true upon the account thereof, may be called divine Teſtimony; but if that humane Teſtimony at laſt leads me to that which is divine, then the Faith muſt receive its Denomination from that which it reſts upon. As ſuppoſe ſome Perſons in *Perſia* at the time of our Saviour's being at *Judæa*, had been made acquainted with the Doctrine which he Preached, and the Holineſs of his Life, while theſe Perſons received all only upon the Credit of their Friends, we may call this a humane Faith; but if they were fully ſatisfied afterwards of the mighty Works which were done by him to atteſt his divine Commiſſion, on which account they believe him to be the true *Meſſias*, their Faith might now more properly be called a divine Faith, becauſe it fixeth it ſelf upon an immediate Teſtimony of God. But then we are to conſider,

Franciſc. bonæ Spei To.3Tr.1. *de fide.* diſp. 1. dub. 2.

1. That there is no fixed and determinate ſenſe of a divine Faith; it being no Term uſed in Scripture, but taken up by Men to expreſs thereby the difference between the Aſſent we give to the Word of God, and to the Teſtimony of Men. But then this Faith may be called divine, either as it relates to the material Object, or the formal Object, or the divine Effects of Faith; that Faith may be ſaid to be divine in one Senſe, which may not be in another. For a Man may believe that which God reveals, and upon the account of his Teſtimony, and yet that Faith may never operate effectually; and ſo be no Effect of divine Grace on the Mind of Man. Therefore one of the great Miſtakes of the School-men in this matter, hath been the making the Belief upon a divine Teſtimony, to be the Act of divine and ſupernatural Faith, which the Devils and *Judas* might have; and excluding Faith built upon fallible grounds from being divine, which yet might effectually lead Men to the Obedience of Faith, and conſequently was truly more divine than the other.

2. The ſame Faith in ſeveral reſpects may be called both humane and divine. Humane, as it is firſt grounded upon the Teſtimony of Men; and Divine, as it finally reſts upon the Teſtimony of God. And in the preſent condition of Mankind, it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that any Faith ſhould now immediately reſt upon the divine Revelation of it, or it muſt be conveyed to them by the Credit of Others. Which accord-

ing to this Notion can beget only a humane Faith: For to reſolve the Belief of one divine Teſtimony into another, is to proceed without end; but this humane Faith, if it be ſo called, ſatisfying a Man's Mind, concerning the Teſtimony which God gave, and thereupon aſſenting to what was delivered upon that Teſtimony, this Faith proceeding in the ſame way of rational Evidence, becomes a divine Faith, by reſting upon the Teſtimony which God gave to thoſe who declared his Will.

3. The Faith whereby we muſt firſt embrace a divine Revelation, cannot in this ſenſe be called a divine Faith, *i. e.* as divine Faith doth rely upon a divine Teſtimony. For that Faith is built upon thoſe two Foundations, *viz.* *That whatever God ſaith is true, and that this is his Revelation*: Now neither of theſe two can be entertained at firſt on the account of a divine Teſtimony: The firſt I have ſhewed already cannot be without a Circle, neither can the ſecond; for ſtill the Queſtion will return on what account you believe that Teſtimony. So that although this be commonly called an Act of divine Faith, yet if Faith be taken in this ſtrict Senſe for believing upon a divine Teſtimony, we muſt find out ſome other Name for this Aſſent, not thereby to take off from the certainty or excellency of it, but to prevent that Confuſion, which the not obſerving theſe things hath cauſed in theſe Controverſies. And if the Terms of Divine, Supernatural, Infallible, Obſcure and Inevident, were baniſhed the Schools, the School-men themſelves would be forced to ſpeak Senſe in theſe matters. And 'twould be a pleaſant ſight to ſee how pitifully *E. W*'s Diſcourſes would look without them: For the main force of all he ſaith, lies in the miſapplying thoſe Terms; and the rattling Noiſe they make, is apt to keep in awe a vulgar Underſtanding, eſpecially that hath been bred up with ſome more than ordinary Reverence to theſe aſtoniſhing Terms.

The true State of the Queſtion.

Sect. 4. Theſe things were neceſſary to be premiſed before we could come to the true State of the Queſtion; which we now plainly ſee doth not relate to that Aſſent wereby we believe whatever God ſaith to be true, but to that, whereby we believe this particular Revelation contained in the Scriptures to be from God? And ſo the Controverſie is brought to this Iſſue, *Whether in order to the certainty of our Faith concerning God's Revelation, an infallible Teſtimony of the Church be neceſſary?* which he affirms, and I deny: For in order to the certainty of Faith, we have already ſeen, he frequently aſſerts the neceſſity of an Infallible Oracle; and makes all degrees of certainty, ſhort of Infallibility, inſufficient for Divine Faith.

But that we may the better underſtand his Opinion, we muſt take notice of his own Explications of it, and the Diſtinctions he thinks neceſſary for that end.

Reaſon and Religion. *Diſcourſ.* 3. c. n. 1. 8.

1. *He diſtinguiſheth between the Judgment of Credibility neceſſary to Faith, and the Act of Faith it ſelf; and the Reſolution of theſe two, though they have a due Subordination to each other, yet depend upon quite different Principles: The Judgment of Credibility, whereby the Will moves and commands the intellectual Faculty to elicit Faith, relies not upon that Object which finally terminates Faith it ſelf, but upon extrinſecal Motives which perſwade and powerfully induce to believe* ſuper omnia.

2. *He diſtinguiſheth between the Nature of Science and Faith; Science is worth nothing unleſs it prove; and Faith purely conſidered as Faith,* (theſe Words *he deſires may be well marked*) *is worthleſs if it prove. For Faith reaſons not, nor asks how theſe Myſteries can be, but ſimply believes:* Or, as he expreſſeth

Proteſt. without Principles *Diſc.* 1. c. 11. n. 2.

preſſeth it in his former Book; *Faith ſolely relies on God's revealed Teſtimony without the mixture of Reaſon for its Motive.* And here he aſſerts, *That there is a more firm Adheſion to the Infallibility of that divine Teſtimony for which we believe, than the extrinſecal Motives inducing to believe, either do or can draw from us.*

3. *He diſtinguiſheth between the humane and divine Authority of the Church; the humane Authority, being as ſuch fallible, is not ſufficient to ground divine Faith. But the firſt Act of Faith whereby every one believes the Church to be God's Oracle, is built upon her infallible divine Authority manifeſted by Miracles and other ſignal marks of Truth.* By the help of theſe Diſtinctions we may better underſtand his Reſolution of Faith, which he delivers in this Manner. *Demanded why we believe the Myſtery of the Incarnation, it is anſwered, Scripture aſſerts it. Ask again why we believe the Divinity of that Book called Scripture? It is anſwered, the Church aſcertains us of that. But how do we know that the Church herein delivers Truth? It is anſwered, if we ſpeak of Knowledge previous to Faith:* Then he brings *the Motives of Credibility, which make the Church's Infallibility ſo evidently credible, that we cannot, if prudent and manifeſt reaſon guide us, but as firmly believe whatever this Oracle teaches, as the* Iſraelites *believed* Moſes *and the Prophets.* This one would think were enough of all conſcience; but he thinks otherwiſe; *for there is*, ſaith he, *but one only difference and that advantageous to them, that in lieu of* Moſes, *they have an ample Church; innumerable Multitudes in the place of one Servant of God, the incomparable greater Light, the Pillar and Ground of Truth, the Catholick Church diffuſed the whole World over:* And a little after aſſerts, *That they have the very ſame way of Reſolving Faith, which the Primitive Chriſtians had in the the Time of Chriſt and his Appoſtles.* Here is enough aſſerted, if it could be proved.

N. 6, 7.

My firſt Argument laid down and defended.

Sect. 5. Againſt this way, laid down by my firſt Adverſary *T. C.* I objected theſe three Things, 1. That it was unreaſonable. 2. That it did not avoid the main Difficulties. 3. That it was notoriouſly falſe; theſe three ways of attacking it, (of which a ſhort Account is given in the Entrance of this Diſcourſe,) I muſt now more largely defend.

I ſhewed this way to be unreaſonable: And that upon theſe Grounds,

1. Becauſe the Aſſent is hereby required beyond all Proportion or Degree of Evidence; for the Act of Faith being according to *E. W. an infallible Aſſent*; and no other Grounds aſſigned for it beſides the Motives of Credibility; he muſt make an infallible Aſſent only upon fallible Grounds. And it is not ſufficient to ſay, that the Infallibility of the Church's Teſtimony makes the Aſſent Infallible; for Aſſent is not according to the objective Certitude of things, but the Evidence of them to our Underſtanding. For is it poſſible to aſſent to the Truth of a Demonſtration in a demonſtrative manner; becauſe any Mathematician tells one the thing is demonſtrable? For in that caſe the Aſſent is not according to the Evidence of the thing, but according to the Opinion ſuch a Perſon hath of him, who tells him it is demonſtrable. Nay, ſuppoſing that Perſon infallible in ſaying ſo, yet if the other hath no means to be Infallibly aſſured that he is ſo, his Aſſent is as doubtful as if he were not Infallible: Therefore ſuppoſing the Teſtimony of the Roman Church to be really Infallible, yet ſince the means of believing it are but probable and prudential, the Aſſent cannot be according to the Nature of the Teſtimony conſidered in it ſelf, but according to the Reaſons which induce me to

believe ſuch a Teſtimony infallible. And in all ſuch Caſes, where I believe one thing for the ſake of another, my Aſſent to the Object believed, is according to my Aſſent to the Medium on which I believe it. As our Light is not according to the Light in the Body of the Sun, but that which preſſeth on our Organs of Senſe. So that ſuppoſing their Church's Teſtimony to be infallible in it ſelf, if one may be deceived in judging whether it be infallible or no, one may be deceived in ſuch things which he believes on that ſuppoſed Infallibility. It being impoſſible, that the Aſſent to the matters of Faith, ſhould riſe higher, or ſtand firmer than the Aſſent to the Teſtimony upon which thoſe things are believed. But now to prove the Church's Infallibility, they make uſe only of the Motives of Credibility, which themſelves grant can be the foundation only of a fallible Aſſent. This was the reaſon I then urged, I muſt now conſider what *E. W.* ſaith in anſwer to it. And the force of his Anſwer lies in theſe Things.

1. *That all this proceeds from ignorance of the nature of Faith, which Diſcourſes not like to Science. For he grants that the Article of Faith which concerns God's Revelation cannot be proved by another believed Article of Faith wholly as obſcure to us as that is; for that would proceed* in infinitum; *therefore all rational Proofs that avail to beget Faith in any, muſt of neceſſity be extrinſecal to Belief, and lie as it were in another Region more clear, yet leſs certain than the revealed Myſtery is, we Aſſent to by Faith. And ſo in that Article of Faith, the Church is God's infallible Oracle,* he ſaith, *that antecedently to Faith it cannot be proved by Arguments as obſcure and of the ſame infallible Certainty with Faith, for then Faith would be ſuperfluous; or rather we ſhould believe by a firm and infallible Aſſent, before we do believe on the Motive of God's infallible Revelation, which is impoſſible. So that that the extrinſecal Motives of Faith whereby the Church's Infallibility, is proved independently on Scripture, are not of the ſame Certainty with ſupernatural Faith it ſelf, and only prove the evident Credibility either of the Scripture or the Church.* Diſc. 3. c. n. 3, 4.

2. *That the force of this Argument will hold againſt our ſelves, and thoſe who believed in the Apoſtles times, whoſe infallible Aſſent of Faith doth as much exceed all proportion or degree of Evidence, as theirs does in believing the Church's Infallibility on the Motives of Credibility.*

In order to the giving a clear and diſtinct Anſwer, it will be neceſſary to enquire 1. What thoſe Acts of Faith are, we now Diſcourſe of? 2. What influence the Motives of Credibility have upon them?

2. For the Acts of Faith, there are two aſſigned by *E. W.* 1. That whereby Men believe the Scripture to be the Word of God. 2. That whereby Men believe the Church to be infallible: both theſe he acknowledges are *Articles of Faith, and to be believed with an infallible Aſſent.* But here mark the ſhuffling: the firſt of theſe cannot be believed, but by an infallible Teſtimony, *viz. of the Church*; for that end the Church's Infallibility is made neceſſary, that the Faith may be *divine* and *infallible, becauſe divine Faith can reſt only upon infallible Teſtimony*; but then in the other Act of Faith, whereby the Church's Infallibility is believed, we hear no more of this infallible Teſtimony; becauſe then it is impoſſible to avoid the Circle. I propoſe therefore this Dilemma to *E. W.* Either it is neceſſary to every Act of divine Faith to have an infallible Teſtimony, or it is not: if it be not neceſſary, then there is no neceſſity of aſſerting the Church's Infallibility in order to believing the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and ſo the Cauſe is

gained; if it be neceſſary, then the Faith whereby the Church's Infallibility is believed, muſt have ſuch a divine Teſtimony; and ſo either a proceſs *in infinitum*, or a Circle are unavoidable by him. If he conſidered this, and yet writ two ſuch Books to prove the neceſſity of Infallibility in order to Faith, he betrays too much Inſincerity for a Man to deal with him; if he did not, he need not complain ſo much of others Ignorance, he may eaſily find enough nearer home. And therefore all the fault of theſe Men does not lie barely in making the Aſſent to be more certain than the Motives of Faith; but in requiring ſo ſtrictly in one Act of Faith a proportionable Certainty to the Aſſent, and not in another. For what is there, I beſeech *E. W.* in believing the Church's Infallibility, which ſhould not make it as neceſſary for that to be ſupported by an infallible Teſtimony, as that whereby we believe the divine Revelation? *If Faith hath no grounds, and doth not Diſcourſe as Science doth*, then I hope the Caſe is alike in both, and ſo the neceſſity of an infallible Teſtimony muſt be affirmed of the one, or equally denyed in the other.

But he ſeems to Aſſert, *That Faith whatever Object it reſpects, doth not Diſcourſe as Science doth; but ſolely relies on God's revealed Teſtimony without the mixture of Reaſon.* Grant this at preſent, but then I hope both theſe Acts of Faith equally do ſo; and ſtill the Church's Infallibility cannot be made neceſſary to Faith; for if Faith immediately relies on God's Teſtimony, what need any other to aſcertain it? or any other Propoſition, than ſuch as is ſufficient to make known the Object of Faith, to which End no Infallibility in the Proponent is neceſſary. Any more than it is neceſſary for the Act of Love toward a deſirable Object, that he that ſhews a Beauty ſhould be infallible in the Deſcription of her. If all the neceſſity of the Church's Propoſition be no more, *than* *to convey the divine Teſtimony to us*, as *E. W.* ſometimes implies, let him take pains to a little better purpoſe, in proving that ſuch a *conditio applicans*, as he calls it, muſt have Infallibility belonging to it. For Infallibility is then only neceſſary, when it is relied upon, and is the ground of Believing, and not where it is a meer condition of Underſtanding. If a Prince ſends an Ambaſſadour about a Match to a foreign Princeſs, declaring that he will wholly rely upon his Teſtimony of her, in this Caſe there needs the greateſt Judgment and Veracity in the Perſon truſted; becauſe the Prince reſolves his Judgment into his Ambaſſadour's Teſtimony; but if he only imploys a Perſon to bring her into the Room where he may ſee and judge of her himſelf, in this Caſe there is no neceſſity of any other quality than only Obedience and Fidelity. So we ſay as to the Church; if the Church's Teſtimony is to be relied upon as the Foundation of our Belief of the Scriptures, then it is neceſſary the Church ſhould be infallible if there can be no Faith without ſuch a Teſtimony; but if all the Office of the Church be only to propoſe the Object of Faith to be viewed and conſidered by us, then a common Veracity may be ſufficient for it. And in this Caſe I grant, Faith is not to be reſolved into the condition of applying the Object of Faith; any more than Love is into the Light whereby a Man ſees Beauty, or the burning of Fire into the laying near of the Fuel: But if it be Aſſerted that there can be no divine Faith without an infallible Teſtimony, that, this Teſtimony is that of the Church, and therefore upon this infallible Teſtimony we muſt build our Faith, he is blind that doth not ſee in this Caſe that it it muſt be reſolved into this infallible Teſtimony,

Diſc. 3. 4. 1. 18.

ny. And therefore *E.W.* very impertinently Charges me with this conſtant Error, *viz. making the Motives of Faith the Foundation of it, and that hereby I confound the Judgment of Credibility with the Aſſent of Faith; by making the infallible Teſtimony of the Church to thoſe who believe it, the formal Object of Faith.* For although the common Motives of Faith ſhould do no more than make the Object of Faith appear evidently Credible, and ſo the Faith of ſuch Perſons be reſolved into a further Reaſon than thoſe Motives; yet they who do believe upon the account of the Infallibility of the Church's Teſtimony, muſt reſolve their Faith into that, which to them is the only, and infallible, and adæquate Ground of Faith. *Ib. n.* 19.

Sect. 6. To lay open the Foundation of all theſe Miſtakes, about the nature of Faith, I ſhall inquire into the influence which the Motives of Credibility have upon believing. And therein give an account of theſe things. 1. What the Motives of Credibility are? 2. How far they are neceſſary to Faith? 3. What influence they have upon the Aſſent of Faith?

Of the Motives of Credibility; and their influence on Faith.

1. What theſe Motives of Credibility are? *Suarez* brings them under four Heads.

1. From the Qualities of the Chriſtian Doctrine; and thoſe are, 1. Its Truth without any mixture of Falſhood; but, ſaith he, if there be many things true, and ſome falſe, it is a ſufficient ſign that Doctrine is not from God, as it was among the Philoſophers of Old. The way to judge of this Quality he thus lays down; thoſe things which the Chriſtian Religion ſpeaks of, which may be known by natural Light, are very agreeable to the common reaſon of Mankind, thoſe other things which are above it, are not repugnant to any Principle of it, but agreeable to the infinite and incomprehenſible Majeſty of God. 2. The Sanctity and Purity of this Doctrine, as appears by the Excellency of the Precepts of it; the moral Precepts are not only agreeable to the Law of Nature, but tend much to the improvement of it; the ſpiritual Precepts have nothing contrary to the Rules of Morality, and are ſuitable to the Perfections of the divine Nature. 3. The Efficacy of it, which is ſeen by the ſtrange and Miraculous ways of its Propagation, by ſuch Inſtruments as were never like to effect their deſign without a divine Power.

Suarez *de fide diſp.* 4. *ſect.* 3.

2. The ſecond Motive is, from the Number of Witneſſes; of the whole Trinity at the Baptiſm of Chriſt, of Chriſt himſelf in his holy and innocent Life, of *Moſes* and the Prophets before him, of the Apoſtles after him, of the Devils themſelves, of the multitude of Martyrs of all kinds of ſuffering with ſo much Patience and Courage, and Chriſtian Religion increaſing by it.

3. From the Teſtimony God gave to the Truth of it; by the Miracles which were wrought in Confirmation of the Doctrine preached, in which ought to be conſidered the Nature, the Effects, the Frequency, the manner of Working them, and the End for which they were wrought, which muſt be, not meerly for the benefit of the Perſon on whom they are wrought, but for a Teſtimony to the Truth of the Doctrine delivered; otherwiſe he grants a Deceiver may work Miracles.

4. From the Continuance of this Doctrine in the World, being ſo hard to believe the Doctrine and Practice the Precepts of it; meeting with ſuch multitudes of Enemies of all kinds; out of all which the

Credibility

Greg. *de Valent. Tom.* 3. *diſp.* 1. *q.* 1. *punct.* 4. Medina *de rectâ in Deum fide l.* 2.

Crediblity of the Chriſtian Religion may be demonſtrated, a divine Providence being ſuppoſed to take care of the Affairs of Mankind. *Greg. de Valentiâ* reckons up theſe Motives to 19. *Michael Medina* follows *Scotus* and makes 10. or 11. of them: on which he largely inſiſts, *viz.* the fulfilling of Propheſies, the Conſent of Scriptures, their Authority and Truth, the care and diligence of the firſt Chriſtians in examining the Doctrine of Chriſtianity, the Excellency of it in all its Parts, the Propagation of it in the World, the Miracles wrought for the Confirmation of it, the Teſtimony of Enemies, the Juſtice of Providence, and the Deſtruction of its Adverſaries. To the ſame purpoſe *Cardinal Lugo* and others of the *School-men* make an Enumeration of theſe Motives of Credibility; but a late *Jeſuit* hath reduced them all to the four chief Attributes of God. His Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Power and Providence, but inlarges upon them much in the ſame way that *Suarez* had done. Thus much may ſuffice for underſtanding what theſe Motives of Credibility are: Which are acknowledged to make up a Demonſtration for the Credibility of the Chriſtian Religion.

Lugo *de fide diſp.* 5. *ſect.* 4. Franciſ. Valent. *Concordia juris Pontificii cum* Cæſareo *part* 1. *q.* 1. *ſect.* 6.

Suarez. *de* Fide *diſp.* 4. *ſect.* 2. *n.* 3.

2. How far theſe are neceſſary to Faith? For that we are to conſider that Faith being an Aſſent of the rational Faculty in Man, muſt proceed upon ſuch grounds as may juſtifie that Aſſent to be a rational Act: Which cannot be, unleſs ſufficient reaſon appear to induce the Mind to Aſſent, which reaſon appearing, is all one with the Credibility of the Object; which doth not imply here what may be believed either with or without reaſon, but what all Circumſtances conſidered, ought to be believed by every prudent Perſon. And in this Senſe, *Suarez* aſſerts *the neceſſity of the Evidence of Credibility to the Act of Faith: For,* ſaith he, *it is not enough, that the Object of Faith be propoſed as revealed by God; but it is neceſſary that it be propoſed with ſuch Circumſtances, as make it appear prudently credible in that way it is propoſed. For levity of Judgment and raſhneſs of Aſſent he makes inconſiſtent with divine Faith; and every Man ought ſo to believe as to exclude all fear of the contrary, and ſo as that he can never prudently disbelieve what he now believes; but if a Man believes upon bad grounds, he may afterwards prudently reject thoſe grounds.* But this is not all; for he makes ſuch a Propoſition of the Object of Faith neceſſary, whereby *it appears evidently credible as revealed by God, and conſequently as certain and infallible.* For which he gives this reaſon; *becauſe an inclination of the Will to Aſſent muſt precede the Aſſent of Faith, before which there muſt be a Judgment determining that Act of the Will; this Judgment muſt either be certain, or uncertain; if uncertain, it is not ſufficient for divine Faith; if it be certain, then there muſt be ſuch an evidence of Credibility in the Object of Faith. And although a practical Certainty as to matters of humane Faith may be ſufficiently founded upon a judgment of Probability, i. e.* a Man may judge it fit for him to believe where he ſees only a greater probability on one ſide than of the other, *yet in matters of divine Faith a higher Judgment than of meer probability, is neceſſary,* viz. *that which is founded upon the evidence of Credibility; for with a meer probability a prudent doubting is conſiſtent, which is not with divine Faith; and withal the certainty of Faith is not meerly practical, but ſpeculative, i. e.* of the Truth of the thing in it ſelf, and therefore requires a ſpeculative Evidence of the Credibility of the Object. From whence he concludes, *that a bare Credibility is not ſufficient, but a greater Credibility of the Doctrine believed than of any other contrary to it;* for if two Doctrines appear equally credible, there can be only a doubtful Aſſent given to one of

them: And a Man might chuſe which he would believe: But in the Aſſent of Faith it is not only neceſſary that there be a greater Credibility of one Doctrine than of the other; but that this be evident to natural Reaſon: Which dictates that in Matters of Salvation, that Doctrine is to be believed which appears more evidently credible than any other. To the ſame purpoſe Cardinal *Lugo* determines, *That the Will cannot command a prudent Aſſent of Faith, where there precedes only a probable judgment of the Credibility of the Object; becauſe there muſt be the apprehenſion of a certain Obligation to believe, which muſt ariſe from the Evidence of Credibility in the Object of Faith.* And *Aquinas* himſelf had determin'd, *That no Man would believe, unleſs he ſaw that the things were to be believed, either for the Evidence of Miracles, or ſomething of a like Nature:* Which *Cajetan* interprets of *believing truly and vertuouſly: truly,* i. e. *without fear of the contrary, and vertuouſly,* i. e. *prudently.* So that although Men may raſhly and indiſcreetly believe Things without ſufficient Evidence of their Credibility, yet no Man can by the acknowledgement of the moſt learned of the Schoolmen, yield a rational and prudent Aſſent of Faith without it.

N. 7.

Lugo *de virt. fidei divinæ, diſp.* 5. *ſect.* 1. *n.* 21.

Aquin. 2. 2. *qa.* 1. *art.* 4.

Cajet. *in loc.*

3. The main thing is to conſider what influence the Evidence of Credibility hath upon the Act of Faith? For *E. W.* aſſerts, *That all that reſults from thence is only a Judgment of Credibility; but that the Act of Faith it ſelf relies wholly upon other Principles:* And by the help of the diſtinction of theſe two he labours to avoid the force of my Arguments. Thus then the Matter ſtands; It is agreed, that Faith muſt have rational Proofs antecedent to it; but theſe Proofs, he muſt ſay, do not perſuade Men to believe; or, which is all one, have no influence upon the Act of Faith. If all that were meant by this Talk were only this, that we are then ſaid properly to believe when we fix our Aſſent upon God's Teſtimony, but that all Acts of the Mind ſhort of this, may not properly be called Believing, but by ſome other Name; this would preſently appear to be a Controverſie about Words, which I perfectly hate. But more muſt be underſtood by ſuch Men as *E. W.* or elſe they do not ſpeak at all to the purpoſe; for the Queſtion is, whether in requiring an infallible Aſſent of Faith to the Church's Infallibility, upon Motives confeſſedly fallible, an Aſſent be not requir'd beyond all proportion or degree of Evidence? To this he anſwers, *That this Argument proceeds upon Ignorance of the Nature of Faith, which doth not diſcourſe as Science doth: And he grants that the Motives of Credibility have not the certainty that Faith hath.* What then can hence follow, but that Faith is an unreaſonable Aſſent, and hath no Grounds; or that it may be ſtronger than the Grounds it proceeds upon? But if it appear, that Faith muſt have Grounds, and that the Aſſent of Faith can be no ſtronger than the Grounds are, then it follows that they are very unreaſonable in requiring an infallible Aſſent of Faith to the Church's Infallibility barely upon the Motives of Credibility.

Of the Grounds of Faith.

Sect. 7. 1. That Faith muſt have Grounds. If a Man had not to deal with Perſons who have confounded their own Underſtandings with an appearance of Subtility, one would think this as needleſs a task, as to prove that Man is a reaſonable Creature; for if Faith be an Aſſent of the Mind, taking it as ſtrictly and properly as they pleaſe, it muſt have the Nature of a rational Act; which it cannot have unleſs it proceeds upon reaſonable Grounds. The Grounds I grant are different in ſeveral Aſſents, but it muſt always have ſome. Thoſe which are accounted the moſt immediate Aſſents, have the cleareſt and moſt evident Reaſon, ſuch as the Aſſents to firſt Principles are; as, that the whole is greater than the part, &c. and for Concluſions drawn from them, the readineſs and firmneſs of the Aſſent is proportionable to the Evidence of their Connexion with thoſe Principles from whence they are drawn. In other Things that depend upon the Evidence of Senſe, the Reaſon of our Aſſent to the truth of them, is from the ſuppoſition of the truth of our Faculties; and that we are ſo framed as not to be impoſed upon, in Matters that are ſo plainly, and with due Circumſtances, convey'd to our Minds by the Organs of Senſe. But if there appear an Evidence of Reaſon overthrowing the certainty of Senſe, *Scepticiſm* immediately follows, and the ſuſpenſion of all Aſſent to the truth of Things convey'd by our Senſes; for no Man can then be certain of any thing by the Evidence of Senſe, but only of the *Appearance* of Things. I may be certain, that Things do appear with ſuch difference of Colours, and Taſtes, and Smells; but I cannot be certain that there are really ſuch differences in the Things themſelves. If therefore the *Scepticks* Arguments ſhould prevail upon any Man's Mind ſo far, as to make him queſtion whether Senſe be a certain *Medium* to convey the truth of the Things to his Mind, it is impoſſible that Man ſhould yield a firm Aſſent to the truth of any thing on the account of the Evidence of Senſe. So that ſtill Aſſent proceeds upon the Grounds of Reaſon, which ſatisfie the Mind, that all Circumſtances conſider'd, it ought not to ſuſpend any longer. Let us now conſider ſuch Things which are not ſo evident of themſelves, nor convey'd by our Senſes; and unleſs we diſtruſt all Mankind, we have reaſon to believe ſome Things to be which we never ſaw our ſelves; and this is the ground of that we call believing; which is nothing elſe, but *taking truth upon truſt*; or receiving a Thing as true upon ſuch Teſtimony as I ſee no reaſon to queſtion. If I ſee any Reaſon to doubt either the Skill or Fidelity of thoſe Perſons upon whoſe Credit I am to rely; it is impoſſible for me firmly to believe upon their Authority; if I ſee none, then on that account I believe what they ſay; wherein it is as evident that my Aſſent is according to the Grounds I proceed upon, as that two and two make four. What is it then that hath thus confounded theſe Mens Minds, to make them to contend that the Act of Divine Faith is of ſuch a Nature, that nothing like it is to be found in any other Act of the Mind? Muſt we ceaſe to be Men by being Chriſtians? Or, where the ſtrongeſt Reaſon is moſt neceſſary, muſt there be none at all? To what end then were their Arguments ever uſed to perſuade Men to believe Chriſtianity? Were thoſe Arguments able to perſuade Men or not? If they were, then Men did believe upon the ſtrength of thoſe Arguments; and is it poſſible for Men to believe upon the ſtrength of Arguments, and yet thoſe Arguments have no influence upon the Act of Faith? This is horrible Nonſenſe, and fit only for thoſe to write who believe Contradictions; for ſuch an Act of Faith indeed can have no reaſon for it. But to come cloſer yet to our Matter: *The Church's Infallibility is to be believed*, ſaith E. W. *with Divine Faith*: Is there any ground for that Act of Faith, or not? If there be none, ſhew what Obligation to believe there can be, where there is no Ground for it: If there be, I deſire to know, whether they are able to perſuade me or not; if not, ſhew then why I ought to believe on inſufficient Grounds; if they be, may not I believe upon thoſe

Grounds? And if I do, doth not that Act of Faith rely upon thoſe Grounds? Beſides, of thoſe who plead for the neceſſity of the Church's Infallibility, I deſire to know on what account they do it? Is it not, that Faith may have a ſufficient Foundation to be built upon, which in their Opinion cannot be without ſuch Infallibility? And yet after all this, muſt not Faith ſtand upon this Ground? Why then are *Scotus*, *Durand*, *Gabriel*, *Medina*, and others, charged by ſome of the Roman Church with *reſolving Faith into the Church's Teſtimony*? What is this elſe but only to make the Church s Teſtimony the Ground of Faith? Nay, why are there any Diſputes at all about the formal Object of Faith? For the formal Object is nothing but the Reaſon of believing; and what account can we give of the Reaſon of believing, if there be none at all? But it may be, all this while, I miſtake my profound Adverſary, it being hardly poſſible that a Man of common Senſe ſhould write ſuch Stuff. To prevent any Suſpicion of this Nature, I ſhall lay down his Aſſertions in his own Words; from ſeveral places of his worthy Works. "Faith ſolely relies on God's revealed Teſtimony, without the mixture of Reaſon for its Motive; the previous Motives well pondered, bring with them an Obligation to believe, and not Faith it ſelf. *For*, Faith reaſons not, but ſimply believes: Faith, contrary to Science, goes beyond the Certainty of all extrinſecal Inducements." And afterwards, where he attempts to anſwer *the main Difficulty*, as he calls it, in the Reſolution of Faith, (which in ſhort is, ſince the Motives of Credibility ſeem to leave the Matter doubtful what that is, which determines the Aſſent to the Objects of Faith as infallibly true?) waving at preſent that Anſwer, "That it is from the Command of the Will, *he ſeems* to attribute ſo great an Evidence to the Motives of Credibility, that they do infallibly prove the Truth of Divine Revelation, there being an inſeparable Connexion between the Motives and Divine Revelation"; but then he ſtarts another Objection, *viz.* that the Revelation muſt appear evident, and ſo Faith would be evident; to which he anſwers "by denying the Conſequence; becauſe this Aſſent is Science and not Faith. Now this Evidence ariſing from the Motive of Credibility, Faith, *ſaith he*, as Faith, leaves, or lays aſide, and firmly adheres to the Divine Revelation only for it ſelf, as contradiſtinct both from the Moral Evidence of the Motives, and their apparent Connexion with the Revelation. The Reaſon is taken, *ſaith he*, from the Notion of Faith, which eſſentially tends obſcurely upon its own Object, as the moſt ancient Fathers aſſert. From whence it is clear, *if you believe him*, that no Evidence of the Teſtimony aſſented to, can move to Faith; not only becauſe we ſhould, in the Caſe of Evidence, be neceſſitated to believe, but upon this account alſo, that the certitude of Faith, taken from the ſupremeſt Verity, is of a higher ſtrain, and far ſurpaſſes all the Certitude we find in Nature, or in the Motives inducing to believe". But which is more pleaſant, he yet adds, "It is true, the more evident theſe Motives appear, the better they induce to believe; yet for that Reaſon have leſs to do with the very Act of Faith, *which, as he ſaid*, reſts upon, and lays claim to no lower a Verity, than the moſt pure and ſupream only; and if it reſts not here, it is no Faith". And yet after all this, he aſſerts, "That the Evidence of Credibility, apparent in thoſe manifeſt Signs and Marks which illuſtrate true Chriſtanity, is abundantly ſufficient to induce the moſt obdurate Heart in the World to believe with ſuch an Aſſent

Canus, l. 2. c. 8.
Lugo *de virt. fidei, diſp.* 1. *ſect.* 5.

Proteſt. without Principles *diſ.* 1. *c.* 11. *n.* 2.
Reaſon and Religion, *diſ.* 3. *c.* 1. *n.* 10.
C. 8. *N.* 4.

N. 10.

N. 11.

Diſ. 3. *c.* 10. *n.* 7.

“ as ſuits God's great Majeſty, *i. e.* with a Faith moſt firm and infal-“ lible.” Here we have Motives, ſuch Motives as give Evidence of Divine Revelation, ſuch Motives as are ſufficient to induce the moſt obdurate Perſon to an infallible Aſſent of Faith; and yet after all this Evidence by theſe Motives in order to believing; this believing hath nothing to do with them; and the more they induce to believe, the leſs influence they have upon Faith: For that fixeth on the Divine Revelation ſolely for it ſelf, and hath a Certainty beyond that of the greateſt Arguments that are uſed for Believing. He that hath the Faculty of underſtanding theſe Things, ought to oblige Mankind with a clearer diſcovery of them, than *E. W.* hath made; who doth not ſeem to underſtand what he writes himſelf; and therefore it cannot be expected that others ſhould. But the Foundation of all this Nonſenſe, is a ſtrange apprehenſion of the Nature of *Faith*, which the School-Doctrine hath ſo riveted into him, that it ſeems to be of the Nature of a firſt Principle with him, which muſt be ſuppoſed as the Baſis of all his Diſcourſe; which is, that *Faith is an obſcure and inevident Aſſent*, *or that it eſſentially tends obſcurely to its Object*; and therefore no Motives or Arguments, how clear or ſtrong ſoever, can have any influence upon Faith. For he imagines as great an Oppoſition between *Arguments* and *Faith*, as between Light and Darkneſs: He firſt conceives Faith to be a kind of deep Dungeon of the Soul, full of Darkneſs and Obſcurity, and then bids Men have a care of bringing Light into it; for if they do, it ceaſeth to be what he deſcribed it. A Light may ſerve a Man very well to ſhew him the Way to his Dungeon; nay, it may direct him to the very Door; but then farewel to all Light, not the leaſt Creviſe muſt be left to let in any to the Mind that is once enter'd into it: But the Excellency of it is, that the Soul fixes more certainly on its Object in this State of Darkneſs, than it could do being environ'd with the cleareſt Light. Juſt as if a Man ſhould ſay, there is a peculiar way of *ſeeing* with *one's Eyes ſhut*; which is far more admirable and excellent, than all the common Ways of beholding Things; being far more certain and piercing than ſeeing by the help of Eyes and Light, is; for the Light and Sight may both fail in the repreſentation of an Object; but this ſeeing without Eyes is an infallible way to prevent all the Fallacies of Senſe. Much in this way doth *E. W.* talk; for all Arguments are fallible, and therefore by no means muſt Faith proceed upon them. O, but this believing *without*, or *above*, or it may be *againſt Arguments*, is the moſt infallible thing in the World; for that Man need never fear being deceived with Reaſon, that diſowns the uſe of it. Upon theſe Grounds a skilful Painter may make a ſhift to bungle and to draw ſome uneven Strokes by the help of his Pencil and a good Light; but if he would be ſure not to miſs making an excellent Piece, he ought to ſhut his Eyes or darken his Room, for then to be ſure that fallible thing call'd *Light* can never deceive him. An indifferent Perſon that only conſulted the Nature and Reaſon of Things, could never have fallen into theſe Dotages; but it hath been the Intereſt of ſome Men to cry down *Light* that have had *falſe Wares* to put off. But of all things, I wonder if this be the whole Nature of Chriſtian Faith, to believe no Man knows why nor wherefore, (for if he doth, his Faith ceaſeth to be Faith being built upon Reaſon) why all this ado is kept about an infallible Church and Motives of Credibility? Cannot a Man believe without Reaſon at firſt as well as at laſt? Cannot Faith fix upon God's Revelation for it ſelf, without troubling thoſe Motives of Credibility to no purpoſe? If a Man hath a mind to leap blindfold from a Precipice, why cannot he do it without ſo much Ceremony? Muſt he have all his Attendance about him, and his Gentleman Uſher to conduct him to the very brink of the Rock, and there bid him Good-night? If all theſe Motives of Credibility contribute nothing to the Act of Believing, what uſe are they of in ſuch a Religion, where Faith is look'd on as the great Principle of Practice, and the means of Salvation? If the Judgment of Credibility would ſave Men, they might ſtill be uſeful; but this will be by no means allow'd; for nothing in their Opinion, but this *blind Guide* (which they call Faith) can conduct Men to Heaven.

Of the Scripture notion of the obſcurity of Faith.

Sect. 8. But what is it that hath made Men ſo in love with Nonſenſe and Contradictions? Hath the Scripture given any countenance to this Notion of Faith? Yes, doubtleſs; they are ſuch Lovers of Scripture, that they dare not take up any Opinion in theſe Matters without plain Scripture. Then I hope Scripture may be plain in clear Things, if it be ſo in the deſcription of ſo obſcure a Thing as they make Faith to be. But doth not the Scripture ſay, *That Faith is the Subſtance of Things hoped for, and the Evidence of Things not ſeen? And is not this all one as if it had been ſaid, that Faith eſſentially tends obſcurely to its Object, and that it is an inevident Aſſent, and therefore cannot make uſe of Arguments?* This I know is all the pretence they have for this Notion of Faith; but is it not very pretty, becauſe Faith is call'd *an Evidence*, therefore it muſt be *Inevident*; or, to follow the vulgar Latin, becauſe it is call'd an *Argument*, therefore it can uſe *none*? No Man is ſo ſenſeleſs to deny, that we believe Things we do not ſee, and Things which cannot be ſeen. We believe ſome Things which might have been ſeen, and were ſeen by ſome whoſe Credit we rely upon; as the Death and Reſurrection of *Jeſus Chriſt*: We believe other Things which are uncapable of being ſeen by our Senſes, as the Joys of Heaven, and the Torments of Hell; and as to ſuch Things Faith ſupplies the want of the Evidence of Senſe to us; and by it our Minds are aſſured of the Truth of them, tho' we do not, or cannot ſee them. Which is all that is intended by this Deſcription of Faith; but how doth it hence follow that our Faith muſt be an *immediate, inevident, obſcure Aſſent*, on which all the Arguments that perſuade Men to believe, can have no influence? May not I believe that Chriſt died and roſe again, and will come to judge the Quick and the Dead, becauſe I ſee all the Reaſon in the World to perſuade me to believe it, from the Teſtimony of thoſe who ſaw him, and have deliver'd his Doctrine to us, and have given the greateſt Evidence of their Fidelity? Doth the ſtrength of the Argument hinder me at all from believing what I did not ſee? I had rather thought the more obſcure the Object had been, (for it is little better than Nonſenſe to call *an Act of Faith obſcure*), the greater neceſſity there had been of ſtrong Evidence to perſuade a Man to believe. Not ſuch Evidence as doth ariſe from the nature of the Thing; for that is contrary to the obſcurity of the Object; but ſuch as gives the greateſt Reaſon to believe from the Authority of thoſe on whoſe Teſtimony I rely. So that the greateſt clearneſs and evidence as to the Teſtimony, is not repugnant to the Nature of Faith. This only ſhews, that in Chriſtian Religion we do not proceed by meer Evidence of Senſe, or rigorous Demonſtrations, in the Things we aſſent to; but that the great Things

Heb. 11. 1.

we believe are remote from Senſe, and received upon the Authority of the Revealer; yet ſo, as that we aſſert we have as great Evidence that theſe Things were revealed by God, as the Matter was capable of; and ſuch Evidence, we ſay, ought to perſuade any prudent Perſon. This is all which the deſcription of Faith ſo much alledged, doth imply; which was never intended for an accurate Definition of it; for, as *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, ſaith of it, *non indicat quid eſt fides, ſed ſignat quid facit*; it doth not ſhew what Faith is, but what it doth; by making things future and inviſible, to have as great Power and Influence on Mens Minds as if they were preſent and viſible. And when the *Fathers* ſpeak of the obſcurity of Faith, they do not mean an Aſſent without Grounds, but the belief of Things out of our view; and that obſcurity is underſtood by them in compariſon with the Clearneſs of a future State: Or in oppoſition to the way of proving Things by meer Reaſon without Revelation. So Cardinal *Lugo* truly anſwers the Teſtimonies of Fathers to that purpoſe, by ſaying, *That when they exclude Reaſon and Arguments from Faith, they take them as they are oppoſed to Authority; but in as much as they ſuppoſe the Myſteries of Chriſtian Faith to be believed for the ſake of Divine Revelation, a Diſcourſe is thereby implied from the Authority* of God *revealing to the Myſteries believed.* Neither is ſuch *Diſcourſe* only requiſite, but that in the firſt place which doth aſſure Men of the Truth of this Revelation; for upon that, the other muſt proceed. All *Mediums* uſed for the Proof of this, muſt be extrinſecal to the Nature of the Thing, and therefore cannot be repugnant to Faith; and in this I have the conſent of ſome of the moſt learned of the Schoolmen, who make *evidentiam in atteſtante*, as they call it, conſiſtent with Faith.

Lugo *de virtut. fid. Divin. diſ.* 7. *ſect.* 2. *n.* 16.

But ſaith *E. W. No Thanks to thee, poor Creature, to aſſent, hadſt thou Evidence.* This it is now to hope to merit at God's Hands by a blind Faith! for ſo elſewhere he ſaith, *Evidence is incompatible with that* Merit *and Obſequiouſneſs of Faith; which God requires of his rational* Creatures *who are to walk to Heaven by an humble and dutiful Faith.* A very *humble Faith*, certainly that hopes to *merit* by believing! And very *dutiful* in expecting ſo large a Reward for doing it knows not what! We think it our Duty to believe firmly whatever God ſaith; but withal we think it our Duty to enquire carefully, whether God hath ſaid it or no, before we believe: And according to the Evidence we have of this, we aſſent to the former. *But this is not to proceed Nobly with God*, ſaith *E. W.* Brave Man! It hath been reported of a *Hector* in this Town, that a little before his Death he ſaid, *He hoped God would deal with him like a Gentleman:* It ſeems *E. W.* would deal ſo with *God.* We have often heard of Works of Super-erogation; but our *noble E. W.* is not content with them, he will have a *Faith of Super-erogation* too. We poor Creatures are contented to do our Duties, and take it as a great Favour, for God to accept of the beſt we can do: We dare not ſo much as think of ſuch Terms of Kindneſs and Favour from us to God, as *to proceed Nobly with him.* Neither do we believe, that God is ſo hugely pleaſed with the Blind and the Lame, when they are offered in Sacrifice to him. Whatever *E. W.* imagines, it is no ſuch *Noble proceeding* to believe infallibly upon confeſſedly fallible Grounds. For that is the preſent Caſe; he grants, that the Motives of Credibility are not infallible, and that there are no other Motives in order to Faith above theſe, and yet he ſuppoſes we ought to oblige God by giving an infallible Aſſent upon theſe Motives. But the bottom of all is, *That our Faith ought to be ſuitable to God's infallible*

Diſ. 3. *c.* 8. *n.* 16.

C. 10. *n.* 5.

lible Veracity which Faith immediately reſts upon, and from whence, and not from the Motives, infallible Certainty, as *E. W.* ſpeaks, *is transfuſed into it.* This deep Speculation by no means ſatisfies me; for though I know it to be impoſſible for God to lie or to deceive; yet our Queſtion is not about believing the Truth of what God ſaith, but about believing this or that to be revealed by him. And while the Queſtion is whether God's Veracity be concerned in the thing, how is it poſſible for his *Veracity to transfuſe an Infallible Certainty into my Belief of it?* Suppoſe *E. W.* be acquainted with as honeſt a Man as ever liv'd, and one comes and tells him from him that ſuch a Friend of his was dead, and gave him five Hundred Pounds; I would fain know whether the unqueſtionable Veracity of the Friend, from the Meſſenger who ſaid he received it, can transfuſe an unqueſtionable Certainty in his Mind of the Truth of the Thing, while he is yet in doubt whether his faithful Friend ſaid it or no? If his Aſſent here be not according to the Veracity of his Friend, unleſs he be firſt aſſured of the Fidelity of the Reporter: No more can it be in the preſent caſe of believing. For no one queſtions what God ſaith; but our only Doubt is whether God has ſaid it; and whilſt one gives no infallible Aſſent to the one, he cannot infallibly reſt upon the other. *But may not credible Arguments, as to the Meſſenger, be ſufficient for infallible Belief of the Thing upon the Authority of the other?* For that, I appeal to *E. W.* whether his belief of the Thing would not, in that caſe, be according to the Grounds he had to believe the Meſſenger? And the Authority of his Friend will make him ſo much the more queſtion whether his Name might not be abſurd by a Perſon that had a deſign to put a Trick upon him; eſpecially if that Meſſenger challenged to himſelf ſo much Credit that he ought to be believed without any diſpute at all. For in this Caſe, the over-eager affirming would give a Man cauſe to queſtion the more the Truth of the Perſon, if his Evidence bear no proportion with his Confidence. So it is in our preſent Caſe: It is granted on all ſides, if God reveals any thing, it muſt be true: Our Enpuiry is, how far we are to believe that God hath ſaid ſuch a thing upon the Credit of thoſe who convey it to us; if they deſire no more Credit with us than they give ſufficient Evidence for, then we are bound to believe them; but if they exact an infallible Aſſent, and offer only fallible Grounds, we have reaſon to miſtruſt their Deſign; and ſo long as we do ſo, we muſt queſtion the Thing which we are to believe upon their Credit. If they require only an Aſſent ſuitable to their Evidence, it would be unreaſonable to deny it; but ſtill the degree of our Aſſent to the Revelation is proportionable to the degree of Evidence, that it is a Divine Revelation. Which Dr. *Holden* thinks to be ſo evident, that he accounts loſt Labour for a Man to go about to prove it to any one that hath common Senſe: *That no Aſſent of Divine Faith can have any greater true and rational Certainty, than the Aſſent of the Medium hath, by which the Object of Faith is applied to the Underſtanding. For whatever Certainty we can attribute to an intellectual Aſſent upon the Authority of God revealing it, is neceſſary it ſhould come from, and depend upon the certainty of the Medium, by which this Authority of God revealing is convey'd to the Underſtanding. For as it is impoſſible that a Man ſhould believe or yield aſſent to any thing becauſe it is revealed by God, unleſs he thinks and knows that God hath revealed it; ſo it is impoſſible that he ſhould believe the things revealed by God with greater true and rational Certainty, than that by which he knows that God revealed them. For whatever*

Holden Analyſ. fidei, l. 1. c. 3.

degree of Uncertainty or Doubt there is in the Mind of a Believer of the Certainty and truth of the Medium, there muſt be the ſame in that Aſſent whereby he believes the things which are propoſed by that Medium. Becauſe with what degree a Man doubts whether God hath revealed this or that, he cannot but doubt in the ſame degree of that which is ſaid to be revealed by God. For what Man in his wits doth not preſently perceive that no Man can be more certain of the things done by Cæſar, *than they are that* Cæſar *was; or of the Myſteries revealed by Chriſt, than that Chriſt was. This he,* ſaith he, *had never mentioned, unleſs ſome later Divines,* (ſuch as *E. W.*) *diſcourſing vainly and Sceptically, and not conſidering the true reaſon of believing, had feigned to themſelves he knew not what kind of divine and Supernatural Certainty in Chriſtian Faith (paſſing by the true and rational) which, it is clearer than Noon day, is but an idle and imaginary thing.* Good Reader, obſerve the power of reaſon over an ingenuous Mind; I know what entertainment Dr. *H.* might have given *E. W.* on other accounts; but it is plain by this Diſcourſe he thought *a dark Room* the fitteſt for him, ſince he pronounces *that no Man in his Senſes can Aſſert the things which he confidently doth.* Although therefore he thought this needleſs to be proved, yet I muſt proceed to ſhew,

Of the power of the Will in the Aſſent of Faith.

Sect. 9. 2. That the Aſſent of Faith can be no ſtronger than the Grounds are. For if it doth proceed upon Grounds, thoſe are of the nature of Premiſſes and the Aſſent of Faith as the Concluſion drawn from them; and therefore muſt be ſtronger or weaker according to them. In every Act of Faith which hath a particular Revelation for its Object, there muſt be two diſtinct Premiſſes conceived, from whence that which is the proper Act of believing follows. As, ſuppoſe the Queſtion be concerning the Reſurrection of the Dead, why I believe that Article of Faith to be true; the preſent Anſwer is, becauſe God hath revealed it; but therein lies the Force of a Syllogiſm, by which it will appear that the Act of Faith follows as the Concluſion from the Premiſſes. Whatſoever God reveals is true, but God hath revealed the Reſurrection of the Dead; therefore it is true. Now ſince the force of a Concluſion depends upon the Premiſſes, the Aſſent of Faith cannot be ſuppoſed ſtronger and firmer than the Premiſſes are from which it reſults. For however it may hold in other Cauſes; in thoſe which are Moral and final, it is an undoubted Maxim of Reaſon, *That which makes another thing to be ſo, muſt be much more ſo it ſelf:* As that end which makes any thing deſirable for its ſake, is much more deſirable, it ſelf, becauſe it is that which moves the Soul to deſire the means; and ſo it is likewiſe in whatever moves the Underſtanding to Aſſent, as well as the Will to deſire: But the Premiſſes do move the Underſtanding to Aſſent to the Concluſion; therefore the Conſent to the Concluſion muſt be agreeable to that of the Premiſſes. This difficulty hath ſo racked and tormented the Minds of the School-men, that *Arriaga* relates *he hath heard the moſt Learned and Ingenious among them profeſs, they could find no way through it. While they did require an infallible Aſſent in the Concluſion, when there could be no infallible Aſſent to one of the Premiſſes,* viz. *that God hath revealed this.* Which ſome have thought they got over when they Aſſerted *the neceſſity of the Church's Infallibility,* as the Foundation of that Aſſent. But granting them the Truth of that, yet they have given the difficulty but one remove by it; for it ſpeedily returns again, concerning the belief of the Church's Infallibility, which

Arriaga Curſ. Philo. diſp. 16. Sect. 4.

they agree muſt be believed infallibly; and yet here again they offer at no more than Motives confeſſed to be fallible, to prove it. And ſo at laſt they are fain to take up with other Anſwers, which make the Church's Infallible Propoſition of no uſe at all in this Matter: For if the Aſſent be ſaid to be *immediate to the Revelation*, if the ſtrength of it ariſes either from *the Spirit of God*, or the *pious Inclination of the Will*, and not from the Motives of Faith; if any of theſe ways can ſolve the difficulty; then however from hence it follows that all theſe will equally do it without ever ſo much as ſuppoſing the *neceſſity of the Church's infallible Teſtimony.* I ſhall not now trouble my ſelf with others, but conſider my Adverſary; who, after making ſeveral Attempts this way and that, at laſt bethinks of a good Friend in a Corner, called *the Power of the Will*; and to this he is willing *to attribute the ſtrength of the Aſſent, when it exceeds the Motives of Faith: Which he thinks the more plain and eaſie way*; and therefore Aſſerts *that after the previous Judgment of Credibility, the Will works by her pious Affection, and that moves the Underſtanding to elicit the infallible Aſſent of Faith. For*, ſaith he, *if it be demanded how the Underſtanding dares reſt moſt firmly on an Object not evidently ſeen, we paſs from that Power, to the Will, and ſay, ſhe can by her pious Affection command the intellectual Faculty to captivate it ſelf in* Obſequium fidei *and believe moſt undoubtedly.* This is the laſt Reſerve in this Matter, which is as weak as any of the former. For if the Will can determine the Underſtanding to Aſſent beyond the ſtrength of the Motives, it may determine it to Aſſent without any Motives at all; becauſe that degree of Aſſent which doth exceed the Evidence of the Motives, hath nothing to incline or move it beſides the meer Power of the Will: And if it can command the higheſt and moſt infallible Aſſent without infallible Grounds, it may equally command a fallible Aſſent without fallible Grounds, and by this means there will be no need of any Motives of Credibility at all. Beſides, this takes away any ſuch thing as the formal Object of divine Faith; for if the infallible Aſſent of Faith do come from the Power of the Will; then to what purpoſe is any formal Object of that Aſſent enquired after? For the formal Object doth aſſign a reaſon of believing from the Object it ſelf, of which there can be none, if the Will by her own Power elicit that which is the proper Aſſent of Faith. And all other material Objects of Faith may be believed in as infallible a manner by the ſame Power of the Will. But if the Will can command the Underſtanding to Aſſent beyond the degree of Evidence; why may not the Underſtanding dictate to the Will to deſire a thing beyond the degree of Goodneſs appearing to it; and by this means both thoſe Faculties would tend to their Objects in a way diſagreeing to their nature.

Diſ. 3. *c.* 8. *n.* 14, 15, 16.

C. 9. *n.* 5.

C. 10. *n.* 10.

All theſe ways being found inſufficient, *Cardinal Lugo* ſaith, *ſome had recourſe at laſt to a Myſterious Elevation of the Underſtanding, beyond all connatural ways of its Operation, whereby it lays hold on the matters of Faith in a way wholly inexplicable*; and however the *Cardinal* ſlights this way, and expreſſeth a great deteſtation of it, *as that which renders the matters of Faith incredible and imperceptible*; yet I think it abſolutely the beſt for thoſe of the Roman Church, that hath yet been thought of; and I would particularly commend it to *E. W.* who loves to talk ſo unintelligibly and confuſedly, as if he had this habit of believing infuſed already.

Lugo de fide, diſp. 1. Sect. 7. *n.* 38.

And thus much in vindication of the firſt Argument, I propoſed againſt making the infallible Teſtimony of the Church the Foundation of Faith, and yet that Infallibility to be only proved by the Motives of Credibility, *viz.* that hereby an infallible Aſſent muſt be built upon fallible Grounds. As to what *E. W.* ſaith, by way of Recrimination, it ſhall be anſwered, when I come to defend our own Grounds of Faith.

Rational Account, part 1. c. 5. Sect. 6. The ſecond Argument defended againſt *E. W*

Sect. 10. The next Argument which affords any new Matter to my Adverſary, whereby I ſhewed this way of reſolving Faith to be unreaſonable, was, becauſe by making the Infallible Teſtimony of the Church neceſſary to Faith, they make that neceſſary to Faith, which was not made ſo by Chriſt or his Apoſtles. What then, ſay I, will become of all thoſe who received Divine Revelations, without the Infallible Teſtimony of any Church at all? With what Faith did the Diſciples of Chriſt at the time of his Suffering, believe the Divine Authority of the Old Teſtament? Was it a true Divine Faith or not? If it was, whereupon was it built? Not certainly on the Infallible Teſtimony of the Jewiſh Church, which at that time conſented to the Death of the Meſſias, condemning him as a Malefactor and Deceiver: Or, did they believe it becauſe of the great rational Evidence they had to convince them, that thoſe Propheſies came from God? If ſo, why may not we believe the Divinity of all the Scriptures on the ſame Grounds, and with a Divine Faith too? With what Faith did thoſe believe in the Meſſias, who were not perſonally preſent at the Miracles which our Saviour wrought, but had them conveyed to them by ſuch Reports as the Woman's of *Samaria* was to the *Samaritans*? Or, were all ſuch Perſons excuſed from believing, meerly becauſe they were not Spectators? But by the ſame Reaſon all thoſe would be excuſed, who never ſaw our Saviour's Miracles, or heard his Doctrine, or his Apoſtles: But if ſuch Perſons then be bound to believe, I ask on what Teſtimony was their Faith founded? Was the Woman of *Samaria* Infallible in reporting the Diſcourſe between Chriſt and her? Were all the Perſons Infallible who gave an account to others what Chriſt did? Yet I ſuppoſe, had it been your own Caſe, you would have thought your ſelves bound to have believed Chriſt to have been the Meſſias, if you had lived at that Time, and a certain Account had been given you of our Saviour's Doctrine and Miracles by Men faithful and honeſt, tho' you had no reaſon to have believ'd them Infallible: I pray, Sir, anſwer me, would you have thought your ſelf bound to have believed or no? If you affirm it (as I will ſuppoſe you ſo much a Chriſtian as to ſay ſo) I pray then tell me whether Perſons in theſe Circumſtances might not have a true and divine Faith where there was no infallible Teſtimony, but only rational Evidence to build it ſelf upon? And if thoſe Perſons might have a Divine Faith upon ſuch Evidence as that was, may not we much more, who have Evidence of the ſame Nature indeed, but much more extenſive, univerſal and convincing than that was? And how then can you ſtill aſſert an infallible Teſtimony of the Conveyers of Divine Revelation to be neceſſary in order to a Divine Faith? Nay, further yet, how few were there in compariſon, in the firſt Ages of the Chriſtian Church, who received the Doctrine of the Goſpel from the Mouths of Perſons Infallible? And of thoſe who did ſo, what certain Evidence have Men, that all thoſe Perſons did receive the Doctrine upon the account of the Infallibility of the Propounders, and not rather upon the Rational Evidence of the Truth of the Doctrine deliver'd; and whether the Belief of their Infallibility was abſolutely neceſſary to Faith, when the report of the Evidences of the Truth of the Doctrine might raiſe in them an Obligation to believe, ſuppoſing them not Infallible in that delivery of it, but that they look'd on them as honeſt Men, who faithfully related what they had ſeen and heard? And to what Evidence of Senſe the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts appealed; ſo that when there was certainly an infallible Teſtimony, yet that is not urged as the only Foundation for Faith, but Rational Evidence produced even by thoſe Perſons who were thus Infallible. If we deſcend lower into the Chriſtian Church, or walk Abroad to view the ſeveral Plantations of the Churches at that time, where do we read or meet with the leaſt intimation of an Infallible Teſtimony of the Catholick Church, ſo call'd from its Communion with that of *Rome*? What Infallible Teſtimony of that Church had the poor *Britains* to believe on? Or thoſe *Barbarians* mention'd in *Irenæus*, who yet believed without a written Word? What mention do we meet with in all the ancient Apologeticks of Chriſtians, wherein they give ſo large an Account of the Grounds of Chriſtian Faith, of the modern Method for reſolving Faith? Nay, what one ancient Father or Council give the leaſt Countenance to this pretended Infallibility, much leſs make it the only ſure Foundation of Faith as you do? Nay, how very few are there among your ſelves who believe it, and yet think themſelves never the worſe Chriſtians for it? If then your Doctrine be true, what becomes of the Faith of all theſe Perſons mention'd? Upon your Principles their Faith could not be a True and Divine Faith; that is, let them all think they believed the Doctrine of Chriſt never ſo heartily, and obey it never ſo conſcientiouſly; yet becauſe they did not believe on the Infallibility of the Church, their Faith was but a kind of guilded and ſplendid Infidelity, and none of them Chriſtians, becauſe not Jeſuits. And doth not this Principle then fairly advance Chriſtianity in the World, when the Belief of it comes to be ſettled on Foundations, never heard of in the beſt and pureſt Times of it; nay, ſuch Foundations, as for want of their believing them, their Faith muſt be all in vain, and Chriſt died in vain for them.

1 Joh. 1. 1.
1 Pet. 1. 16
Luk. 1. 1, 2

And what now, ſaith *E. W.* to all this? *Firſt*, he ſaith, *I do not bring Inſtances enough. Secondly, That I bring too many.*

1. That I do not bring enough; for he much wonders, *I omit to touch upon an Inſtance much more difficult than any of theſe concerning rude and illiterate Perſons, which I, and all others, are bound to ſolve.* Methinks he might have been contented with thoſe I had brought, unleſs he had anſwered them better; and ſhould not have blam'd me for omitting that which I purpoſely take notice of, and give a ſufficient Anſwer to in theſe Words. Although the Ignorance and Careleſneſs of Men in a Matter of ſo great Conſequence, be ſo great in all Ages, as is not to be juſtified; becauſe all Men ought to endeavour, after the higheſt Ways of Satisfaction in a Matter ſo nearly concerning them (and it is none of the leaſt Things to be blamed in your Church, that we doth ſo much countenance this Ignorance and Neglect of the Scripture), yet ſuch Perſons who either morally or invincibly are hindred from this Capacity of examining Scripture, there may be ſufficient Means for their Faith to be built upon. For altho' ſuch illiterate Perſons cannot themſelves ſee and read the Scripture; yet as many as do believe, do receive the Doctrine of it by that Senſe, by which Faith is conveyed; and by that means they have ſo great Certainty as excludes all doubting, that ſuch Do-

Dis. 3. c. 3. n. 6.

Rational Account, part 1. c. 6. Sect. 15.

againſt making the infallible Teſtimony of the Church the Foundation of Faith, and yet that Infallibility to be only proved by the Motives of Credibility, *viz.* that hereby an infallible Aſſent muſt be built upon fallible Grounds. As to what *E. W.* ſaith, by way of Recrimination, it ſhall be anſwered, when I come to defend our own Grounds of Faith.

Rational Account, part 1. c. 5. Sect. 6. The ſecond Argument defended againſt *E. W*

Sect. 10. The next Argument which affords any new Matter to my Adverſary, whereby I ſhewed this way of reſolving Faith to be unreaſonable, was, becauſe by making the Infallible Teſtimony of the Church neceſſary to Faith, they make that neceſſary to Faith, which was not made ſo by Chriſt or his Apoſtles. What then, ſay I, will become of all thoſe who received Divine Revelations, without the Infallible Teſtimony of any Church at all? With what Faith did the Diſciples of Chriſt at the time of his Suffering, believe the Divine Authority of the Old Teſtament? Was it a true Divine Faith or not? If it was, whereupon was it built? Not certainly on the Infallible Teſtimony of the Jewiſh Church, which at that time conſented to the Death of the Meſſias, condemning him as a Malefactor and Deceiver. Or, did they believe it becauſe of the great rational Evidence they had to convince them, that thoſe Propheſies came from God? If ſo, why may not we believe the Divinity of all the Scriptures on the ſame Grounds, and with a Divine Faith too? With what Faith did thoſe believe in the Meſſias, who were not perſonally preſent at the Miracles which our Saviour wrought, but had them conveyed to them by ſuch Reports as the Woman's of *Samaria* was to the *Samaritans*? Or, were all ſuch Perſons excuſed from believing, meerly becauſe they were not Spectators? But by the ſame Reaſon all thoſe would be excuſed, who never ſaw our Saviour's Miracles, or heard his Doctrine, or his Apoſtles: But if ſuch Perſons then be bound to believe, I ask on what Teſtimony was their Faith founded? Was the Woman of *Samaria* Infallible in reporting the Diſcourſe between Chriſt and her? Were all the Perſons Infallible who gave an account to others what Chriſt did? Yet I ſuppoſe, had it been your own Caſe, you would have thought your ſelves bound to have believed Chriſt to have been the Meſſias, if you had lived at that Time, and a certain Account had been given you of our Saviour's Doctrine and Miracles by Men faithful and honeſt, tho' you had no reaſon to have believ'd them Infallible: I pray, Sir, anſwer me, would you have thought your ſelf bound to have believed or no? If you affirm it (as I will ſuppoſe you ſo much a Chriſtian as to ſay ſo) I pray then tell me whether Perſons in theſe Circumſtances might not have a true and divine Faith where there was no infallible Teſtimony, but only rational Evidence to build it ſelf upon? And if thoſe Perſons might have a Divine Faith upon ſuch Evidence as that was, may not we much more, who have Evidence of the ſame Nature indeed, but much more extenſive, univerſal and convincing than that was? And how then can you ſtill aſſert an infallible Teſtimony of the Conveyers of Divine Revelation to be neceſſary in order to a Divine Faith? Nay, further yet, how few were there in compariſon, in the firſt Ages of the Chriſtian Church, who received the Doctrine of the Goſpel from the Mouths of Perſons Infallible? And of thoſe who did ſo, what certain Evidence have Men, that all thoſe Perſons did receive the Doctrine upon the account of the Infallibility of the Propounders, and not rather upon the Rational Evidence of the Truth of the Doctrine deliver'd; and whether the Belief of their Infallibility was abſolutely neceſſary to Faith, when the report of the Evidences of the Truth of the Doctrine might raiſe in them an Obligation to believe, ſuppoſing them not Infallible in that delivery of it, but that they look'd on them as honeſt Men, who faithfully related what they had ſeen and heard? And to what Evidence of Senſe the Apo- 1 Joh. 1. 1. 1 Pet. 1. 16 ſtles and Evangeliſts appealed; ſo that when there was certainly an in- Luk. 1. 1, 2 fallible Teſtimony, yet that is not urged as the only Foundation for Faith, but Rational Evidence produced even by thoſe Perſons who were thus Infallible. If we deſcend lower into the Chriſtian Church, or walk Abroad to view the ſeveral Plantations of the Churches at that time, where do we read or meet with the leaſt intimation of an Infallible Teſtimony of the Catholick Church, ſo call'd from its Communion with that of *Rome*? What Infallible Teſtimony of that Church had the poor *Britains* to believe on? Or thoſe *Barbarians* mention'd in *Irenæus*, who yet believed without a written Word? What mention do we meet with in all the ancient Apologeticks of Chriſtians, wherein they give ſo large an Account of the Grounds of Chriſtian Faith, of the modern Method for reſolving Faith? Nay, what one ancient Father or Council give the leaſt Countenance to this pretended Infallibility, much leſs make it the only ſure Foundation of Faith as you do? Nay, how very few are there among your ſelves who believe it, and yet think themſelves never the worſe Chriſtians for it? If then your Doctrine be true, what becomes of the Faith of all theſe Perſons mention'd? Upon your Principles their Faith could not be a True and Divine Faith; that is, let them all think they believed the Doctrine of Chriſt never ſo heartily, and obey it never ſo conſcientiouſly; yet becauſe they did not believe on the Infallibility of the Church, their Faith was but a kind of guilded and ſplendid Infidelity, and none of them Chriſtians, becauſe not Jeſuits. And doth not this Principle then fairly advance Chriſtianity in the World, when the Belief of it comes to be ſettled on Foundations, never heard of in the beſt and pureſt Times of it; nay, ſuch Foundations, as for want of their believing them, their Faith muſt be all in vain, and Chriſt died in vain for them.

And what now, ſaith *E. W.* to all this? *Firſt*, he ſaith, *I do not bring Inſtances enough. Secondly, That I bring too many.*

1. That I do not bring enough; for he much wonders, *I omit to touch* Diſ. 3. c. 3. n. 6. *upon an Inſtance much more difficult than any of theſe concerning rude and illiterate Perſons, which I, and all others, are bound to ſolve.* Methinks he might have been contented with thoſe I had brought, unleſs he had anſwered them better; and ſhould not have blam'd me for omitting that which I purpoſely take notice of, and give a ſufficient Anſwer to in theſe Words. Although the Ignorance and Careleſneſs of Men in a Mat- Rational Account, part 1. c. 6. Sect. 15. ter of ſo great Conſequence, be ſo great in all Ages, as is not to be juſtified; becauſe all Men ought to endeavour, after the higheſt Ways of Satisfaction in a Matter ſo nearly concerning them (and it is none of the leaſt Things to be blamed in your Church, that we doth ſo much countenance this Ignorance and Neglect of the Scripture), yet ſuch Perſons who either morally or invincibly are hindred from this Capacity of examining Scripture, there may be ſufficient Means for their Faith to be built upon. For altho' ſuch illiterate Perſons cannot themſelves ſee and read the Scripture; yet as many as do believe, do receive the Doctrine of it by that Senſe, by which Faith is conveyed; and by that means they have ſo great Certainty as excludes all doubting, that ſuch Do-

ctrines, and ſuch Matters of Fact, are contained in thoſe Books, by which they come to the underſtanding of the nature of this Doctrine, and are capable of judging concerning the Divinity of it. For the Light ſpoken of in Scripture, is not a Light to the Eye, but to the Mind: Now the Mind is capable of this Light, as well by the Ear, as by the Eyes. The Caſe then of ſuch honeſt illiterate Perſons, as are not capable of reading Scripture, but diligently and devoutly hear it read to them, is much of the ſame Nature with thoſe who heard the Apoſtles Preach this Doctrine before it was writ. For whatever was an Argument to ſuch to believe the Apoſtles in what they ſpake, becomes an Argument to ſuch who hear the ſame Things, which are certainly conveyed to us, by an unqueſtionable Tradition: So that nothing hinders but ſuch illiterate Perſons may reſolve their Faith into the ſame Doctrine and Motives which others do; only thoſe are conveyed to *them* by the *Ear*, which are convey'd to *others* by the *Eyes*. But if you ſuppoſe Perſons ſo Rude and Illiterate, as not to underſtand any thing, but that they are to believe as the Church believes; do if you can, reſolve their Faith for them; for my part I cannot, and am ſo far from it, that I have no Reaſon to believe they can have any. Judge now, Reader, what meaſure I am like to meet with from ſuch Men, who can ſo impudently charge me with omitting a Difficulty, which I give ſo punctual an Anſwer to.

2. But thoſe Inſtances I have brought, are too many for him; as will eaſily appear by the ſhuffling Anſwers he makes them. My deſign was from them to prove, that the Church's Infallibility was not neceſſary in C. 3. n. 5. order to Faith; he puts it thus: *If the Infallibility of the Church be a ſure Foundation of Faith*, &c. Is not this a good beginning to put *Sure* inſtead of *Neceſſary*, or *only ſure?* For that *may be ſure* which is *not neceſſary*, and it was the Neceſſity I diſproved by theſe Inſtances. To them however he attempts to give an Anſwer.

N. 7. 1. In general. *That none make the Roman Catholick Church in all Circumſtances the only ſure Foundation of Divine Faith. For the firſt Man that believed in Chriſt our Lord before the compleat Eſtabliſhment of the Church, had perfect Faith reſting on that great Maſter of Truth, without dependance on the Chriſtian Church; for Chriſt alone was not the Church, but the Head of it. Faith therefore in general requires no more, but only to rely upon God, the firſt Verity, ſpeaking by this or that Oracle, by one or more Men lawfully ſent to Teach, who prove their Miſſion, and make the Doctrine propoſed by them, evidently credible. In like manner, the Apoſtles preached no Doctrine in the Name of the Chriſtian Church, whilſt our Saviour lived here on Earth, but teſtified that he was the true Meſſias by virtue of thoſe Signs and Miracles which had been already wrought above the force of Nature.* A very fair Confeſſion! which plainly deſtroys the neceſſity of the Church's Infallibility in order to Faith. For if no more be neceſſary in order to Faith, *but to rely upon God, the firſt Verity, ſpeaking by this or that Oracle*, &c. how comes the infallible Teſtimony of the Church to be in any Age neceſſary to Faith? For God ſpake by Chriſt and his Apoſtles as his *Oracles*, by whom his Word is declared to us, therefore nothing can be neceſſary to Faith but to rely upon God the firſt Truth, ſpeaking by them. And this we aſſert as well as they. But he muſt prove that we cannot rely on God as ſpeaking by them, unleſs he hath an *Infallible Church* in every Age, if he will make this infallible Teſtimony of the Church neceſſary to Faith; which I deſpair of ever ſeeing done while the World ſtands.

2. In particular, 1. To the inſtance of the Diſciples of Chriſt believing the divine Authority of the Old Teſtament without any infallible Teſtimony of the Jewiſh Church; only upon the rational Evidence they had to convince them that thoſe Propheſies came from God: he anſwers; *that it is hard to ſay where the force of it lies, ſeeing there were innumerable* N. 8. *Jews then diſperſed all Jury over, and the other parts of the World, who moſt firmly believed the divine Authority of thoſe Books, upon whoſe Teſtimony the Apoſtles might believe thoſe Books to be divine.* A moſt excellent Anſwer if we well conſider it! Have not they of the Church of *Rome* proved the neceſſity of Infallibility in the Church from *Deut.* 17. 10, 11, 12. (of which abundant Inſtances might be produced, and particularly *the Conſiderator of my Principles*) which Words, if they imply any Infallibility at all, do neceſſarily prove that it is lodged in the ſupream Eccleſiaſtical, Judges, and no where elſe; ſo that if there were no Infallibility in them, it could not be ſuppoſed to be any where elſe; therefore I propoſed the Caſe at that time when theſe Eccleſiaſtical Judges conſented to the Death of Chriſt, and my Queſtion will not only hold of the *Apoſtles*, but of any common *Jews* among them, who might not believe Chriſt infallible, any more than the *Sanhedrim*, I ask whether ſuch might not have ſeen ſufficient ground to believe that *the Propheſies came not in old time by the will of Man, but by the Will of God?* If ſuch Perſons had reaſon ſufficient for their Faith without any infallible Teſtimony; the ſame, I ſay, may all Chriſtians have of the Divine Authority of the New Teſtament. For if the concurrent Teſtimony of the diſperſed Jews firmly believing the divine Authority of the Old Teſtament, were a ſufficient ground for a Perſon then to believe the Divinity of thoſe Books; why may not the concurrent Teſtimony of all Chriſtians afford as ſufficient a ground to believe the Authority of the Books of the New, though no Eccleſiaſtical Senate among Chriſtians be ſuppoſed any more infallible, than the Jewiſh *Sanhedrim* was at the Death of Chriſt? and by this I hope *E.W.* may a little better perceive what this Objection aims at. *But*, ſaith he, *hence it follows not, that then there was no Jewiſh Church which believed the divine Verities of the old Scripture:* O the monſtrous Subtilty of Jeſuits! Who is able to ſtand before their terrible Wits? What have we to do with a Church's believing the Divine Verities of the Old Scripture? We only enquire for the Teſtimony of a Church, as neceſſary in order to others believing it. If they firmly believed, and yet had no infallible Teſtimony of a Church at that time, what can be more to our Advantage than this? ſeeing it hence follows, that there may be a firm Faith without any Church's infallible Teſtimony. *Well, but he verily thinks, I miſtook one Objection for another; perhaps* N. 9. *I would have ſaid that the Apoſtles loſt Faith of our Saviour's Reſurrection at the time of his Paſſion, but this Difficulty is ſolved over and over.* And then falls unmercifully to work with this Man of Clouts; he throws him firſt down and tramples upon him, then ſets him up again to make him capable of more Valour being ſhown upon him; then he kicks him afreſh, beats him of one ſide and then of the other, and ſo terribly triumphs over him, that the poor Man of Clouts bleſſeth himſelf that he is not made of Fleſh and Bones, for if he had, it might have coſt him ſome Aches and Wounds. But I aſſure him I meant no ſuch thing; yet if I had, I do not ſee, but after all his Batteries, the Argument, ſuch as tis, would have ſtood firm enough; for ſuppoſing the infallible Te-

ſtimony of the Church to reſt in the Apoſtles after our Saviour's Death, it muſt have prejudiced the Faith of others who were to believe that Article upon their Authority, if they loſt the Faith of Chriſt's Reſurrection.

2. I inſtanced in thoſe who believed in Chriſt and yet were not perſonally preſent at the Miracles which our Saviour wrought, but had them conveyed to them by ſuch Reports as the Woman's of *Samaria* was to the *Samaritans.* Of theſe I ask what infallible Teſtimony their Faith was built upon? And if thoſe Perſons might have a divine Faith meerly upon rational Evidence, may not we much more who have Evidence of the ſame nature, but much more extenſive, univerſal and convincing than that was? To this he anſwers, *by diſtinguiſhing between the Motive or the natural Propoſition of Faith, which comes by hearing; and the infallible Oracle whereupon it relies; and he thinks it ſtrange I did not ſee the diſtinction.* N. 10. It is far eaſier to ſee the Diſtinction than the Pertinency of it to his purpoſe; for our Queſtion is not about the neceſſity of an infallible Oracle in order to Faith, but of an infallible Propoſition: We ſtill yield that which our Faith relies upon to be the infallible Oracle of God; but if a natural Propoſition of that be ſufficient for Faith, we have all we contend for. But to what purpoſe *the Legend of S.* Photina, *and the Diſpute whether ſhe were the* Samaritan *Woman,* is here inſerted, is very hard to underſtand, unleſs he thought it the beſt way by any means to eſcape from the buſineſs in hand. N. 11. Next, he tells us, *what he might anſwer to theſe Inſtances, by ſaying with good Divines, that all immediate Propounders or Conveyers of divine Revelation in ſuch particular Caſes, need not to be infallible.* I am glad to hear of ſuch good Divines among them: only I would know why in theſe particular Caſes an infallible Propoſition was unneceſſary to Faith, if in the general Caſe of all Chriſtians it be now become neceſſary? N. 12. But he ſaith, *although Infallibility be not neceſſary for young beginners ſeldom moleſted with difficulties againſt Faith, yet it is not only convenient but abſolutely neceſſary for others more learned, who often ſtruggle to captivate their Underſtanding, when the high Myſteries of Chriſtianity are propoſed.* Never was there certainly a more ſenſeleſs Anſwer: for *who are moleſted with Difficulties againſt Faith,* if thoſe who are to be converted to Chriſtianity are not? who have none of the advantages of Education to recommend the Doctrines of Chriſtianity to their Minds; and are filled and prepoſſeſſed with contrary prejudices. Never were there ſuch happy Converters of Infidels as the *Jeſuits* are, if they meet with ſuch *Converts* who *are never moleſted with difficulties againſt Faith*; only as they grow up, *they begin to grow Infidels again,* and then it is neceſſary to choke them with an *infallible Church.* I do not at all wonder, that the more learned in the Church of *Rome* ſeeing the weakneſs of the grounds of Faith among them, do ſtruggle with themſelves about believing the Myſteries of their Faith; but I very much wonder if ſo unreaſonable a pretence as that of Infallibility can ever ſatisfie them. I deſire to know of theſe *more learned Believers,* whether they believed the Church's Infallibility before thoſe *ſtrugglings*, or not? if they did not, how came they to be Believers, ſince there can be no divine Faith, without an infallible Teſtimony? if they did, how came they to queſtion whether they were to believe the particular Myſteries of Faith, if they did believe the Church infallible which propoſed them? But I ſuppoſe theſe learned Believers, were ſuch as

queſtioned the Infallibility of the Church, and Chriſt and his Apoſtles too; of which ſort I doubt not there are many in *Rome* it ſelf.

But yet he hath two other Ways to ſolve theſe Difficulties. 1. *By God's ſpecial Illumination*; and that I hope may ſerve all as well as theſe; and then let him ſhew the Neceſſity of an infallible Proponent. 2. *That every particular Proponent as a Member conjoin'd with Chriſt's infallible Oracle, may be ſaid to teach infallibly.* A moſt admirable Speculation! and ſo may every one we meet with in the Streets, be Infallible, not as conſidered in himſelf, but *as a Member conjoyned with Truth*: Or every Sectary; *as a Member conjoyned with God's Word*, which I hope is an *Oracle*, altogether as infallible as the *Church*. But the Queſtion is, whether ſuch a one may be divided from God's infallible Truth or not? If not, he is abſolutely Infallible: If he may; then what Security hath any one to rely upon him upon ſuch a conditional Infallibility which he can have no aſſurance of? N. 14.

But ſtill he hopes to retort the Inſtances upon me. I never ſaw ſuch a way of Retorting in my whole Life. My Deſign was to prove by theſe Inſtances, that an infallible Teſtimony of a Church was not neceſſary in order to Faith; He ſaith, *I muſt ſolve my own Difficulties.* I confeſs I ſee none at all in my way that need to be anſwer'd; for I aſſert, that Men may have ſufficient Grounds of Faith without any infallible Proponent. Well, *but he ſuppoſeth all theſe Barbarians converted to Chriſt, to have had true Faith, and conſequently prudent Motives to believe, before they firmly aſſented to the Divine Revelation.* And ſo do I too. But what were theſe Motives? *To this Queſtion,* he ſaith, *I return the ſtrangeſt Anſwer he ever heard; for I ſeem to make the Motives inducing to Faith, nothing but the rational Evidence of the Truth of the Doctrine delivered, and therefore I grievouſly complain that they deſtroy the Obligation which ariſeth from the rational Evidence of the Chriſtian Religion*; upon which he diſcourſes, as though by *rational Evidence the ſelf-evidencing Light of the Doctrine, and conſequently all the Miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, were to no purpoſe.* Have not I reaſon to applaud my good Fortune that I met with ſo ingenious an Adverſary? But I ſee thoſe who write Controverſies, muſt be true *Nethinims*; not only Hewers of Difficulties, and Drawers of the Waters of Contention, but Bearers of Burdens too; even ſuch, as their Adverſaries pleaſe to lay upon them. Could any thing be further from my Meaning than by the *rational Evidence of Chriſtianity*, to underſtand *the Self-evidencing Light of the Scriptures*? But it is not what I ſay, but what *E. W.* finds in his *Common-Place-Book*? A little before, when I have propoſed an Argument he had not met with in thoſe Terms, he preſently fancied I meant another Argument, which he found under the Title of *the Defectibility of the Church*; and then in comes that with the Anſwers he found ready to it. Now for *the Rational Evidence* of Chriſtian Religion, he finds not that *Head* in his *Note-Books*; and cannot therefore tell what to make of it. But an Argument he had ready againſt *the Self-evidencing Light of the Scriptures*; and therefore the Seraphim's Feather muſt ſerve inſtead of St. *Laurence*'s Gridiron. He might have been eaſily ſatisfied in that very Paragraph, what I mean by the Rational Evidence of Chriſtian Religion, *viz.* the unqueſtionable Aſſurance which we have of the Matters of Fact, and the Miracles wrought by Chriſt for confirmation of his Doctrine: And this within four Lines after the Words by him produc'd. And in the foregoing Paragraph, I inſiſt very much on the Evidence of Senſe, as to the Miracles

wrought

ſtimony of the Church to reſt in the Apoſtles after our Saviour's Death, it muſt have prejudiced the Faith of others who were to believe that Article upon their Authority, if they loſt the Faith of Chriſt's Reſurrection.

2. I inſtanced in thoſe who believed in Chriſt and yet were not perſonally preſent at the Miracles which our Saviour wrought, but had them conveyed to them by ſuch Reports as the Woman's of *Samaria* was to the *Samaritans*. Of theſe I ask what infallible Teſtimony their Faith was built upon? And if thoſe Perſons might have a divine Faith meerly upon rational Evidence, may not we much more who have Evidence of the ſame nature, but much more extenſive, univerſal and convincing than that was? N. 10. To this he anſwers, *by diſtinguiſhing between the Motive or the natural Propoſition of Faith, which comes by hearing; and the infallible Oracle whereupon it relies; and he thinks it ſtrange I did not ſee the diſtinction.* It is far eaſier to ſee the Diſtinction than the Pertinency of it to his purpoſe; for our Queſtion is not about the neceſſity of an infallible Oracle in order to Faith, but of an infallible Propoſition: We ſtill yield that which our Faith relies upon to be the infallible Oracle of God; but if a natural Propoſition of that be ſufficient for Faith, we have all we contend for. But to what purpoſe *the Legend of S.* Photina, *and the Diſpute whether ſhe were the* Samaritan *Woman*, is here inſerted, is very hard to underſtand, unleſs he thought it the beſt way by any means to eſcape from the buſineſs in hand. N. 11. Next, he tells us, *what he might anſwer to theſe Inſtances, by ſaying with good Divines, that all immediate Propounders or Conveyers of divine Revelation in ſuch particular Caſes, need not to be infallible.* I am glad to hear of ſuch good Divines among them: only I would know why in theſe particular Caſes an infallible Propoſition was unneceſſary to Faith, if in the general Caſe of all Chriſtians it be now become neceſſary? N. 12. But he ſaith, *although Infallibility be not neceſſary for young beginners ſeldom moleſted with difficulties againſt Faith, yet it is not only convenient but abſolutely neceſſary for others more learned, who often ſtruggle to captivate their Underſtanding, when the high Myſteries of Chriſtianity are propoſed.* Never was there certainly a more ſenſeleſs Anſwer: for *who are moleſted with Difficulties againſt Faith*, if thoſe who are to be converted to Chriſtianity are not? who have none of the advantages of Education to recommend the Doctrines of Chriſtianity to their Minds; and are filled and prepoſſeſſed with contrary prejudices. Never were there ſuch happy Converters of Infidels as the *Jeſuits* are, if they meet with ſuch *Converts* who *are never moleſted with difficulties againſt Faith*; only as they grow up, *they begin to grow Infidels again*, and then it is neceſſary to choke them with an *infallible Church.* I do not at all wonder, that the more learned in the Church of *Rome* ſeeing the weakneſs of the grounds of Faith among them, do ſtruggle with themſelves about believing the Myſteries of their Faith; but I very much wonder if ſo unreaſonable a pretence as that of Infallibility can ever ſatisfie them. I deſire to know of theſe *more learned Believers*, whether they believed the Church's Infallibility before thoſe *ſtrugglings*, or not? if they did not, how came they to be Believers, ſince there can be no divine Faith, without an infallible Teſtimony? if they did, how came they to queſtion whether they were to believe the particular Myſteries of Faith, if they did believe the Church infallible which propoſed them? But I ſuppoſe theſe learned Believers, were ſuch as

queſtioned the Infallibility of the Church, and Chriſt and his Apoſtles too; of which ſort I doubt not there are many in *Rome* it ſelf.

But yet he hath two other Ways to ſolve theſe Difficulties. 1. *By God's ſpecial Illumination*; and that I hope may ſerve all as well as theſe; and then let him ſhew the Neceſſity of an infallible Proponent. 2. *That every particular Proponent as a Member conjoin'd with Chriſt's infallible Oracle, may be ſaid to teach infallibly.* A moſt admirable Speculation! and ſo may every one we meet with in the Streets, be Infallible, not as conſidered in himſelf, but *as a Member conjoyned with Truth*: Or every Sectary; *as a Member conjoyned with God's Word*, which I hope is an *Oracle*, altogether as infallible as the *Church.* But the Queſtion is, whether ſuch a one may be divided from God's infallible Truth or not? If not, he is abſolutely Infallible: If he may; then what Security hath any one to rely upon him upon ſuch a conditional Infallibility which he can have no aſſurance of? N. 14.

But ſtill he hopes to retort the Inſtances upon me: I never ſaw ſuch a way of Retorting in my whole Life. My Deſign was to prove by theſe Inſtances, that an infallible Teſtimony of a Church was not neceſſary in order to Faith; He ſaith, *I muſt ſolve my own Difficulties.* I confeſs I ſee none at all in my way that need to be anſwer'd; for I aſſert, that Men may have ſufficient Grounds of Faith without any infallible Proponent. Well, *but he ſuppoſes, all theſe Barbarians converted to Chriſt, to have had true Faith, and conſequently prudent Motives to believe, before they firmly aſſented to the Divine Revelation.* And ſo do I too. But what were theſe Motives? *To this Queſtion*, he ſaith, *I return the ſtrangeſt Anſwer he ever heard; for I ſeem to make the Motives inducing to Faith, nothing but the rational Evidence of the Truth of the Doctrine delivered, and therefore I grievouſly complain that they deſtroy the Obligation which ariſeth from the rational Evidence of the Chriſtian Religion*; upon which he diſcourſes, as though by *rational Evidence the ſelf-evidencing Light of the Doctrine, and conſequently all the Miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, were to no purpoſe.* Have not I reaſon to applaud my good Fortune that I met with ſo ingenious an Adverſary? But I ſee thoſe who write Controverſies, muſt be true *Nethinims*; not only Hewers of Difficulties, and Drawers of the Waters of Contention, but Bearers of Burdens too; even ſuch, as their Adverſaries pleaſe to lay upon them. Could any thing be further from my Meaning than by the *rational Evidence of Chriſtianity*, to underſtand *the Self-evidencing Light of the Scriptures*? But it is not what I ſay, but what *E. W.* finds in his *Common-Place-Book*? A little before, when I have propoſed an Argument he had not met with in thoſe Terms, he preſently fancied I meant another Argument, which he found under the Title of *the Defectibility of the Church*; and then in comes that with the Anſwers he found ready to it. Now for *the Rational Evidence* of Chriſtian Religion, he finds not that *Head* in his *Note-Books*; and cannot therefore tell what to make of it. But an Argument he had ready againſt *the Self-evidencing Light of the Scriptures*; and therefore the Seraphim's Feather muſt ſerve inſtead of St. *Laurence*'s Gridiron. He might have been eaſily ſatisfied in that very Paragraph, what I mean by the Rational Evidence of Chriſtian Religion, *viz.* the unqueſtionable Aſſurance which we have of the Matters of Fact, and the Miracles wrought by Chriſt for confirmation of his Doctrine: And this within four Lines after the Words by him produc'd. And in the foregoing Paragraph, I inſiſt very much on the Evidence of Senſe, as to the Miracles wrought by Chriſt as a great part of the Rational Evidence of Chriſtianity, which is deſtroy'd by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, while Tranſubſtantiation is believed in it. For what Aſſurance can there be of any Object of Senſe, ſuch as the Miracles of Chriſt were, and his Body after his Reſurrection; if we are ſo framed, not only that our Senſes may be, but we are bound to believe that they are actually deceiv'd in as proper an Object of Senſe as any in the World? And if ſuch a thing may be falſe, what Evidence can we have, when any thing is true? For if a thing ſo plain and evident to our Senſes may be falſe, *viz.* That what I and all other Men ſee, is Bread; what ground of Certainty can we have, but that which my Senſes, and all other Men's, judge to be falſe, may be true? For by this means the *Criterium*, both of Senſe and Reaſon, is deſtroy'd, and conſequently all Things are equally true and falſe to us; and then farewel Senſe and Reaſon, and Religion together. Theſe Things I there largely inſiſt upon; which is all very ſilently paſſed over, the *Schools* having found no Anſwers to ſuch Arguments; and therefore they muſt be content to be let alone. But however, tho' Arguments cannot be anſwer'd, I deſire they may not be miſrepreſented; and that when I fully declare what I mean by *Rational Evidence*, ſuch a Senſe may not be put upon my Words as I never dream'd off.

There is nothing after which looks with the face of an Anſwer to *N.* 19. theſe Inſtances, unleſs it be, that he ſaith, *That none can have infallible Aſſurance either of our Saviour's Miracles, or of any other Verity recorded in Scripture, independent of ſome actual Living, Actual Infallible, and moſt clear evidenced Oracle, by Signs above the force of Nature, which in this preſent ſtate is the Church.* Theſe are good Sayings, and they want only proving; and by the Inſtances already produced, I have ſhewed that Perſons did believe upon ſuch Evidence, as implied no infallible Teſtimony; and if he goes about to prove the Church Infallible by ſuch Miracles wrought by her as were wrought by the Apoſtles, I deſire only not to believe the Church Infallible, till I be ſatisfied about theſe Miracles; but of that afterwards.

But I demand, if we can have no aſſurance of the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles without an Infallible Church, what Obligation can lie upon Men to believe them, who ſee no reaſon to believe any ſuch Infallibility? And ſince the Articles of our Faith are built upon Matters of Fact, ſuch as the Death and Reſurrection of *Jeſus Chriſt*, whether theſe Matters of Fact may not be conveyed down in as unqueſtionable a manner as any others are? Cannot we have an unqueſtionable Aſſurance that there was ſuch Perſons as *Cæſar* and *Pompey*, and that they did ſuch and ſuch Things, without ſome infallible Teſtimony? If we may in ſuch Things, why not in other Matters of Fact which infinitely more concern the World to know, than whatever *Cæſar* or *Pompey* did? This his Margin calls *an unlearned Objection*, and in the Body of his *Book* *N.* 20. ſaith, *I might have propoſed a wiſer Queſtion:* An eaſier, I grant, I might; as appears by the Anſwer he gives it. For *two Things*, he ſaith, *may be conſidered*, 1. *That the Man called Chriſt, died upon the Croſs; and this*, he ſaith, *both Jews and Gentiles yet aſſent to upon Moral Certainty, but therefore do not believe in Chriſt.* 2. *That the Man called Chriſt, dying for us, was the only Meſſias, truly God, the Redeemer of Mankind.* Here we *have*, he ſaith, *the hidden Verities of Chriſtian Religion, the certain Objects of Faith, conveyed unto us by no mortal Aſſurance, but only upon God's Infallible*

Revelation. A very wiſe Anſwer, I muſt needs ſay: If intolerable ſhuffling be any part of Wiſdom. Read over my Words again, and be aſhamed. *If ſo, then Men cannot have any unqueſtionable Aſſurance that there was ſuch a Perſon as Chriſt in the World; that he wrought ſuch great Miracles for confirmation of his Doctrine; that he died and roſe again.* Is all this no more *than the common Conſent of Jews, Gentiles and Chriſtians, that Chriſt died on a Croſs*? Was ever any Man ſo ſenſeleſs as to make only the belief of the Death of Chriſt on the Croſs, the reaſon of believing his Divinity? But, I ſay, his Miracles before, and Reſurrection after, gave abundant Teſtimony that he was ſent from God, and therefore his Doctrine muſt be true; and when we believe the Truth of his Doctrine, we are bound to believe every part of it; ſuch are his being the only Meſſias, the true God, the Redeemer of Mankind, and all other Divine Verities contained therein. Let the Reader judge whether the Objection or the Anſwer ſavours of more Ignorance and Folly. But it is the Miſchief of this School Divinity, that it adds Confidence to Ignorance, and it makes Men the moſt apt to deſpiſe others, when they moſt expoſe themſelves.

I proceed to ſhew, that inſtead of ſettling Faith on a ſure Foundation by the Church's Infallibility, they bring it to greater Uncertainties than it was in before; becauſe they can neither ſatisfie Men what that Church is, which they ſuppoſe Infallible, what in that Church is the proper Subject of this Infallibility, what kind of Infallibility it is, nor how we ſhould know when the Church doth define Infallibility: And yet, I ſay, every one of theſe Queſtions is abſolutely neceſſary to be reſolv'd in order to the ſatisfaction of Mens Minds as to the Foundation of their Faith. His Anſwer to theſe Queſtions refers us *to his Proofs of the Roman Church's Infallibility, as the only Society of Chriſtians which hath power to define Infallibility by her repreſentative moral Body*; which when I ſee proved, I ſhall confeſs an Anſwer is given to thoſe Queſtions. Only one thing he thinks fit to give a more particular Anſwer to; which is, that this Infallibility ſhould be the only Foundation of believing all things in Religion; and yet ſo many Things, and ſome of them very ſtrange ones, muſt be certainly believed before it. Here his *Common-Place Book* fails him, and therefore wanting his Compaſs, he roves and wanders from the Point in Hand. He tells me *it is hard to gueſs at my Meaning for I name not one Article thus aſſented to. Perhaps I would ſay, that the Verities revealed in ſome Books of Scripture, called Protocanonical, known by their own proper Signatures or Motives, as the Harmony, Sanctity, and Majeſty of the Stile, may be believed without this Teſtimony of an Infallible Church.* Well, he doth not know what I meant, but he knew an Argument, he had an Anſwer ready to; and therefore that muſt be the meaning. But are not my Words plain enough to any one that reads them? And what a vaſt meaſure of Faith, ſay I, is neceſſary to believe the Papal Infallibility; for unleſs a Man believes the particular *Roman* Church to be the Catholick Church, unleſs he believes that Chriſt hath promiſed an infallible Aſſiſtance to the Paſtors of the Church, and that not as ſeparate, but as aſſembled in Council; and not in every Council, but ſuch as the Pope calls, and preſides in, and confirms, he cannot believe this Doctrine of Infallibility. Nay, further, he muſt infallibly believe the Church to be infallible, tho' no infallible Argument be brought for it; that this Church doth judiciouſly and authoritatively pronounce her Sentence in Matters of Faith, though we know not what that Church

Rational Account, part 1. c. 5. ſect. 9.

Diſ. 3. *c.* 3. *n.* 12.

C. 5. *n.* 1

is which muſt ſo pronounce; that he infallibly knew that this particular Sentence was ſo pronounced, tho' he can have no other than moral Means of knowing it; and laſtly, that the Infallibility muſt be the firſt thing believed, altho' theſe things muſt be believed before it. Could any Man well in his Senſes, after reading theſe Words, imagine that I meant *the Self evidencing Light of the Scriptures* again? But they write for thoſe that believe them, and that never dare look into the Books they pretend to confute.

Yet he hath a mind to prove the name of *Roman Catholick Church* to be no *Bull:* Which I ſaid in a *Parentheſis*, was like *German-univerſal Emperor:* This gives a new ſtart; another Common-Place Head is ſearch'd, *Title, Catholick Church*, there he finds ready the old Weather-beaten Teſtimonies, *Rom.* 18. *Your Faith is renowned the whole World over:* Ergo *Roman* and *Catholick* are all one. A plain Demonſtration! What need they talk of the *obſcurity of Faith*, where there is ſuch convincing Evidence? But what if it ſhould have happen'd that St. *Paul* had ſaid the ſame thing of the Faith of the *Corinthians*, or *Theſſalonians*, would it not have been a moſt evident Demonſtration that the Church of *Corinth* was the *Catholick Church* at that time, and was to continue ſo in following Ages? But Scripture, tho' never ſo plain, cannot ſerve their turn; they muſt have Fathers too. So *E. W.* brings in St. *Hierom*, St. *Cyprian*, St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Ambroſe*, *all evidently proving that the Church of* Rome *was once Catholick:* And what then, I beſeech him? Were not other Churches ſo too? But theſe very Teſtimonies, as it unhappily falls out, had been particularly and largely examin'd by me in a whole Chapter to that purpoſe. But it is no matter for that, I had not blotted them out of his *Note-Books*, and there he found no Anſwers, and therefore out they come again.

Rational Account, part 1. c. 1.

Of the Circle in the Reſolution of Faith, not avoided by *E. W.*

Sect. 11. 2. The ſecond Thing I objected againſt this way of reſolving Faith, was, that it did not effect that which it was brought for; for ſuppoſing that Church infallible, and that Infallibility proved by the Motives of Credibility, they do not eſcape the Circle objected againſt them: Which, I ſhewed, 1. From the Nature of Divine Faith, as explain'd by them. 2. From the Conſideration of the Perſons whoſe Faith was to be reſolved. 3. From the Nature of that Infallibility which is attributed to the Church. I muſt now conſider how *E. W.* attempts the clearing of theſe Difficulties.

1. As to the Nature of Divine Faith. I ask whether a Divine Faith, as to the Church's Infallibility, may be built upon the Motives of Credibility? If it may be, then a Divine Faith may reſt upon prudential Motives; if not, then this way cannot clear them from a Circle in the Reſolution of Divine Faith. For I demanded why with a Divine Faith they believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God? Their Anſwer is, becauſe the Church, which is infallible, delivers them as ſuch to us. If I then ask, why with a Divine Faith they believe the Church's Infallibility? I deſired them to anſwer me, if they can, any other way, than becauſe the Scriptutes, which are infallible, ſay ſo. It is a very pleaſant thing to ſee how *E. W.* is miſerably put to his Shifts about this Difficulty; for altho' in his former Diſcourſes he had preſſed the neceſſity of *Divine Faith* ſo much, that from thence he might induce the neceſſity of Infallibility; yet he now ſeems wholly to have forgotten any ſuch Diſtinction, of Faith Humane and Divine; altho' he could not but ſee, that the force

of my Argument did depend upon it. The Subſtance of his Anſwer is, *That the firſt Act of Faith, whereby we believe the Church's Infallibility relies not on Scripture, but upon the Church it ſelf, as the moſt known manifeſted Oracle.* Diſ 3.c.5. n.5. Be it ſo: But the Queſtion is, whether this firſt Act be *Divine Faith* or not; if not, it is nothing to the purpoſe; if it be, then Divine Faith may want an infallible Teſtimony: For this firſt Act of Faith concerning the Churchs Infallibility, hath nothing to rely upon, but the infallible Motives of Credibility, and conſequently *Divine Faith* may want an infallible Teſtimony. And I ſay ſtill, let them anſwer this if they can; without apparent ſhuffling and running away from the Queſtion in Hand.

2. From the Conſideration of the *Perſons* whoſe Faith is to be reſolv'd: For I ſay, 1. The Queſtion is not which way they will prove the Infallibility of the Church againſt thoſe who deny it, but which way they reſolve their own Faith of the Church's Infallibility. 2. In diſputing againſt their Adverſaries they cannot avoid the Circle; for while they prove Infallibility from Scripture, the Queſtion ariſes how they came to know infallibly that this is the Senſe of thoſe Places? For which they muſt again appeal to the Church's Infallibility in delivering the ſenſe of Scripture: Which if it be not a Circle, I ſay, there is hardly ſuch a Figure in Mathematicks. To this he anſwers. 1. *That they both reſolve and prove*; N. 7. but then if they do reſolve their Faith into this Infallibility, it is no ſufficient Anſwer to ſay, *they only prove it to Adverſaries*: Which was all I intended by that firſt Particular. But what Anſwer doth he give the Second concerning *the Senſe* of Scripture? Here again he makes uſe of his Diſtinction *of the firſt and ſecond Act of Faith*; *the firſt*, he ſaith, N. 8, 9. *is not at all founded upon the Senſe of Scripture, but upon the Church's own infallible Teſtimony, made by it ſelf, and for it ſelf, immediately credible. Now, if we ſpeak*, ſaith he, *of another diſtinct, conſequent, and more explicit Act of Faith, when we believe the Church's Infallibility upon this Ground, that ſhe declares the Scripture's genuine Senſe, which proves her an infallible Oracle, there is no Difficulty at all; becauſe this very Expoſition or Interpretation of Scripture is ultimately reſolved into (and therefore again believed upon) the ſame infallible Authority of the Church; or rather upon Scripture, and the Church's Interpretation together. For thus jointly taken, they ground Faith, and not like two diſparate Principles, as if we firſt believed the Scripture's Senſe independently of the Church's Interpretation, and then again believed the Church's Interpretation to be infallible, becauſe the Senſe of Scripture known* aliunde, *or without depending on Church-Authority, ſaith, ſhe is infallible: This cannot be, if Scripture and the Church's Interpretation indiviſibly concur to this latter Act of Faith, whereby we now ſpeak. Here then is a Dilemma that clears all, and frees us from the leaſt ſhadow of a Circle: We either know (or believe) the Scriptures ſenſe independently of the Church's* N. 10. *Interpretation, or receive it upon her infallible Authority. Grant the firſt, there is no danger of a Circle; grant the latter, there are two imaginable Propoſitions to make a Circle of, whilſt that ſenſe internal to the Letter cannot be infallibly propounded otherwiſe, than by the Church.* I have ſet down theſe Words more at large, to let the Reader try his Faculty upon them; what tolerable Senſe he can make of them. My Objection was plain and eaſie; they offer to prove the Church's Infallibility by Scripture, at leaſt as to the ſecond Act of Faith, which is alone pertinent to our Purpoſe; I asked what way they came to believe Infallibility themſelves, and aſſure others this is the Senſe of thoſe Places; and in this Caſe they

are forced to return to the Church's Infallibility. Judge now, Reader, whether here be not a plain Circle, becauſe they believe the Church infallible, becauſe the true Senſe of Scripture ſaith ſhe is ſo; and again, they believe this to be the infallible Senſe of Scripture, becauſe the infallible Church ſaith ſo. No, ſaith *E. W. Here is not the leaſt ſhadow of a Circle.* I would he had told us firſt what a Circle was, and then applied what he had ſaid to the Deſcription given of it. But for all that, I can ſee by his Anſwer he had a mind to amuſe his Reader by ſeeming to ſay ſomething; but no great matter what. Is not this a Circle, when the Argument made uſe of to prove another thing by, muſt it ſelf be proved by that very Thing, which it is made uſe of to prove? For in this caſe the Mind had nothing to fix it ſelf upon, and therefore muſt ſuſpend all Aſſent: Which muſt have ſome certain Foundation to proceed upon, on which it may reſt it ſelf. As the Will could not love Phyſick for the ſake of Health, if it loved Health for the ſake of Phyſick; ſo neither can the Underſtanding aſſent to one Truth for another, if it aſſent to that only for the ſake of the former. For then the ſame Propoſition would be more certain than the other, as it is the Antecedent by which the other is proved; and leſs certain as it is the Conſequent prov'd by the other as its Antecedent: And ſo in different Reſpects would be more and leſs certain than it ſelf. Let us not apply this to our preſent Caſe. The Thing to be prov'd is the Church's Infallibility; the Argument to prove it by, is the infallible Senſe of Scripture; but if the infallible Senſe of Scripture can be prov'd by nothing but the Church's infallible Interpretation; then it is plain that is aſſumed as an Argument to prove Infallibility by, which cannot be otherwiſe known than by this Infallibility. Now let any Man attend to the Anſwer he gives: He ſaith, *There is no Difficulty at all in believing the Church's Infallibility upon this Ground, that ſhe declares the Scripture's genuine Senſe which proves her an infallible Oracle.* No Difficulty at all! Nay, that is a little ſtrange, that there ſhould be no difficulty at all in believing the Church's Infallibility upon the Senſe of thoſe Scriptures, whoſe Senſe could not be infallibly known without the ſuppoſal of that Infallibility, which is to be proved by them. But how comes there to be *no Difficulty at all* in this Matter? *Becauſe this very Expoſition or Interpretation of Scripture, brought to its laſt Principle, is ultimately reſolved into (and therefore again believed upon) the ſame infallible Authority of the Church, or rather upon Scripture and the Church's Interpretation together.* What a ſtrange thing the difference of Mens Underſtandings is! That which he thinks makes it *no Difficulty at all*, makes it to me the greateſt in the World. For by the *Expoſition or Interpretation*, I ſuppoſe he means, *the infallible Senſe of Scripture:* And if this be reſolved into and believed upon the ſame *infallible Authority of the Church*, then I ſtill enquire how this infallible Authority of the Church comes to be proved by this Expoſition of Scripture, the Infallibility of which doth ſuppoſe the thing to be proved, *viz.* the Church's Infallibility. And if the Senſe internal to the latter cannot be infallibly propounded otherwiſe than by the Church; I would fain know what Aſſurance any Man can have of this Senſe, but from the Belief of this infallible Interpreter? *But*, ſaith he, *Scripture and the Church's Interpretation indiviſibly concur to the latter Act of Faith.* This *indiviſible Concurrence*, is to me an odd piece of *myſtical Divinity:* The meaning muſt be (if there be any) that I believe the Church-Infallibility by thoſe Scriptures, from the Church's Infallibility appearing in the infallible Senſe of thoſe Scriptures. But whence,

Ὁ, δὲ διάλληλος συνίσαται ὅταν τὸ ὀφεῖλον τοῦ ζητουμένου πράγματος εἶναι βεβαιωτικὸν, χρείαν ἔχῃ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ ζητουμένου πίστεως *Sextus Empir. Pyrrho. hypotyp. l. 1. c. 15.*

whence, ſay I, doth this appear to be the infallible Senſe of them? For if the Senſe of any places of Scripture be doubtful, theirs is; ſince their meaning is ſo doubtful, how come Men firmly to believe this to be the true and infallible Senſe of thoſe places, and none elſe? Can Men come to an infallible Senſe of Scripture, without an infallible Church? If ſo, what need of any ſuch Infallibility? If not, then the infallible Senſe of theſe places cannot be known but from the Church's Infallibility: And therefore the Circle unavoidably follows, *viz.* that they muſt prove the Church's Infallibility by the infallible Senſe of Scripture, and the infallible Senſe of Scripture by the Church's Infallibility. And any Man might eaſily gueſs that *E. W.* was in a Circle by his Conjuring, and ſpeaking things which neither he, nor any one elſe can underſtand.

3. I ſhewed, that they avoided not the Circle by this way, from the nature of the *Infallibility*, which they attribute to the Church. Which is not by *an immediate Revelation*, but *by divine Aſſiſtance promiſed in Scripture*; and therefore the utmoſt the Motives of Credibility can do in this Caſe, is only to notifie or diſtinguiſh the Church; but ſtill this formal reaſon of believing this Infallibility, cannot be from thoſe Motives, but from thoſe Promiſes, which are ſuppoſed in Scripture to imply it. So that ſtill the Circle returns; for they believe the Scriptures infallible becauſe of the Church's Teſtimony, and the Church infallible, becauſe of the Promiſes of Scripture. This, he gravely calls, *an unlearned Objection.* That is, even as it pleaſes him; but I have no reaſon to take him for an infallible Judge of Learning: However, it is no great matter; learned or unlearned, it is more than he gives any tolerable Anſwer to. But I ſee no reaſon why he calls it ſo, unleſs it be, becauſe, he ſaith, *it is in effect the ſame Objection repeated again.* And he thinks a Man may be allowed to call his Creditor Rogue or Raſcal, that comes a ſecond time, becauſe he could get no good Anſwer at firſt. However ſuch is the Civility of *E. W.* that he will not ſend it away without a ſufficient Anſwer; and yet after all, we have nothing for payment, but *the firſt general Act of Faith*; one would have thought it had been the Act of *publick Faith*, by the badneſs of the Payment. *And this firſt general Act of Faith*, he ſaith, *wholly relies upon the Church's own infallible Teſtimony, without depending on Scripture.* But what is this to that divine Faith we enquire after, and which, he ſaith, muſt reſt upon an infallible Authority? For ſince Faith muſt reſt upon its Motives, and thoſe Motives are confeſſed to be fallible; this cannot be that Aſſent of Faith, which himſelf makes to be neceſſary and we have made appear, notwithſtanding all his ſhuffling, unavoidably brings them into a Circle.

CHAP. III.

An Enquiry into the Miracles of the Roman Church.

E.W's Aſſertions about the Miracles of the Roman Church. Rational Account *Part* 1 C. 5. *Sect.* 12.

Sect. 1. THE next thing which I Objected againſt this way of reſolving Faith, was, that it was notoriouſly falſe, *viz. that here are the ſame Motives of Credibility for the Infallibility of the Roman Church, that there were for the Infallibility of* Moſes *and the Prophets, or of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* The natural Conſequence, I ſaid, of affirming this, was, that there is as great danger in not believing the Church of *Rome* infallible, as in not believing *Moſes* and the Prophets, Chriſt and his Apoſtles to have been ſent from God. For where there is an equal Obligation to believe, there is an equal Sin in not believing; and where the Sin is equal, it ſtands to reaſon, that the Puniſhment ſhould be ſo too. So that the denial of the Roman Church's Infallibility, muſt be accounted by them as high a piece of Infidelity, as calling in Queſtion the Infallibility of Chriſt himſelf; or denying the Scriptures. This doth not in the leaſt ſtartle *E.W.* for he he boldly Aſſerts, *that there are equal Motives of Credibility, as to their Church, and Chriſt and his Apoſtles:* He frequently challenges me *to ſhew the Diſparity*; nay, he put the whole Iſſue of his Cauſe upon it. As may be ſeen by theſe Words of his: The main Argument of *T. C.* he ſaith, was this. "As Chriſt and his Apoſtles proved themſelves Oracles ſent from "God by their Works, Signs and Miracles; again as the Primitive "Chriſtians induced by ſuch Signs believed Chriſt and the Apoſtles up-"on their own Teſtimony to be infallible Teachers; ſo we having ever "had the very like Works, Signs, and Miracles manifeſt in the Church, "are prudently induced to believe her as an infallible Oracle, upon "her own infallible Teſtimony. To ſolve this plain and preſſing Ar-"gument, *ſaith, E.W.* one of theſe two things muſt be done: Either "a Diſparity is to be given between thoſe firſt Signs and Miracles of "the Apoſtles, and the later of the Church; or it muſt be ſhewn where-"in the Inference made, is defective or unconcluding, *viz.* that the "Church Evidenced by her Signs, is not proved God's infallible Oracle, "as the Apoſtles were proved by their Signs, to be infallible Teachers.

Reaſon and Religion, *diſc.* 3. *c.* 6. *n.* 1, 2.

N. 4. Afterward he ſaith, *he hath proved that the Church hath wrought Miracles every way equal with thoſe, which the Apoſtles wrought.* In thoſe Chapters to which he refers us for the proof of this, I find this Aſſertion in the beginning. *I ſay firſt, clear and unqueſtionable Miracles of the like quality with thoſe which Chriſt and his Apoſtles wrought, have been ever ſince moſt glorioųſly manifeſt in the Roman-Catholick Church, and in no other Society of Chriſtians.* Afterwards he calls their Miracles, *glorious Miracles ſtanding upon indubitable Record*; and for the proof of theſe Miracles, he appeals *to the Lives of the Saints, and certain Church-hiſtory. Beſides the Teſtimonies of ſome Fathers, of Miracles done in their time,* not at all to his purpoſe, (as ſhall afterwards appear) *he appeals, to the known Miracles of thoſe two admirable Saints, Bleſſed St.* Dominick *and the Seraphical St.* Francis, *and St.* Vincentius Ferrerius, *reported by the Pious and Learned St.* Antoninus *Arch Biſhop of* Florence. From whence he infers that *the Miracles wrought in the Roman-Catholick Church, are not inferior to*

Diſc. 2. *c.* 8, 9. *C.* 8. *n.* 1.

N. 4.

N. 6.

N. 7.

thoſe done by the Apoſtles; and a little after, *If the Miracles of Chriſt and* N. 13.
the Apoſtles rationally proved againſt Jews *and* Gentiles, *the Credibility of*
Apoſtolical Doctrine, the very like Signs and ſupernatural Effects moſt evi-
dent in the Roman-Catholick Church, as rationally prove againſt Sectaries
the Credibility of our now profeſſed Catholick Doctrine; for which he gives
this reaſon. *The ſame Signs and Marks of Truth, when equal in Majeſty Worth,*
Quality and Number, ever diſcover to reaſon the ſame Truth: wherefore if
the Roman-Catholick Church moſt clearly gives in evidence of her Miracles
equal in Worth Quality and Number with thoſe wrought by Chriſt and his A-
poſtles, it follows, that as thoſe firſt Apoſtolical Wonders were ſufficient to
convince Jews *and* Gentiles *of the Truth of Chriſtianity; ſo theſe later alſo*
wrought in the Church are of like force, and no leſs efficacious to convince
Sectaries of whatever Doctrine ſhe teaches. Now ponder well what the A-
poſtles did; they cured the Sick, diſpoſſeſſed Devils, raiſed the Dead, con-
verted Nations, &c. *but theſe very Miracles have been done in the Roman-*
Catholick Church, yea, and greater too. Ergo, *we have the like Evidence*
of Truth in both the Primitive Age and this; conſequently with it the ſame
Truth. The Sequel is undeniable. After this, for particular Inſtances,
he appeals to *the undeniably Authentick Monuments and Teſtimonies of that*
one ſacred Houſe of Loreto; *to the continual Miracles done at the Reliques*
of St. James *at* Compoſtella *in* Spain, *to the Sacred Vial of St.* Mary N. [illegible].
Magdalen *in* France, *wherein*, ſaith he, very gravely, *the precious Blood*
gathered by that penitent Saint at our Saviour's Paſſion, is yet preſerved, and
viſibly boyls up on the very day he ſuffered after the reading of the Paſſion;
to the undoubted Miracles wrought by the Interceſſion of our Bleſſed Lady at N. 17.
Montaigu, *for which he calls in the Teſtimonies of* Lipſius *and* Putean, and
at large relates *a Miracle wrought by St.* Xaverius *upon* F. Marcellus *a Je-* N. 18.
ſuit at Naples; *and then anſwers ſome few Objections, and concludes with* C. 9.
the vindication of the Miracle at Zaragoza *in* Spain. This is the ſub-
ſtance of *E. W's*. Diſcourſe upon this Subject; which in proper conſe-
quence of it, doth more really enervate the Proofs of Chriſtianity, than
eſtabliſh the Infallibility of the Roman Church. For I do not think an
Atheiſt would deſire more Advantage againſt the Chriſtian Religion,
than to have it granted that the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles were
no other than ſuch as are wrought in the Roman Church; and that the
Proofs of them are no more Authentick and undeniable than thoſe of
the Miracles done at *Loreto*, *Compoſtella*, or *Montaigu*: And that Chriſt
and his Apoſtles gave no more illuſtrious Evidences of their being ſent
from God, than St. *Dominick*, or St. *Francis*; and that there was no great-
er Evidence of Chriſt's Reſurrection from the Dead, than there is of
the boyling up of the Blood of Chriſt in the Vial of St. *Mary Magdalen*
in the Church of St. *Maximin* in *France*.

Therefore not only to invalidate the Teſtimony drawn from hence for the Roman Church's Infallibility, but to preſerve the Honour of Chriſtianity, I am obliged to enquire into theſe two things.

1. Whether the Teſtimony upon which the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and thoſe of the Roman Church, are delivered, be equally credible?

2. Whether the Miracles of the Roman Church be ſo equal (to abate him what he ſaith of *greater*) in Worth, Quality and Number with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that the Roman Church's Infallibility is as much atteſted by them, as Chriſt and his Apoſtles was by theirs?

1. I ſhall enquire into the Credibility of the Teſtimony on both

ſides. Two things are agreed to make up ſufficient Credibility in a Teſtimony; *viz.* the Knowledge and Fidelity of the Perſons who deliver it. If they ſpeak nothing but what they were certain Witneſſes of, and never gave ſuſpicion of Fraud and Deceit, and offered the higheſt ways of Proof concerning their own Fidelity, then it is an unreaſonable thing to disbelieve them. This is the Caſe of thoſe who recorded our Saviour's and his Apoſtles Miracles; they were Perſons who either ſaw them wrought themſelves, or had them delivered to them immediately by them who ſaw them; they publiſhed them to the World in that Age wherein they were capable of being diſproved by Perſons then living in the ſame places where they were wrought, and were notorious Enemies to the Perſons who did them, who were concerned to diſcover for their own Juſtification, the leaſt Fraud or Impoſture in thoſe Matters. But beſides this, to take away all Suſpicion of Deſign, the Witneſſes of theſe things freely quitted all expectations of Worldly Advantages, they ran themſelves upon the greateſt hazards to atteſt the Truth of what they ſaid, and at laſt Sacrificed their Lives to confirm the Truth of their own Teſtimony. But on the other ſide, if I can prove

1. That the greateſt Number of the Miracles in the Roman Church have been believed upon the Credit of Fables and uncertain Reports.

2. That the Teſtimony of thoſe who deliver them, hath been contradicted by Men of greater Authority than themſelves.

3. If upon ſtrict and careful Examination, notorious Forgeries and Impoſtures have been diſcovered; and never any Perſons laid down their Lives to atteſt the Truth of any of their Miracles; then it can be nothing but the greateſt Impudence in any to parallel the Teſtimony of the Primitive Church concerning the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, with that of the Miracles wrought in the Church of *Rome.*

1. That the greateſt number of Miracles in the Roman Church have been believed upon the Credit of Fables and uncertain Reports. For the proof of this, I ſhall make choice of his own Inſtances of *Loreto* in *Italy*, *Compoſtella* in *Spain*, St. *Maximin's* Church in *France*, and the Lives of his two admirable Saints to which I ſhall add ſome nearer home, that we may have a Proof of the Credibility of theſe Miracles in the moſt conſiderable places of *Europe.*

Of the Miraculous Tranſlation of the Chappel of *Loreto.*

Sect. 2. Let us firſt go on Pilgrimage to our *Lady* of *Loreto*, to view the *undeniably Authentick publick Monuments and Teſtimonies of Miracles there wrought.* The firſt to be ſeen there, in a Table hanging up for that purpoſe, is, the wonderful Miracle in the Tranſlation of that Chappel, firſt from *Nazareth* to *Dalmatia*, and from *Dalmatia*, into thoſe parts of *Italy* where it now ſtands. The Story cannot be better told, than it is in the Authentick Table it ſelf: Which may be thus Tranſlated.

“ The Church of our B. Lady of *Loreto* was a Chamber of the Houſe
“ of the B. Virgin *Mary*, Mother of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which Houſe
“ ſtood in the Country of *Judea*, in a City of *Galilee*, whoſe Name was
“ *Nazareth*; in which Chamber the B. Virgin *Mary* was born, and bred
“ up, and afterwards there received the Salutation of the Angel *Gabriel*,
“ and in the ſame Chamber ſhe Educated her Son Jeſus Chriſt to the
“ Age of Twelve Years. After the Aſcention of Chriſt to Heaven, the
“ Virgin *Mary* remained upon Earth with the Apoſtles and other Diſ-
“ ciples of Chriſt, who ſeeing many divine Myſteries performed in the
“ ſaid Chamber, did by the common conſent of them all Decree, to
“ make a Church of that Chamber to the Honour of the B. Virgin *Ma-*

“ry, which they did, and the Apoſtles and Diſciples conſecrated that Chamber to be a Church, and there celebrated divine Offices, and St. *Luke* the Evangeliſt with his own Hands, made an Image to the likeneſs of the B. Virgin, which is there to this day. Afterwards that Church was inhabited, and Honoured with much Devotion by the Chriſtian People in thoſe parts in which it ſtood as long as the People remained Chriſtians. But after they renounced the Chriſtian Faith, and embraced Mahometiſm, the Angels of God took away the ſaid Church, and carried it into the Parts of *Sclavonia*, and there placed it by a certain Caſtle called *Fiume*, where it met not with that Honour which the B. Virgin deſired. Therefore the Angels came and took it from thence and carried it clear over the Sea, into the Parts of the Territory of *Recanati*, and there placed it in a Wood which belonged to a Noble Lady who had the command of the City of *Recanati*, and was Owner of the Wood, whoſe Name was *Loreta*; and from her the Church took its Name of St. *Maria de Loreto*. In that time by reaſon of the great concourſe of all People to that Wood in which the Church remained, abundance of Robberies and Miſchiefs were committed there; and therefore the Angels again took up the Chappel and carried it to a Hill belonging to two Brothers where the Angels ſet it down; theſe Brothers getting a vaſt Revenue by the reſort of Pilgrims thither, and the Oblations by them made, fell to a great diſcord. Upon which the Angels came again and took away the Chappel from that place, and carried it into the High-way; and there placed it where it is now, with many Signs and innumerable Gifts and Miracles. Then all the People of *Recanati* went to ſee the Church which ſtood upon the Earth without any Foundation: And being aſtoniſhed at ſuch a Miracle, and fearing leſt it ſhould come to ruin, they compaſſed it about with a good thick Wall and a ſtrong Foundation, as it is ſeen at this day, and yet no one knew, from whence that Church came into thoſe Parts, until in *A. D.* 1290. the bleſſed Virgin appeared in a Dream to a certain Man much devoted to her, to whom ſhe revealed the foregoing things, and he preſently divulged them to certain honeſt Men of that Country: Who immediately reſolved to know the Truth of theſe Matters; and therefore determined to ſend ſixteen notable good Men to *Nazareth*, to find out the Truth of them. Who carried with them the Meaſure of the ſaid Church, and there they found exactly the Foundations of it and the juſt Meaſure; and to make all ſure, they found it written upon a Wall, that ſuch a Church had been there, and was gone from thence, and theſe Perſons upon their return certified the Truth of all theſe things; and from that time it was known that that Chappel was the Chamber of the bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, and the Chriſtian People ſhewed great Devotion towards it: For the bleſſed Virgin there every day, doth infinite Miracles, as Experience ſhews.

“There was a certain Eremite that was called Brother *Paul* of the Wood, who dwelt in a ſmall Cottage in that Wood, and every Morning went to divine Offices in that Chappel, and was a Man of a great Abſtinence and a Holy Life, who ſaid, that ten Years before, or thereabouts, on the day of the Nativity of the bleſſed Virgin being the 8th of *September*, two Hours before day in a clear Air, going out of his Cottage towards the Church, he ſaw, a Light deſcend from Heaven up-

“ on the Church twelve Foot long, and ſix broad, and when it was up on the Church it vaniſhed; upon which he ſaid it was the bleſſed Virgin, which there appeared on the day of her Nativity, and came too ſee her Feaſt obſerved; but no Man ſaw her beſides this Holy Man.

“ To confirm the Truth and Certainty of all theſe things, two honeſt Men of this Village reported them ſeveral times to me *Teremanus* the Over-ſeer and Governour of the ſaid Church: One of them was called *Paulus Renaldatii*, the other *Francis Prior*. The ſaid *Paul* told me that his Grandfather's Grandfather ſaw when the Angels carried the ſaid Chappel over the Sea, and placed it in the Wood, and that he and other Perſons oftentimes went to the ſaid Chappel. And the ſaid *Francis* oftimes ſaid to me that his Grandfather being one hundred and twenty Years Old, ſaid, that he went often to the ſaid Church in the Wood. Moreover the ſaid *Francis* averred that his Grandſather's Grandfather, had a Houſe and dwelt there: And that in his time the Chappel was removed by Angels from the Hill of the Two Brothers to the High-way.

Deo gratias. Imprinted at *Venice* by *Benedictus de Bindonis*, *A. D.* 1499.

In the *Italian* Copy it is only added, *that this Narration was taken out of an Original Authentick* M.S. *belonging to the ſaid Chappel*, March 20. A.D. 1492.

And is not this a very pleaſant Story, to be matched in point of Credibility with the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? What do theſe Men think in their Hearts of Chriſtian Religion; that dare avouch ſuch ridiculous Fictions as theſe are, and impoſe them on the Credulity of Mankind? But we are not to imagine this to be only a *Legend* hung up at *Loreto*, for the Comfort of devout Pilgrims; but it is delivered in the ſame manner, by Men who ſhould have had more Wit, or more Honeſty. *Baron. Annal.* Tom. 1. *A.* 9. *n.* 1. *Cardinal Baronius* in his Annals, cannot let it eſcape, but relates the miraculous Tranſlation of this Chappel from *Nazareth* to *Dalmatia*, from thence to *Loreto* much after the ſame way. All the Argument he brings for the Truth of it, *is taken from God's Omnipotency*, as though, *Caſaub. Exercit.* 7. *ſect.* 1. as *Iſ. Caſaubon* truly Anſwers him, all the Rabbinical and Mahometan Fables might not be believed on the ſame ground. And he obſerves from ſome of the Fathers, that *God's Omnipotency is the Sanctuary of Hereticks*, whither they betake themſelves when they are baffled with reaſon. *Caniſ. Hiſt. Deipara*, l. 5. c. 25. But *Baronius* refers us to *Caniſius* for a fuller Account of this admirable Story; who very wiſely brings the Stories of the Prophet *Elias*, *Habakkuk*, and *Philip* in the *Acts*, to confirm the Truth of this; as though the diſpute were whether God could do it, and not whether the thing were really done? But if we offer to Queſtion whether the Holy Angels are ever employed in the carrying Houſes (not on their Shoulders I ſuppoſe, but their Wings) he chokes us preſently, with the *Angels, being* Heb. 1. 14. *ſaid to be miniſtring Spirits for the heirs of Salvation*; as though it were not poſſible for them to diſcharge that Office faithfully, unleſs at ſome time or other, they took away an old Houſe from its Foundations, and mounted it into the Air, and conveyed it about two thouſand Miles. Is not this notable Service to the Heirs of Salvation? The latter Writers, ſuch as *Raynaldus*, *Bzovius*, *Spondanus*, and *Benedictus Gononus*, refer us to *Horatius Turſellinus*, as the moſt Authentick Hiſtorian of this ſtupendous Miracle: And this Book was not only approv'd by the General of his Order, but hath a Bull of *Clement* VIII. prefixed before it. The Subſtance of his Story is the very ſame with the Table of *Teremanus*, only inlarged with ſome more improbable Circumſtances, and that the Trees made lowly Reverences, and bowed themſelves to the Chappel in its Paſſage; (but it ſeems they bowed ſo low that they could never recover themſelves after; being, I ſuppoſe, of great Age when they made this Obeyſance) that, when the new Wall was built for the ſupport of the Chappel; the Walls of it would not endure the others being too near, but made the new Wall by degrees know its due diſtance; ſo that at laſt a Boy might be put in between them: That the Image of our Saviour being taken out to be ſet in a more conſpicuous Place, it went of its own accord into the Chappel again; ſo that after ſeveral attempts, they were fain to give over their Deſign. I confeſs theſe Circumſtances do not tend much to the making the Story it ſelf more credible; but what Authority hath *Turſellinus* found out for ſo ſtrange a Miracle? He often quotes *Hieronymus Angelita*, but he writ in *Clement* the Seventh's Time, and dedicated his Hiſtory of that Chappel to him; but the main Prop of all this Story is the Tradition of *Loreto*, and the *Table* of *Teremanus*, whom he highly commends for his Integrity and Prudence, who was Governour of the Chappel in the time of *Pius* II. about the Year 1460, and to his Teſtimonies *Turſellinus* appeals for proof of the Matter of Fact. And was ever ſo great a Miracle better atteſted than this? We will out of meer Kindneſs, ſet aſide the Teſtimony from Viſions and Dreams; but then could we imagine any thing leſs than ſome Perſons of Credit, who had ſeen the Chappel in its march over the Sea, were reſolved to obſerve, where ſuch *a Chappel in the Air* would at laſt fix it ſelf; or, that ſome that ſaw it pitched upon the Ground without any Foundations, ſhould preſently fill the Country with the noiſe of it, as ſuch ſtrange Things are very apt to do; and that ſuch Witneſſes being ſtrictly examin'd, ſhould have left a Depoſition written by them for the ſatisfaction of future Ages. Inſtead of which, we have two plain Countrymen brought in to give Teſtimony to a thing done in the time of their Grandfathers Grandfathers: Neither do they both give Teſtimony to the ſame Thing; but one of them ſaith, *his Granfather's Grandfather* (not *his Grandfather*, as *Turſellinus* hath it) ſaw the Chappel, while it was in the Air, carried by Angels over the Sea. Is not this a ſubſtantial Witneſs, that atteſts what his Grandfather's Grandfather ſaw, without any other Evidence of it, than that he heard ſo? *Turſellinus* ſaith, *That it was not only to* Teremanus *that they atteſted this by word*, but *they did ſwear to it*: Which adds very much to their Credit, conſidering the Nature of their Teſtimony; but methinks *Teremanus* himſelf ſhould not have forgotten that. All the force of this Teſtimony lies upon one Man, who is reported by his great Grandchild to have ſeen the Chappel carry'd by Angels over the Sea. But ſuppoſe he did ſee ſomething moving upon the Sea, while he was cutting Wood, or feeding his Cattle in the Fields of *la Marca di Ancona*; was he ſure it was the Chappel of *Loreto*: Did he ſee the Angels carrying it? Might not a plain Countryman miſtake a little about the Colour and Shape of Angels? Might not a Ship under Sail, in the Adriatick Gulf, be taken by ſuch a Man for a Houſe carry'd by Angels with white Wings?

Raynald. A.*D*.1291. *n*. 68, 69. *Bzov. Anal.* ad A. *D.* 1296. *n.* 14. *Spondan.* A.D. 1291. *n.* 22. *Gonon. Chronic. deip.* A.D. 1298. *Turſellin. Hiſt. Laur.* l. 1. c. 6. C. 16.

“ on the Church twelve Foot long, and ſix broad, and when it was up
“ on the Church it vaniſhed; upon which he ſaid it was the bleſſed Virgin,
“ which there appeared on the day of her Nativity, and came
“ too ſee her Feaſt obſerved; but no Man ſaw her beſides this Holy
“ Man.

“ To confirm the Truth and Certainty of all theſe things, two honeſt
“ Men of this Village reported them ſeveral times to me *Teremanus*
“ the Over-ſeer and Governour of the ſaid Church: One of them
“ was called *Paulus Renaldatii*, the other *Francis Prior*. The ſaid *Paul*
“ told me that his Grandfather's Grandfather ſaw when the Angels carried
“ the ſaid Chappel over the Sea, and placed it in the Wood, and
“ that he and other Perſons oftentimes went to the ſaid Chappel. And
“ the ſaid *Francis* oftimes ſaid to me that his Grandfather being one
“ hundred and twenty Years Old, ſaid, that he went often to the ſaid
“ Church in the Wood. Moreover the ſaid *Francis* averred that his
“ Grandfather's Grandfather, had a Houſe and dwelt there: And that
“ in his time the Chappel was removed by Angels from the Hill of the
“ Two Brothers to the High-way.

Deo gratias.

Imprinted at *Venice* by *Benedictus de Bindonis, A. D.* 1499.

In the *Italian* Copy it is only added, *that this Narration was taken out of an Original Authentick* M. S. *belonging to the ſaid Chappel*, March 20. A.D. 1492.

And is not this a very pleaſant Story, to be matched in point of Credibility with the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? What do theſe Men think in their Hearts of Chriſtian Religion; that dare avouch ſuch ridiculous Fictions as theſe are, and impoſe them on the Credulity of Mankind? But we are not to imagine this to be only a *Legend* hung up at *Loreto*, for the Comfort of devout Pilgrims; but it is delivered in the ſame manner, by Men who ſhould have had more Wit, or more Honeſty. *Cardinal Baronius* in his Annals, cannot let it eſcape, but relates the miraculous Tranſlation of this Chappel from *Nazareth* to *Dalmatia*, from thence to *Loreto* much after the ſame way. All the Argument he brings for the Truth of it, *is taken from God's Omnipotency*, as though, as *Iſ. Caſaubon* truly Anſwers him, all the Rabbinical and Mahometan Fables might not be believed on the ſame ground. And he obſerves from ſome of the Fathers, that *God's Omnipotency is the Sanctuary of Hereticks*, whither they betake themſelves when they are baffled with reaſon. But *Baronius* refers us to *Caniſius* for a fuller Account of this admirable Story; who very wiſely brings the Stories of the Prophet *Elias*, *Habakkuk*, and *Philip* in the *Acts*, to confirm the Truth of this; as though the diſpute were whether God could do it, and not whether the thing were really done? But if we offer to Queſtion whether the Holy Angels are ever employed in the carrying Houſes (not on their Shoulders I ſuppoſe, but their Wings) he chokes us preſently, with the *Angels, being ſaid to be miniſtring Spirits for the heirs of Salvation*; as though it were not poſſible for them to diſcharge that Office faithfully, unleſs at ſome time or other, they took away an old Houſe from its Foundations, and mounted it into the Air, and conveyed it about two thouſand Miles. Is

Baron. Annal. Tom. 1. *A.* 9. *n.* 1.

Caſaub. Exercit. 7. *ſect.* 1.

Caniſ. Hiſt. Deipara, l. 5. c. 25.

Heb. 1. 14.

not this notable Service to the Heirs of Salvation? The latter Writers, ſuch as *Raynaldus*, *Bzovius*, *Spondanus*, and ***Benedictus Gononus***, refer us to *Horatius Turſellinus*, as the moſt Authentick Hiſtorian of this ſtupendous Miracle: And this Book was not only approv'd by the General of his Order, but hath a Bull of *Clement* VIII. prefixed before it. The Subſtance of his Story is the very ſame with the Table of *Teremanus*, only inlarged with ſome more improbable Circumſtances, and that the Trees made lowly Reverences, and bowed themſelves to the Chappel in its Paſſage; (but it ſeems they bowed ſo low that they could never recover themſelves after; being, I ſuppoſe, of great Age when they made this Obeyſance) that, when the new Wall was built for the ſupport of the Chappel; the Walls of it would not endure the others being too near, but made the new Wall by degrees know its due diſtance; ſo that at laſt a Boy might be put in between them: That the Image of our Saviour being taken out to be ſet in a more conſpicuous Place, it went of its own accord into the Chappel again; ſo that after ſeveral attempts, they were fain to give over their Deſign. I confeſs theſe Circumſtances do not tend much to the making the Story it ſelf more credible; but what Authority hath *Turſellinus* found out for ſo ſtrange a Miracle? He often quotes *Hieronymus Angelita*, but he writ in *Clement* the Seventh's Time, and dedicated his Hiſtory of that Chappel to him; but the main Prop of all this Story is the Tradition of *Loreto*, and the *Table* of *Teremanus*, whom he highly commends for his Integrity and Prudence, who was Governour of the Chappel in the time of *Pius* II. about the Year 1460, and to his Teſtimonies *Turſellinus* appeals for proof of the Matter of Fact. And was ever ſo great a Miracle better atteſted than this? We will out of meer Kindneſs, ſet aſide the Teſtimony from Viſions and Dreams; but then could we imagine any thing leſs than ſome Perſons of Credit, who had ſeen the Chappel in its march over the Sea, were reſolved to obſerve, Where ſuch *a Chappel in the Air* would at laſt fix it ſelf; or, that ſome that ſaw it pitched upon the Ground without any Foundations, ſhould preſently fill the Country with the noiſe of it, as ſuch ſtrange Things are very apt to do; and that ſuch Witneſſes being ſtrictly examin'd, ſhould have left a Depoſition written by them for the ſatisfaction of future Ages. Inſtead of which, we have two plain Countrymen brought in to give Teſtimony to a thing done in the time of their Grandfathers Grandfathers: Neither do they both give Teſtimony to the ſame Thing; but one of them ſaith, *his Granfather's Grandfather* (not *his Grandfather*, as *Turſellinus* hath it) ſaw the Chappel, while it was in the Air, carried by Angels over the Sea. Is not this a ſubſtantial Witneſs, that atteſts what his Grandfather's Grandfather ſaw, without any other Evidence of it, than that he heard ſo? *Turſellinus* ſaith, *That it was not only to* Teremanus *that they atteſted this by word*, but *they did ſwear to it:* Which adds very much to their Credit, conſidering the Nature of their Teſtimony; but methinks *Teremanus* himſelf ſhould not have forgotten that. All the force of this Teſtimony lies upon one Man, who is reported by his great Grandchild to have ſeen the Chappel carry'd by Angels over the Sea. But ſuppoſe he did ſee ſomething moving upon the Sea, while he was cutting Wood, or feeding his Cattle in the Fields of *la Marca di Ancona*; was he ſure it was the Chappel of *Loreto*: Did he ſee the Angels carrying it? Might not a plain Countryman miſtake a little about the Colour and Shape of Angels? Might not a Ship under Sail, in the Adriatick Gulf, be taken by ſuch a Man for a Houſe carry'd by Angels with white Wings?

Raynald. A.*D*.1291. *n.* 68, 69. *Bzov. Anal.* ad A. *D.* 1296. *n.* 14. *Spondan.* A.D. 1291. *n.* 22.*Gonon. Chronic. deip.* A.D. 1298. *Turſellin. Hiſt. Laur.* l. 1. c. 6. C. 16.

are ſuch Miracles ſo little regarded by the People of *Italy*, that no proof could be produced for it, but what two Affidavit-men ſaid, that they had heard what their Anceſtors almoſt two hundred Years before had ſeen or heard? Is it poſſible the memory of ſuch a Miracle ſhould be ſo near being quite loſt? Were there no Writers in that Age to record it, and take notice of it? Is it credible ſo great a Miracle ſhould happen in thoſe days, and neither *Dantes* nor *Petrarch*, nor *Boccace* take the leaſt notice of it, although they were all *Italians*, and inquiſitive Men, and had ſufficient occaſion in their Writings to mention it? But ſuppoſe, theſe Men were not apt to believe ſuch things; what ſhall we ſay to *St. Antonin* of *Florence*, whom *E. W.* calls *a pious learned Man*, who hath written ſuch a Rapſody of all ſorts of Miracles, and lived a good while after this miraculous Tranſlation and yet takes not the leaſt notice of it? What ſhall we ſay *to that admirable Saint*, St. *Vincentius Ferrerius*, as *E. W.* calls him, who lived after A. D. 1440. who ſaith, *that the Chamber of our Lady was ſtill in* Nazareth? And although the former are negative Teſtimonies, yet they cannot be rejected by ſuch who make uſe of Teſtimonies to caſt off a matter of Fact atteſted by much better Authors than *Paulus Renaldatii*, *Franciſcus Prior*, or *Petrus Georgius Teremanus*. And that is in the Story of Pope *Joan*, wherein *Baronius* ſaith, *That the ſilence of ſo long time after it, wherein there was a juſt occaſion to mention it, was more than a thouſand witneſſes to prove the falſity of it.* And if ſilence be a thouſand witneſſes on their ſide, I hope it may be at leaſt five hundred on ours. But *Turſellinus* offers to bring all the Teſtimonies which were to be had: The firſt, is *Blondus*, who was Secretary to *Eugenius* the 4th. about the Year 1450. a good competent time after the Miracle was ſaid to be wrought. Yet all that *Blondus* ſaith, is only, *that there was a famous Chappel of our Lady at* Loreto, *as appeared by the many Oblations there made*, but not one Word of the miraculous Tranſlation. The Poet *Mantuan* ſaith, *he read the Table hanging up in the Chappel*; and no wonder if he found the Story fit for a Poet's Brain to work upon. *Leander Albertus* ſpeaks home, but he comes much too late to give any Teſtimony, having publiſhed his Deſcription of *Italy*, A. D. 1550. But *Leander* ſeems to rely moſt upon the Miracles there wrought as an Evidence of the Chappel's miraculous Tranſlation; and the proof of thoſe Miracles depends upon the *Tables* hung up in the Chappel; which I ſuppoſe are *E. W's. undeniable and Authentick Teſtimonies.*

Vincent. ſerm. de Aſſump. B. V.

Baron. Annal. A. D. 853. *n.* 65.

Turſel. Hiſt. Lauret. l. 1. c. 23.

Blondi Italiæ illuſtr. in Piceno, p. 339.

Leand. Albert. in Picen. p. 428.

Of the Miracles wrought at the Chappel of *Loreto*.

Sect. 3. Therefore inſtead of purſuing farther this incredible Fiction of the Tranſlation of this Chappel from *Nazareth* to *Dalmatia*, and ſo to *Loreto*, by any ſcrupulous Enquiries, how ſuch a Chamber, or part of Houſe, ſhould be able to hold for above One Thouſand ſix Hundred Years without decay: How at *Nazareth* it ſhould eſcape being deſtroy'd when *Joſephus* and *Dion*, ſay, all the Country thereabout, was burnt and deſtroy'd by the *Romans*, fifty Caſtles, and nine Hundred eighty five Towns being conſumed by *Trajan* after the ſtrange Devaſtation made by *Veſpaſian*? How the *Church* of the *Annunciation* at *Nazareth* ſhould be remov'd to *Italy*, and yet remain ſtill at *Nazareth* by the conſtant Tradition of the Eaſtern Parts? How the Meaſure ſhould be found exactly agreeing by thoſe ſent to examine it, when *Thomas de Novariâ* ſaith, that he lately found out the only true Foundations larger than the Angels Chappel there built? Theſe, and ſeveral other Scruples, I ſhall now let alone; and conſider the other *undeniably Authentick Monuments and Teſtimonies of the ſacred Houſe of* Loreto. *Turſellinus* mentions one, which he ſaith,

Joſeph de bello Jud. l. 7. *Dion in vit. Trajani.*

Quareſm. Elucid. terræ S. l. 7. c. 5. *peregr.* 3.

Turſell. Hiſt, Lauret. l. 2. c. 18.

ſaith, *is ſo well atteſted, that it is a Sin to doubt of it:* And is very well worth our reading, that we may ſee what rare Stories *are parallel'd with the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.*

A certain Prieſt of Dalmatia *being hugely devoted to the bleſſed Virgin of* Loreto, *was taken Priſoner by the* Turks; *who would have forced him to renounce his Religion, which he would by no means hear of; but ſtill called upon Chriſt and* Mary: *They being enraged at him, ask'd of him, what he meant to uſe thoſe Names ſo much; he told them, they ſtuck to his very Entrails; upon which they threatened they would pull out his very Entrails, if he did not immediately curſe them both. Which they reſolving to do, the poor Prieſt made a Vow to the Bleſſed Virgin of* Loreto, *that if he lived he would go in Pilgrimage thither. At which they being more enraged, cut open his Breaſt and pulled out all his Entrails, and gave them into his Hand being now ready to ſink, and bid him go and carry them to the Lady of* Loreto. *The Prieſt preſently goes on his way, and after many Days Journey, comes ſafe to* Loreto, *having his Entrails in his Hand. Where ever he came, great flocking of People there was about him,* (as we may eaſily imagine) *and to our Lady's Servants here he ſhews his naked Breaſt, and his Entrails taken out; and after having offered up his Devotions to the Bleſſed Virgin, in the Sight and Embraces of her, he breathed his laſt.* Is not this a ſwinging Miracle; and deſerving Credit beyond thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? To ask how a Man could breath without his Lungs, or live without a Heart, or by what Veſſels the Circulation of the Blood was then perform'd? Or any ſuch untoward Queſtions, were but to gratifie carnal Reaſon too much, where nothing is required but meer Faith. And ſuch Men have certainly great ſtore of that, or rather of Folly and Impudence, that can dare to call theſe *Legends* by the Name of *Authentick Monuments, or undeniable Teſtimonies.* This is a very hopeful beginning in the ſearch into *theſe Monuments*; but I have ſeveral Things further to object againſt this way of proving Miracles by *Tables* that are hung up in ſuch Places, as the *Chappel* of *Loreto* is.

1. That any extraordinary Accident that befalls a Perſon, if he either chanced to think upon the *Bleſſed Virgin* of *Loreto*, or pray to her, or at leaſt tell thoſe ſo, who are concerned to have it believed, this immediately paſſes for a Miracle. There are very few Perſons in the World, but at ſome time or other of their Lives, do meet with extraordinary Deliverances, either from Diſeaſes, or other Dangers. If any of theſe had liv'd in thoſe Parts, and had been poſſeſſed with the ſame ſuperſtitious Follies, immediately any ſuch Paſſage of their Lives, if they had gone to *Loreto* after it, and there acquainted the *Pænitentiary* or *Confeſſor* with it, it had been entred into the *Tables*, and had been preſerved (as a Tooth drawer doth Teeth) for the Reputation of the Place. The far greateſt part of the Miracles mention'd by *Turſellinus*, are of this kind. The firſt Miracle, by his own Confeſſion, which brought the Church of *Loreto* into Reputation, was the Cure of *Pius* the Second, who being troubled with the Gout, and a Feaver, and a Cough, pray'd to the Lady of *Loreto* for his Recovery, (not meerly to go to *Ancona* but as the Inſcription expreſſeth it on the Cup he ſent to *Loreto*, that he might be freed from his Diſeaſes, and recover ſound Health) and *Turſellinus* tells us, *That he did not fail of his Hope in any part; for immediately,* ſaith he, *his Feaver went off, his Cough left him, and his Limbs recover'd ſtrength; and away he goes for* Ancona, *and there dies of his Feaver and Conſumption.* Call you this a Miracle? I know not what kind of Miracles the

Turſ. Hiſt. Lauret. l. 1. c. 26.

the Lady of *Loreto* works; I am ſure Chriſt and his Apoſtles never wrought ſuch. We uſe to ſay, that a Miracle is *a perfect Work*; and is dying of a Diſeaſe a miraculous Cure? *Platina* and *Ciacconius* in his Life take no notice of a Cure, much leſs of a Miracle; but ſay, that upon ſome intermiſſion he undertook his Journey where he dy'd of his Diſeaſe. Yet *Turſellinus* ſaith, *The Fame of this Cure brought great Reputation to the Lady of* Loreto: Which till that time (*viz.* for one Hundred and Sixty Years after the miraculous Tranſlation) was known only among the Inhabitants of the Country about *Ancona*; and ſcarce the leaſt knowledge of it was paſſed into the Neighbour Countries; which is the Reaſon he gives why *Vincentius*, *Antoninus*, and the *Italian Writers* take no notice of it: And thoſe who did, as *Blondus*, yet *do not mention the Tranſlation, leſt they ſhould ſeem to utter vain and incredible Things.* A very ſubſtantial Reaſon, I confeſs. But after this time Miracles grew more frequent, as the Superſtition and Credulity of the People did increaſe. If a Man recover'd of a dangerous Sickneſs; if *Julius* the Second eſcape being ſhot by a Cannon Bullet; if *Clement* the Seventh eſcape with his Life in the Sacking of *Rome*; if others are deliver'd from great Dangers either by Sea or Land, in what Way or Kind ſo ever it be, if they do but ſend or go to *Loreto* afterwards, all theſe are recorded there for Miracles.

l. 2. c. 2. c. 12. c. 24, c. 27. l. 3. c. 15, 16, 17, 18, 24. 26. 27. l. 4. 5, 6, 7. 17, 18, 19, &c.

2. That this way of Teſtimony is liable to the greateſt Exceptions. For, the Prieſts who make theſe *Tables*, are eaſily abuſed by the confident Affirmation of Perſons who come and tell them great Stories of Miracles wrought at the Invocation of the *Lady* of *Loreto*; as in all likelihood *Rivera* the Pænitentiary of *Loreto* was, by many who came to him, who were Perſons of no Reputation at all. As the *Jew* that told the formal Story, *of his being deliver'd at* Nazareth *out of Priſon, by calling upon his Countrywoman, the Lady of* Loreto; *who thereupon appeared to him with her Woman called* Lucia, *waiting upon her,* (*whom ſhe bid to knock off his Chains,*) *and opened the Priſon-doors and led him to the Sea ſide, and ſhewed him a Ship ready for his Paſſage, and bid him make haſte to* Loreto, *and be there Baptized.* And we may think he obey'd her Will; for he told *Riera*, that he came to *Ancona* in two Days. Yet this Man was received with great Joy, and the Miracle highly magnified; and which was more, for all that we can find, verily believed. And no doubt the *Venetian Courteſan* was a Perſon of great Credit, who having ſpent many Years in that Trade, came to *Loreto* full of a very ſtrange Miracle, *viz. That ſhe was ſet upon in her way thither by her Companion, who deſperately wounded her in many places and cut her Throat; and ſhe juſt in the very nick of expiring, called upon the Lady of* Loreto *for help; who preſently appeared to her, and took her in her Lap, and ſtroked her Wounds, and immediately cured her Body, and filled her Soul with heavenly Joy.* Was not the bleſſed Virgin very kind to a Courteſan? But all this was preſently believed at *Loreto*; and as an impregnable Evidence of the Truth of it, ſhe ſhewed a *ſhining Liſt about her Neck upon the Skin*; which was a demonſtration ſhe was healed by a divine Hand. For St. *Winifred* and others had juſt ſuch a one when their Heads were joyned to their Bodies again. And are not theſe *Authentick Teſtimonies and undeniable Monuments?* Is the Teſtimony of the whole Chriſtian Church to be compared to that of a *Jew* and a Courteſan? But ſuppoſing the Perſons who delivered theſe things to them, were ſuch as had a great credit;

Turſ. l. 1. c. 12.

(and ſo they had need to be when the reputation of a Miracle depends upon their ſingle Teſtimony,) yet it is not poſſible to ſuppoſe that the Prieſts for the reputation of their Houſe, may help out a lame Miracle with an advantagious Circumſtance or two? It being for ſo good a Cauſe as the Honour of their Church. Eſpecially when ſuch infinite Riches come by it, as may be ſeen by *Turſellinus* his Hiſtory of the *Lady* of *Loreto*; whoſe Book is made up of Miracles and Riches: And in Truth the greateſt Miracle there is the Riches of that Chappel ſince it gained reputation in the World. They had need of a very untainted Credit, to have their Teſtimony taken on their bare Words, when there is ſuch a reward for Lying. Men need not ask *Caſſius* his Queſtion *cui bono?* For any one may eaſily diſcern that, that compares the Tables of Miracles and the vaſt Riches accruing by them together. The honeſt Heathens thought a Perſon's Teſtimony was then to be relyed upon; when there was no reward for Falſehood.

Cum ſunt præmia falſi
Nulla, ratam debet teſtis habere fidem.

Tacitus thought, it was a good Argument of Men's Fidelity, if they affirmed a thing *poſtquam nullum mendacio pretium*; when there was no advantage to be got by it. But I am ſure this can never hold in theſe *Authentick Teſtimonies* of the Miracles of the Roman Church; Rich Jewels, Silver Shrines, Preſents of all ſorts, and vaſt Endowments may tempt Men to ſtrain a little in ſuch Trifles, as a few Circumſtances, which can eaſily change an ordinary Accident into a Miracle. Nay, Perſons of great Honour and Reputation, (beyond ten thouſand ſuch Prieſts whoſe Intereſt is ſo deeply concerned in the belief of theſe things,) have Affirmed, that they have ſeen Tables hanging up in one of the Churches mentioned by *E.W.* of a miraculous Cure wrought upon a lame Perſon, whom themſelves have ſeen immediately after; ſo lame as to uſe Crutches. Therefore I hope ſuch Teſtimonies as theſe, for meer ſhame, will never more be compared with the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: Who had no *Diana's* to attend upon, not expected *any ſilver Shrines*. Not that I compare the bleſſed Virgin to a Heathen Goddeſs; but I may ſafely enough, the nature and reward of the attendance on both, and the means to draw Riches to their Temples. Can any one imagine if all the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles had been done in this manner, and the Teſtimony of them only taken from *Tables hanging upon Walls*, that ever Chriſtianity would have prevailed upon the ingenuous part of Mankind? No, it was becauſe theſe Miracles were wrought publickly by Chriſt and his Apoſtles in the view of Enemies; and they who atteſted them did not ſit to receive Preſents, and tell Tales, but ventured their Lives as well as Fortunes, to give Teſtimony to the Truth of theſe things; and offered as much ſatisfaction as Senſe and Reaſon could require in theſe Matters. But if they had nothing to ſhew but Tables hanging upon the Walls of their Temples; the Heathens would have told them, they had as good Evidence for Miracles among them. For,

3. Such *Authentick Teſtimonies* as theſe have been among the greateſt Enemies to Chriſtianity. And I hope *E.W.* will not ſay that Chriſtianity hath no better Proofs than Paganiſm. If we ſearch but a little into the practices of this nature among the Heathens, we ſhall find that

Polydore,

the Lady of *Loreto* works; I am ſure Chriſt and his Apoſtles never wrought ſuch. We uſe to ſay, that a Miracle is *a perfect Work*; and is dying of a Diſeaſe a miraculous Cure? *Platina* and *Ciacconius* in his Life take no notice of a Cure, much leſs of a Miracle; but ſay, that upon ſome intermiſſion he undertook his Journey where he dy'd of his Diſeaſe. Yet *Turſellinus* ſaith, *The Fame of this Cure brought great Reputation to the Lady of* Loreto: Which till that time (*viz.* for one Hundred and Sixty Years after the miraculous Tranſlation) was known only among the Inhabitants of the Country about *Ancona*; and ſcarce the leaſt knowledge of it was paſſed into the Neighbour Countries; which is the Reaſon he gives why *Vincentius*, *Antoninus*, and the *Italian Writers* take no notice of it: And thoſe who did, as *Blondus*, yet *do not mention the Tranſlation, leſt they ſhould ſeem to utter vain and incredible Things.* A very ſubſtantial Reaſon, I confeſs. But after this time Miracles grew more frequent, as the Superſtition and Credulity of the People did increaſe. If a Man recover'd of a dangerous Sickneſs; if *Julius* the Second eſcape being ſhot by a Cannon Bullet; if *Clement* the Seventh eſcape with his Life in the Sacking of *Rome*; if others are deliver'd from great Dangers either by Sea or Land, in what Way or Kind ſo ever it be, if they do but ſend or go to *Loreto* afterwards, all theſe are recorded there for Miracles.

l. 2. c. 2. c. 12. c. 24, c. 27. l. 3. c. 15, 16, 17, 18, 24. 26. 27. l. 4. 5, 6, 7. 17, 18, 19, &c.

2. That this way of Teſtimony is liable to the greateſt Exceptions. For, the Prieſts who make theſe *Tables*, are eaſily abuſed by the confident Affirmation of Perſons who come and tell them great Stories of Miracles wrought at the Invocation of the *Lady* of *Loreto*; as in all likelihood *Rivera* the Pænitentiary of *Loreto* was, by many who came to him, who were Perſons of no Reputation at all. As the *Jew* that told the formal Story, *of his being deliver'd at* Nazareth *out of Priſon, by calling upon his Countrywoman, the Lady of* Loreto; *who thereupon appeared to him with her Woman called* Lucia, *waiting upon her*, (*whom ſhe bid to knock off his Chains*,) *and opened the Priſon-doors and led him to the Sea ſide, and ſhewed him a Ship ready for his Paſſage, and bid him make haſte to* Loreto, *and be there Baptized.* Turſ. l. 1. c. 12. And we may think he obey'd her Will; for he told *Riera*, that he came to *Ancona* in two Days. Yet this Man was received with great Joy, and the Miracle highly magnified; and which was more, for all that we can find, verily believed. And no doubt the *Venetian Courteſan* was a Perſon of great Credit, who having ſpent many Years in that Trade, came to *Loreto* full of a very ſtrange Miracle, *viz. That ſhe was ſet upon in her way thither by her Companion, who deſperately wounded her in many places and cut her Throat; and ſhe juſt in the very nick of expiring, called upon the Lady of* Loreto *for help; who preſently appeared to her, and took her in her Lap, and ſtroked her Wounds, and immediately cured her Body, and filled her Soul with heavenly Joy.* Was not the bleſſed Virgin very kind to a Courteſan? But all this was preſently believed at *Loreto*; and as an impregnable Evidence of the Truth of it, ſhe ſhewed a *ſhining Liſt about her Neck upon the Skin*; which was a demonſtration ſhe was healed by a divine Hand. For St. *Winifred* and others had juſt ſuch a one when their Heads were joyned to their Bodies again. And are not theſe *Authentick Teſtimonies and undeniable Monuments?* Is the Teſtimony of the whole Chriſtian Church to be compared to that of a *Jew* and a Courteſan? But ſuppoſing the Perſons who delivered theſe things to them, were ſuch as had a great credit;

(and ſo they had need to be when the reputation of a Miracle depends upon their ſingle Teſtimony,) yet it is not poſſible to ſuppoſe that the Prieſts for the reputation of their Houſe, may help out a lame Miracle with an advantagious Circumſtance or two? It being for ſo good a Cauſe as the Honour of their Church. Eſpecially when ſuch infinite Riches come by it, as may be ſeen by *Turſellinus* his Hiſtory of the *Lady* of *Loreto*; whoſe Book is made up of Miracles and Riches: And in Truth the greateſt Miracle there is the Riches of that Chappel ſince it gained reputation in the World. They had need of a very untainted Credit, to have their Teſtimony taken on their bare Words, when there is ſuch a reward for Lying. Men need not ask *Caſſius* his Queſtion *cui bono?* For any one may eaſily diſcern that, that compares the Tables of Miracles and the vaſt Riches accruing by them together. The honeſt Heathens thought a Perſon's Teſtimony was then to be relyed upon; when there was no reward for Falſehood.

Cum ſunt præmia falſi
Nulla, ratam debet teſtis habere ſidem.

Tacitus thought, it was a good Argument of Men's Fidelity, if they affirmed a thing *poſtquam nullum mendacio pretium*; when there was no advantage to be got by it. But I am ſure this can never hold in theſe *Authentick Teſtimonies* of the Miracles of the Roman Church; Rich Jewels, Silver Shrines, Preſents of all ſorts, and vaſt Endowments may tempt Men to ſtrain a little in ſuch Trifles, as a few Circumſtances, which can eaſily change an ordinary Accident into a Miracle. Nay, Perſons of great Honour and Reputation, (beyond ten thouſand ſuch Prieſts whoſe Intereſt is ſo deeply concerned in the belief of theſe things,) have Affirmed, that they have ſeen Tables hanging up in one of the Churches mentioned by *E.W.* of a miraculous Cure wrought upon a lame Perſon, whom themſelves have ſeen immediately after; ſo lame as to uſe Crutches. Therefore I hope ſuch Teſtimonies as theſe, for meer ſhame, will never more be compared with the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: Who had no *Diana's* to attend upon, not expected *any ſilver Shrines.* Not that I compare the bleſſed Virgin to a Heathen Goddeſs; but I may ſafely enough, the nature and reward of the attendance on both, and the means to draw Riches to their Temples. Can any one imagine if all the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles had been done in this manner, and the Teſtimony of them only taken from *Tables hanging upon Walls*, that ever Chriſtianity would have prevailed upon the ingenuous part of Mankind? No, it was becauſe theſe Miracles were wrought publickly by Chriſt and his Apoſtles in the view of Enemies; and they who atteſted them did not ſit to receive Preſents, and tell Tales, but ventured their Lives as well as Fortunes, to give Teſtimony to the Truth of theſe things; and offered as much ſatisfaction as Senſe and Reaſon could require in theſe Matters. But if they had nothing to ſhew but Tables hanging upon the Walls of their Temples; the Heathens would have told them, they had as good Evidence for Miracles among them. For,

3. Such *Authentick Teſtimonies* as theſe have been among the greateſt Enemies to Chriſtianity. And I hope *E.W.* will not ſay that Chriſtianity hath no better Proofs than Paganiſm. If we ſearch but a little into the practices of this nature among the Heathens, we ſhall find that

Polydore,

Polyd.Virgil de Invent. rer. l. 5. c. 1.

*Lambin.in Horat.*l. 1. Od. 5.

Cicer. de Nat. Deor. l. 3.

Diodor. Sicul. Hiſt. l. p. 22.

Polydore Virgil had reaſon of his ſide, when he ſaid this cuſtom of hanging up Tables, was taken from them: Among whom nothing was more uſual than upon any extraordinary Deliverance to ſet up their *votivæ taubulæ* in the Temples of thoſe Gods they were moſt addicted to: Some to *Iſis*, ſome to *Neptune*, ſome to *Æſculapius*, eſpecially in the Caſe of Eſcape from Shipwrack to *Iſis* and *Neptune*; and in caſe of recovery from dangerous Diſeaſes to *Iſis* or *Æſculapius*. *Lambin* ſaith, *the very ſame Cuſtom continues ſtill; only inſtead of the Heathen Gods, they do it to the Virgin* Mary, *or ſome Saint*. This Cuſtom is mentioned not only by *Horace*, but by *Virgil*, *Ovid*, *Tibullus*, *Juvenal*, *Perſius*, and others, And all know the Saying of ***Dionyſius*** upon ſeeing theſe Tables of thoſe who had made Vows and eſcaped; *but what is become*, ſaith he, *of thoſe who made Vows and were drowned*? And the very ſame Queſtion may be asked of theſe modern Vows as well as theirs. I ſhall only mention the Tables of thoſe who had, as they thought, miraculous Deliverances from Sickneſſes; of which kind there are ſo many in the *Tables* of *Loreto* and elſewhere. It is a remarkable Teſtimony to this purpoſe which *Diodorus Siculus* gives of *Iſis* in *Egypt:* Where he ſaith of her, *That being now advanced to Immortality, ſhe takes great delight in the cure of Men; and that to any who deſire her help, ſhe manifeſts her preſence to them in ſleep* (as it is in very many of thoſe of *Loreto*) *and her great readineſs to help them. For the proof of which they do not bring Fables as the* Greeks *do; but the Evidence of Matters of Fact; or undeniable Authentick Teſtimonies. For the whole World bears witneſs to it by the Honors they give her, and the Preſents they ſend for the Cures they have received. For many have been ſtrangely cured by her help, who have been given over by Phyſitians, and many blind and lame have been healed by her.* Let *E.W.* produce more *Authentick Teſtimonies* than theſe are: If he thinks ſo much Credit to be given to theſe Tables, or any Argument can be drawn from a Catholick Reputation, or great Preſents. Neither was this only in *Egypt*, but *Tibullus* mentions the ſame at *Rome* too ſpeaking of *Iſis*.

*Tibull.*l. 1. *Eleg.* 3.

Nunc Dea nunc ſuccurre mihi, nam poſſe mederi
Picta decet templis multa tabella tuis.

*Strabo, Geogr.*l 8.

The ſame may be ſeen in the *Temples* of *Æſculapius*, eſpecially that of *Epidaurus*, of which *Starbo* ſpeaks, and ſaith, *It was full of the Tables of ſuch as had recovered from Diſeaſes by his help, as likewiſe his Temples at* Co *and* Tricca. The like may be obſerved of the Temple of *Æſculapius* near *Rome* in the *Iſle* of *Tyber*, of which ſome of the *Tables* have been preſerved in *Rome* by the *Maphæi* and are publiſhed by *Mercurialis*. And *Cicero* ſpeaking of an Image of *Ceres* at *Enna* in *Sicily*, ſaith, *That many Prodigies were done by her, which ſhewed her Power and Divinity; that in many moſt difficult Caſes Perſons have found her help; and not only the* Sicilians, *but other Nations flock thither:* And that the *Statue* of *Hercules was in ſo great eſteem there, that his very Chin was worn, with the Salutations which were given him*; To the ſame purpoſe as *Turſellinus* ſomewhere ſpeaks of the Image at *Loreto*. So that the Arguments drawn from the *Tables*, from general Reputation, and the Concourſe of People, will equally hold for a Religion directly oppoſite to Chriſtianity. But *we have not followed any cunningly deviſed Fables*; the Proofs of our Religion do not depend upon the Fraud of Prieſts, or the Superſtition and Credulity of the People, nor upon any Credulity of the People, nor upon any extraordinary Accidents and rare Occurences; but the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles were publick and frequent, wrought by their own Words while they were converſant among Men; not at Shrines or Altars, or in dark and obſcure places, and only among Perſons prepoſſeſſed before hand with ſufficient readineſs to believe what ever ſhall be related as a Miracle. Theſe are the Circumſtances of the Miracles wrought in the Roman Church, but as vaſtly different from thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, as Light is from Darkneſs, or Truth from uncertain Reports, or a well-grounded Faith from ſuperſtitious Credulity. And thus much for *the Authentick Teſtimonies of Miracles in the ſacred Houſe of* Loreto.

Of the Miracles wrought by St. *James* at *Compoſtella.*

Sect. 4. Having performed one *Pilgramage*, we muſt begin another to St. *James* of *Compoſtella*: And there take notice of the Miracles done at his *Relicks* there. But what if St. *James* have no *Relicks* at all there? What if he never were in *Spain*, how can his *Relicks* there ever then perform any Miracles? But what ever we believe, it is Infidelity in *Spain* to queſtion it; it is fit therefore we ſhould have the Story as they relate it, who think they ſhould know it beſt: And it is this, *That* James *the Son of* Zebedee *having paſſed through* Judea *and* Samaria, *came into* Spain *to Preach the Goſpel; and having converted ſome there, he returned to* Hieruſalem *carrying his Diſciples with him; where he was ſlain by* Agrippa, *and his Body afterwards was carried to* Compoſtella, *where it is ſolemnly Worſhipped by Pilgrims flocking thither from all* Parts *of the World.* This is the ſubſtance of what the preſent *Roman Breviary* allows; and is truly more kind to the Story than it hath been formerly; for I am much miſtaken, if *Clement* the 8th. did not inſert into his *Breviary*, *That he came into* Spain *according to the Tradition of that Province.* For we muſt know the *Court* of *Rome* hath been very jealous of ſuch pretences as thoſe are, of receiving the Faith at firſt from any of the Apoſtles, beſides St. *Peter* or thoſe ſent by him, leſt under ſuch a pretence they might one time or other plead for their exemption from the Pope's Authority. This made *Cardinal Baronius* ſo much to ſet himſelf againſt this Tradition of St. *James* his Preaching in *Spain*; and diſproves it from the Teſtimony of *Rodericus Ximenius Archbiſhop of Toledo*, who in the *Lateran Council* under *Innocent* the Third, denied that ever St. *James* came into *Spain*, and that not unadviſedly; but in a ſolemn Debate between him and the *Biſhop* of *Compoſtella*. He confeſſes indeed that when he was a Boy he heard the Story of it, but it was only from *ſome Religious Women*, ſaith, *Baronius*, *ſome Nuns and Religious Widows*, ſaith, *Rodericus* himſelf; but as *Baronius* obſerves, he did not think it worth inſerting into his Hiſtory; and the *Biſhop* of *Compoſtella* could not produce one ancient Author for that Tradition, though he came provided to the Council for the managing this Debate. Beſides, he ſaith, that the Church of *Compoſtella* could then boaſt but of the Antiquity of one hundred and nine Years, (one hundred wanting nine, ſaith *Baronius*) for then *Pope Caliſtus* Tranſlated the *Biſhoprick* of *Merida* to *Compoſtella*, before which there was only a ſmall Oratory there. To this Teſtimony, he adds, two Popes, *Innocent* the firſt, and *Gregory* the ſeventh, affirming that *Spain* firſt received the Faith from *Rome*. But the preſent *Breviary* hath excellently accommodated this difference; by making *ſeven of* St. James *his Diſciples to be ordained by* St. Peter *at* Rome, *and thence ſent into* Spain. This it is to ſerve a turn, though it be without the leaſt pretence from Antiquity! But now is not this Tra-

Baron. An. A.D. 816. *n.* 49, 50, 51.

Concil. Gen. Tom. 11. part 1. p. 236.

dition of St. *James* his being in *Spain* confirm'd by *undeniable and authentick Teſtimonies?*

What ſhall we ſay then to the *Miracles* wrought by him? For we are to conſider, altho' the Story be ſo lean and bare in the preſent *Breviary*, yet *the learned and worthy Arch-Biſhop St.* Antonin (beſides others) have it much improved. For he tells us, *how St.* James, *after his return to* Judea, *was much oppoſed by* Hermogenes *a Magician, who ſent his Diſciple* Philetus *to confound him:* (we muſt never ask from whence they had this Story; it is fully enough that the Name of *Hermogenes* and *Philetus* are in the New Teſtament.) Well, *Philetus becomes a Diſciple of St.* James, *at which* Hermogenes *was ſo enraged, that he enchanted him ſo that he could not move. Now we will ſee,* ſaith he, *if St.* James *can releaſe you.* Philetus *ſends word to St.* James, *who ſent him his Handkerchief, and by that was releaſed.* Hermogenes *commands the Devils to bring St.*James *and* Philetus *both bound to him; when they came near him, the Devils cry'd out, they were bound by Angels of Heaven, and beg'd St.* James *to releaſe them; he did ſo, and commanded them to bring* Hermogenes *bound, which they immediately did, with his Hands ty'd behind him; and then St.* James *bid* Philetus *unbind him; at which* Hermogenes *was deſirous to turn Chriſtian; but being afraid of the Devils, he craved St.* James *his Aſſiſtance, who lent him his walking Staff; and ſo he became his Diſciple.* Is not this now like one of the Apoſtle's Miracles, to give Men Inſtruments for the cudgelling of Devils? But this Miracle, for all that, haſten'd St. *James* his End; *for* Abiathar *the High-Prieſt* (where are we now? For I remember no *Abiathar* High-Prieſt ſince the Days of King *Solomon*; but it is no matter for ſuch a ſlender Miſtake as that:) *raiſed a Commotion among the People, and brought him to* Herod, *who beheaded him, upon the Day in which Chriſt was incarnated and ſuffered, one whole Year being paſſed.* That's well again; it ſeems St. *James*, in a Years time, preach'd through *Judea* and *Samaria*, and went into *Spain*, and return'd into *Judea* and was there beheaded by *Herod.* But St. *James* ſuffer'd the ſame Year, that St. *Peter* was deliver'd out of Priſon, which by the conſent of their own Writers, was not till the ſecond Year of *Claudius.* A pretty long Year, from the eighteenth of *Tiberius*, according to *Baronius*, to the ſecond of *Claudius!* To paſs by *Joſias the Scribe's ſuffering together with St.* James; (which the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*, by reaſon of the Inſufficiency of Scripture, take no notice of) we are to underſtand, *that the Diſciples of St.* James, (being then ſo much at leiſure to attend the Corpſe of their Maſter ſo long a Journey) *took away his Body, and carried it to the Sea ſide, where they found a ſmall Veſſel lying ready* (no matter to whom it belong'd) *into this they entred, and committing themſelves to God's Providence, and the Mercy of the Sea, they came ſafe to the Coaſt of* Spain, *and entring the City of* Compoſtella, *they there buried his Body in a Church erected to his Honour*; (no matter by whom, for all St. *James* his Diſciples went away with him) yet this was not eaſily performed; for *there was one Queen* Lupa *in the Country at that time*; how! a *Queen* in a Roman Province! but doubtleſs ſhe was ſome Roman Lady;) for I think *Romulus* his Nurſe was of that Name.) *And there were Miracles to be wrought to convince her to give way to his burial.* Here St. *Antonin* gives over; but others are ſo kind, as to tell us what the Miracle was which convinced *Queen Lupa:* I ſhall not ſo much as once mention the Author of the *Golden Legend* (though a Perſon that highly merited of the Church of

Antonin. Chron. part 1. c.7. Tit. 6.

Rome in his time:) having ſo much better Authorities. No leſs a Man than *John Beleth* (a grave Doctor of the *Sorbon*, a Man of great Learning, ſaith *Trithemius*, and excellent at confounding Hereticks ſaith *Laurimanus*) who gives this account of it, *That Queen* Lupa *caſt theſe Men into Priſon, but being miraculouſly delivered thence, ſhe propoſed this Condition to them; that if they would take ſuch Oxen as ſhe ſhould give them, they ſhould carry the Body whether they pleaſed. But ſhe deſigned only to put a Trick upon them, the Oxen being very wild and unruly; but ſhe was over-reached in all her Cunning; for they only made the ſign of the Croſs over the Oxen, and they were as quiet as Lambs: And they carried the Body to the place appointed, and without any Driver went back to the Queen's Palace, and ſtaid not till they came to the very middle of it; at which Miracle Queen* Lupa *was turned into a Lamb, and turned her Palace into a Church.* Is not this now a Miracle as great and as well atteſted, as any wrought by Chriſt or his Apoſtles? The firſt part of this Story about *Hermogenes* and *Abiather* the *High Prieſt*, was ſolemnly read here in *England* on the twenty fifth of *July*, as part of the Leſſons of the Day; and the latter confirmed by *Vincentius* in his Hiſtory. *Bivarius* cites about twenty Spaniſh *Breviaries* that mention St. *James* his coming into *Spain*; but whether with the relation of theſe Miracles, I know not. *Mariana*, in his Hiſtory, finds no ſuch Argument for his coming into *Spain*; but the Tradition of the People, which he was unwilling to contradict. It's true, in a Diſcourſe on purpoſe, he goes about to defend this Tradition, as well as he could; but yet confeſſes, there is a wonderful ſilence in all ancient Writers, about St. *James* his coming into *Spain*, and his Body being at *Compoſtella*; both in the *Chronicon Alveldenſe*, above 600 Years old; in the *Chronicon* of *Alphonſus* the Great, above 700 Year old; in *Iſidorus Pacenſis*, *Sampirus Aſturicenſis*, nay in the ancient Hiſtory of *Compoſtella* it ſelf, there is not a Word of St. *James* his coming into *Spain*: In his Anſwer to this Argument, he confeſſes *they have no Hiſtories come near that time, and therefore it is no wonder they ſhould not mention it*; but upon what Grounds came it afterwards to be believ'd then, if they have no Teſtimony of ancient Time to confirm it? For *Baronius* lays down an excellent Rule as to theſe matters; *whatever is delivered by later Authors concerning Matters of Antiquity, and is not confirmed by the Authority of ſome ancient Writer, is contemned.* And by this Rule, in all theſe matters, let us ſtand or fall. *But ſuppoſing St.* James *never were in* Spain, *yet his Reliques might be carried thither, and work Miracles there?* No one queſtions the poſſibility of the Thing, but the reaſon of believing it; and we have hitherto ſeen very little for the one or the other. *Baronius*, whoſe Zeal carried him no farther than the Pope's Intereſt, is willing enough to allow them the *Body* of St. *James* at *Compoſtella*; and that it was carried from *Jeruſalem* thither; but yet, he ſaith, *the Memory of it was quite loſt, as he proves by* Venantius Fortunatus: *till at laſt it was diſcovered by a miraculous Light in the time of* Alphonſus Caſtus. But what was diſcovered by that Light? A Body buried among Buſhes and Thorns? And what then? Muſt this needs be St. *James* his Body and none elſe? What Characters were there upon it, which might diſcover it more plainly than the Light did? No Inſcription on it is alledg'd; but after all, *Baronius* thinks, *there is no need to prove that which is ſo abundantly atteſted by the Miracles there wrought.* Proceed we then to the Examination of theſe Miracles, of which Pope *Caliſtus*

Beleth *de divinis officiis.* c. 140.

Portiforium *ſecundum uſum ſacrum.* Julii 25.

Vincent. *ſpec. hiſt. l.* 8. *c.* 7.

Bivarii *Comment. in Dextri Chronic.* A. D. 36.

Mariana *de rebus Hiſp. l.* 4. *c.* 6.

Mariana *de Adventu* Jacobi *c.* 3.

Baron. *Annal. n.* 12.

Baron. *Annal.* A. D. 816. *n.* 52, 53.

Mariana *de Adventu* Jacobi *c.* 12. Vincent. *ſpec. Hiſt. l.*26. *c.*30. the ſecond wrote a whole Book, which *Mariana* ſaith, *he ſaw entire*, but by what is preſerved of it, we may judge it was a very worthy one, and that the Miracles there wrought deſerve to be compared with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. He tells us, *that from a Child he loved St.* James *of* Compoſtella, *and ſpent fourteen Years in going from place to place to learn his Miracles, and that he put them together in looſe Papers which were miraculouſly preſerved among Thieves, in Priſon, in Water, in Fire, and at laſt by a Viſion was confirmed that his Work was pleaſing to God. Therefore he deſires that no body would deſpiſe his Work, for whatever is written in it is Authentick and confirmed by great Authority; and decrees that the Miracles ſhould be read in the Refectories on Feſtival days.* He could not have decreed better, for in truth they are an excellent Entertainment.

c. 33. " *In* A.D. 1090. *ſaith* Calixtus, certain *Germans* were going to " St. *James*, and in the City of *Tholouſe*, they were made drunk by " their Hoſt, who put two Silver Cups into the Portmantues of two of " them: Next Morning he ran after them, and cried Thieves; they " knowing their own Innocency, deſired to be examined; the Cups were " found in the Portmantues of Father and Son: The Judge determined " that but one of them ſhould be hanged, and after much complementing between them the Son was Executed; the Father goes on his Pilgrimage, and after thirty ſix days returning by the place he goes to " the Body of his Son, and there wept bitterly over him. On a ſudden his Son began to comfort him, and ſaid, O my Father, weep not, " but rejoyce, for I never was ſo well in my whole Life. For to this " time St. *James* hath ſupported me, and comforted me with Heavenly " pleaſure; at which his Father being overjoyed, ran to the City, and " the People flocking thither, took him down ſafe and ſound, and hanged up the Hoſt in his Room. *Was our Saviour's raiſing* Lazarus *after* " *four days, to be compared to this?*

Ibid. " In the Year 1100. a certain French-man, avoiding the Mortality " then in *France*, reſolved to go in Pilgrimage with his Wife and Children to St. *James* of *Compoſtella*; at *Pampelona* his Wife died, and the " Hoſt ſeized upon his Beaſt and his Mony. The Man went on however with his Children; and at the Town's end one meets him with " an Aſs, which he lends him to carry his Children. When he " was come to *Compoſtella*, one Night as he was praying, St. *James* appeared to him and asked him if he knew him; he told him no; then " he ſaid I am *James* the Apoſtle who met thee at *Pampelona* and lent " thee my Aſs; and now I lend him thee home again, and I tell thee " thou ſhalt find thy Hoſt dead, which happened accordingly; and as " ſoon as ever he took his Children off from the Aſs he diſappeared. " *This is an inſtance of his kindneſs by Land, but* Calixtus *tells us he was as kind by Sea too.*

c. 34. Witneſs *the Sea Captain that tumbled to the bottom of the Sea with his Armour on; to whom St.* James *there appeared and taking him by the hand, brought him ſafe to his Ship again.*

c. 35. Witneſs *the Pilgrim that fell into the Sea, whom St.* James *held by the Hair of his Head, and kept him above Water for three days till he came to his Port.*

Ibid. Theſe were pretty odd things at Sea, but if we come to Land again, what ſhall we think *of his making a Man leap from a Tower forty Cubits high without any hurt.*

Nay, which is a much greater and a more courteous Miracle, what ſhall we ſay *to a high Tower ſtooping to the ground that a Man might go off without any danger from a leap?* Yet this is related by the ſame Pope to have happened *A.D.* 1106. c. 36.

Theſe are pleaſant taſtes of the kind of St. *James* his Miracles related by no meaner a Perſon than the Head of the Roman Church: But theſe are too luſcious to be inſiſted on.

c. 41. Only for a warning that Men ſhould obſerve his Feaſt, he ſaith, *that a Country Man in* Spain *preſuming to threſh on that day, and at Night going into a Bath, the Skin of his back parts from his Shoulders to his Thighs, went off from him and ſtuck to the Wall*; and ſo the poor Man died for an Example.

If theſe things do not prove that the Miracles wrought by St. *James* at *Compoſtella*, are equal to thoſe wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles in *Judea*, truly I do not know what will.

Of St. *Mary Magdalen's* Vial and other Reliques.

Sect. 5. We muſt now proceed *to the Vial of St.* Mary Magdalen *and the Church of St.* Maximin *in* France: *into which ſhe put the Blood of our Saviour which viſibly boyls up every Year on the day of our Saviour's Paſſion.* It would aſtoniſh a Man to ſee ſuch Fopperies as theſe are, compared with the Miracles of Chriſt and Apoſtles. If they had done no more than ſhewed ſuch tricks to convince the World, it might have remained under Paganiſm to this day. The Miracles wrought by Chriſt or his Apoſtles tended to the great Benefit and Advantage of Mankind, and were not cunningly managed in a Corner; for a ſolemn ſhew at a certain Seaſon of the Year; but the Gift of healing the Sick and the Gift of Tongues, in which conſiſted chiefly the Teſtimony God gave to his Apoſtles, were things of real Advantage to the World and lay open to the obſervation of every one. But the World is apt to ſuſpect and not without reaſon, theſe uſeleſs and ſecret Miracles; if they be true they ſignifie no good to the World; if they be falſe, they do unſpeakable miſchief to Religion. Our Saviour's Blood was never ſhed to ſhew tricks with, and *Mary Magdalen* was hardly at leaſure at our Saviour's Paſſion to gather up his Blood as it dropt from him. But what will not theſe Men ſay, and profeſs to believe too! Certainly there were never more ſhameful Impoſtures than about Reliques and Miracles in the Roman Church; and when ſome of the wiſer Men of their own Communion abroad ſhake their Heads and are aſhamed of them; our *S. C's* and *E. W's* magnifie them ſtill, as though the People of *England* were as capable of being made Fools as ever. I pity their Weakneſs and Credulity of ſome, but I abhor the Hypocriſie and Fraud of thoſe, who do not believe theſe things themſelves, and yet would make others believe them. Gentlemen, Religion is a grave and ſerious thing, and a ſevere Account muſt be given to God of any thing we ſay about it; God will never think himſelf Honoured by the Falſhood and Hypocriſie of Men; and that of all others in the World ſhall never draw me to its Communion which cannot be upheld without abuſing Mankind, and the moſt excellent Religion in the World. If you have any Miracles to ſhew, do them as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did, in the midſt of their Enemies, and upon them too; can you do them for a better End than our Converſion? Was not this the End God deſigned Miracles for? And how comes he to change his Patent among you, with whom they are only done among Friends and in Corners: Where they may be ſhewed with advantage among ignorant People who have no skill in Opticks, nor judgment to know the difference between the boyling of a thing from a natural Cauſe, and by a Miracle. For truths ſake, if your Church hath ſuch a power of Miracles as Chriſt and his Apoſtles had, never ſend us to *Loreto* or *Compoſtella*, or St. *Maximin's Church* in *France*; nor refer us to your *Tables* and *Legends*; thoſe are things in no requeſt among us, whatever they be with you; but we have many ſick and wounded perſons and many dead; come and cure all manner of Diſeaſes with a Word, in an inſtant, perfectly, and openly; raiſe thoſe who have died of a known incurable Diſeaſe, and are carried out to be buried, or have lain in their Graves, as Chriſt did: Or elſe, out of honour to Chriſt and Truth, and for meer ſhame avoid ſuch rude and impudent Compariſons of the Miracles of your Church, with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. If we muſt believe St. *Mary Magdalen's* Vial; why not as well all the reſt of the Glorious Reliques of your Church, for there are few of them, but have as good Authority as that of *Spondanus*, which *E. W.* produces for this Miraculous Vial? Why not the *Foreskin* of Chriſt about which no meaner a Man than *Cardinal Tolet* ſaith *great Miracles were wrought at* Calcata *in* Italy *A. D.* 1559. *after it had been ſtolen from the Lateran Church in* Rome *by a certain Souldier.* A.D. 1527. *and lay undiſcovered till after his death*; and yet *Ferrandus* tells us, that *Germany*, *Flanders*, *Lorrain* and *France*, all boaſt that they have it. *Bollandus*, or rather *Roſwayd* tells us, *that thoſe of* Antwerp *pleaded a poſſeſſion of it for almoſt* 500 *Years*; and the *Teſtimonies of Pope* Eugenius *A. D.* 1446. and *Clement* the eighth *A. D.* 1599. Pope *Innocent* the third notwithſtanding his pretence to Infallibility, *thought it fit that ſo weighty a Cauſe ſhould be left to God himſelf to determine. Symphorianus Campegius* in *Bollandus*, ſaith, that it is at *Anicium* (le Puy) *in* France *together with* Aaron's *Miter*; others ſay, *that it was carried by an Angel to* Charles *the Great, and he placed it at* Aken. Now the ſame Worſhip is given at all theſe places where it is ſuppoſed to be, and I ſuppoſe Miracles equally wrought at them. I deſire to know when falſe and counterfeit Reliques do work Miracles, what we are to think of the Teſtimony given by ſuch Miracles, and of the nature of them? It is a pleaſant thing to ſee the Accounts given by theſe Men of the ſame Reliques being in ſeveral places at once. *Ferrandus* hath found out very ſubtil ways to ſolve this difficulty, and particularly concerning this Foreskin of Chriſt. 1. *By a Multiplication of it*; which being in God's Power to do, no queſtion is to be made but he does it. 2. *By a wonderful Replication of it*; the Terms, I confeſs, are not very eaſie; but I ſuppoſe he means, that the ſame Body may be in ſeveral places at once. He tells us, that *Suarez* and *Collius* ſee *no cauſe for ſo great a Miracle*; *but he thinks there is as much reaſon for it, as for the Multiplication of the Wood of the Croſs*; and I think ſo too. But yet he hath another reſerve, which is, *that theſe ſeveral Prepuces are really nothing but ſo many parts of the Umbilical Veſſels, which are ſent up and down for the conſolation of the Faithful.* And no doubt they tend very much to it; eſpecially when they miſtake one thing for another. And why may not then that which goes for the Blood of Chriſt, be the Blood of ſome other Perſon; eſpecially ſince the Blood of Chriſt is ſhewn in ſo many other places beſides? But that we may not however doubt of the Truth of both theſe, St. *Brigit* ſaith in her *Revelations*, *that the Virgin* Mary *told her, that a little before her Aſſumption ſhe committed the ſacred Prepuce to the care of St.* John, *with ſome of the Blood which remained*

Tolet *in c.* 2. *Luc. Annot.* 31.

Joh. Ferrandi *diſquiſ Reliqui. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *ſect.* 1.

Bolland *Acta Sectorum*, Jan. 1. *p.* 3, 4, &c.

Innocent. *de Miſſæ myſter. l.* 4. *c.* 30.

Ferrand. *diſq. Reliq l.* 1. *c.* 1. *ſect.* 2.

Brigit *Revel. l.* 6.

mained in the Wounds of Chriſt. Et jam liceat dubitare? Saith *Ferrandus*: By no means. But it is good to underſtand where it is. Yet he Ferrand.
tells us, *ſome are of Opinion, that there is no other Blood of Chriſt upon* l. 2. c. 1.
Earth, beſides that in the Euchariſt: And others, that all the Blood of Chriſt ſect. 1.
which was ſhed in his Paſſion, was reſumed at his Reſurrection, and therefore he rather inclines to think, it is ſome of the Blood he ſhed in his Agony, which is preſerved in ſo many places. But was St. *Mary Magdalen* there with her Vial to gather it up? No, it is ſaid, it was at the time of his Paſſion and therefore this Anſwer cannot ſerve. How then come ſuch great quantities of this Blood to be ſeen? Not only in St. *Maximin's* Church, but at *Paris*, at *Rome*, at *Mantua*, and ſeveral other places mentioned by *Ferrandus*. To this, he Anſwers with *Biel*, *that Chriſt had a whole Legion of Wounds* 6666. and *Alanus de Rupe* hath undertaken to caſt up juſt how many drops he ſhed, *viz.* 547500. And can there be any reaſon in the World to queſtion the Credibility of the Teſtimonies of ſuch Perſons who are ſo exact and punctual in their Calculations? Far be it from us in the leaſt to derogate from that ineſtimable Love which the Son of God expreſſed in ſhedding his Blood as a Sacrifice of Propitiation for us. We adore, and celebrate that ſacred Myſtery of our Redemption by the Blood of that immaculate Lamb. It is the Blood of Chriſt we Glory in, and Hope for Salvation by; but not as kept for Reliques, or preſerved in Vials to make a ſhew of; much leſs to abuſe Mankind with a pretence of that ſacred Blood, when there is not the leaſt ſhadow of reaſon to believe it.

But thus it hath been in the Church of *Rome*: they have turned the moſt wiſe, and Holy and reaſonable Religion in the World, in to a Matter of Shew and Ceremony. And for this End they have made uſe of all manner of devices to get any thing into their Hands, that ſeemed to have any relation to the Bodies, or Garments of Chriſt, or his Diſciples. And thus while they ſlight their Words, and corrupt their Doctrine, and pervert their Inſtitutions; no perſons can contend more than they for the Hair, or Nails that belonged to any of their Bodies, although they deſtroy each others Teſtimonies, by ſo many pretending to be kept in two ſeveral places in *France*: And thoſe put into a Vial too by the bleſſed Virgin, if we believe the *Jeſuit Ferrandus*. It is a *Diſq. Re-*
pretty competent Miracle to preſerve Tears ſo long: But what cannot *liq.* l. 1. c.
they ſhew, *who have ſome of the Hair of Chriſt, when an Infant*, at St. De- 2. ſect. 2.
nis in France, as *Spondanus* aſſures us, and *ſome of the ſwadling Clouts he* Spond. A.
he was wrapt in in the Manger? And as good an Author every whit as *Spon-* D. 1205.
danus relates that at *Courchiverni* a Place near *Bloys*, the Breath of *Joſeph* *n.* 1.
is kept in a *Vial* too, which the Angel took while he was cleaving Wood. *Molinæi.*
What a ſhame would it be now for us to queſtion the truth of any other *hyperaſ-*
Relicks among them? Why ſhould we diſpute the vaſt quantity of the *piſt.* c. 18.
bleſſed Virgin's Milk, ſo learnedly defended by *Ferrandus*, to be ſeen in *Ferrand.*
Judea, in *Italy*, in *Spain*, and in many places in *France*? What doubt l. 1. c. 2
can be made of the *ſeveral Locks of her Hair*? For although they believe her Body aſſumed up into Heaven; yet no doubt, *ſaith Ferrandus*, *Ibid.*
by frequent combing, enough would fall off to furniſh the ſeveral Churches in Rome, *in* Spain, *in* France, *and other places, with it.* What if ſo many places pretend to have the *true Seamleſs Coat of Chriſt?* Is it poſſible, they ſhould be any of them miſtaken, although there could be but one true one? For it is a very weak defence of *Ferrandus* to ſay, that l. 1. c. 7.
there were many made after the likeneſs of the true one; for all places ſect. 4.

contend that they have the true. It were endleſs to give an account of multitudes of other Relicks, which *Ferrandus* confeſſes to be equally challeng'd by many Places; and which he pitifully defends by ſuch Shifts, as theſe are.

But it is not enough to ſhew in general that there can be no ſufficient credibility in the Teſtimony given to the *Reliques* of the Roman Church; but I ſhall now ſhew it more particularly concerning this *Vial* of St. *Mary Magdalen*. This Vial is ſuppoſed to be of her own bringing into *France*, and it is worth the while to know how ſhe came thither.

Thus the Story is related in the *Roman Breviary*. *After Chriſt's Aſcenſion to Heaven,* Martha, *with her Siſter* Mary, (whom they ſuppoſe to be *Mary Magdalen*) *and with her Brother* Lazarus *and their Servant* Marcella, *and* Maximinus, *one of the ſeventy Diſciples of our Lord, with many other Chriſtians, were put into a Ship by the Jews, without any Sail or Oars, that they might periſh by Shipwrack: But by the Providence of God the Ship came ſafe to* Marſeilles: *By which Miracle and Preaching, the Inhabitants of* Marſeilles *and of* Aix, *and the neighbour People were converted: And* Lazarus *was made Biſhop of* Marſeilles, *and* Maximinus *of* Aix. *But* Mary Magdalen *having accuſtomed her ſelf to Prayer and a contemplative Life, retired into a hollow Cave of a very high Mountain; where ſhe continued thirty Years, ſeparated from all Converſation with Men, and every Day was carried up by Angels, to hear the Choir of Angels ſing.* This is contained in the fourth and fifth Leſſons on *July* 29. in the preſent *Roman Breviary*: But we are to conſider, that this Story was not always in the *Roman Breviary*; for thoſe who reformed it under *Pius* the fifth, had left it out; but ſince it hath been thought fit to be reſtored again; it being much for the Education of the People, to hear ſuch *Legends*. For there is not the leaſt pretence in Antiquity for any part of it, as a Learned Doctor of the *Sorbon* hath at large proved, ſhewing, in a ſet Diſcourſe, that for a Thouſand Years after Chriſt it was the conſtant Tradition of the *Greek* and *Latin Church*, that *Lazarus*, *Martha*, and *Magdalen*, all dy'd in the *Eaſtern Parts*, and not a Word ſaid of *Maximinus*; that the whole Story is taken out of a very fabulous Book, pretended to be written by *Marcella*, the Servant to *Martha*, in the *Hebrew* Tongue, and tranſlated by one *Synthex* into *Latin*; and preſerved by *Vincentius* in his Hiſtory. It may not be amiſs to ſet down ſome of the Miracles contained in this Story; one is, of the Perſons who accompanied them, and the Places aſſign'd to them; as *Trophimus* was ſent to *Arles*, *Paulus* to *Narbon*, *Eutropius* to *Aurange*, *Auſtregeſilus* to *Bourges*, *Irenæus* to *Lyons*, *Ferrutius* to *Bezancon*, and *Dionyſius* is placed over all *France*. Was there ever better Company put together? When *Irenæus* dy'd A.D. 205. *Eutropius* A.D. 464. *Auſtregiſilus* A.D. 629. and *Trophimus*, *Paulus*, *Martialis*, *Saturnius*, and *Dionyſius* are by the moſt Learned Writers of *France*, caſt back as far as the time of *Decius*; and *Ferrutius* was a Diſciple of *Irenæus*. It would be too tedious to relate *Mary Magdalen*'s Preaching at *Marſelles*, (notwithſtanding St. *Paul*'s Prohibition, which the Author ſaith, *ſhe had not heard of, but as ſoon as ſhe did, ſhe retired into her Cave*) the manner of the Converſion of
c. 95. the *Governour* of *Marſeilles* and his *Lady*, *their going towards* Hieruſa-
lem; *her Death upon the Birth of her Child in the paſſage; St.* Peter's *condu-*
c. 96. *cting him to* Hieruſalem, *ſeeing the Badge of the Croſs on his Shoulders;* the
c. 97. *miraculous Education of the Child by ſucking the Breaſts of his dead Mother,*
c. 98. *who was found by his Father on the ſhore, after two Years, playing with Stones, and*

Joh. Launoii de Commentitio Lazari & Maximini, Marthæ & Magdalenæ in Provinciam appulſu opuſcula. Pariſ. 1660.

Vincent. ſpec. Hiſt. l. 9. c. 94.

and running upon all four: The Reſurrection of the Mother, their return to Marſeilles, *where they found* Mary Magdalen *Preaching to a Multitude of People; the monſtrous Dragon tamed by* Martha, *with a little holy Water and the ſign of the Croſs; which was thicker than an* Oxe, *longer than a* Horſe, *had the Head of a* Lyon, *and the ſtrength of twelve* Lyons, *and was ſuppoſed to be of the Race of the* Leviathan *mention'd in* Job, *and came by Sea from* Galatia; *being begotten of the* Leviathan, *on a ſtrange Beaſt of that Country, which kills by its ſcent the length of an Acre, and whatever it touches, it burns like fire:* Theſe and ſeveral other ſuch pleaſant Miracles I purpoſely omit; which *Launoy* calls *more than old Wives Tales, by which the Chriſtian Religion is diſhonoured, and Men are abuſed; which make the Enemies of Chriſtianity deſpiſe it, and fill its Friends with Indignation;* to hear ſo holy a Religion ſo horribly corrupted by the impudent Lies of idle Men. But after all theſe Things, thus laid together, can we do otherwiſe than believe that *the Blood of Chriſt is kept in the Vial of St.* Mary Magdalen, *in the Church of St.* Maximin, *and that it boils up every Year on the Day of our Saviour's Paſſion?*

c. 99.

Launoy, p. 298, 321.

Of the Miracles St. *Dominick.*

Sect. 6. The next thing we are to conſider, is, the Miracles recorded in the Lives of thoſe two admirable Saints, *B. St.* Dominick, *and Seraphical St.* Francis. The firſt Miracle we read of concerning St. *Dominick*, was the miraculous Prediction concerning him in the two Pictures in St. *Mark*'s Church in *Venice*, reported by no meaner a Perſon than St. *Antonin* (*E. W*'s *pious and learned Arch-biſhop of* Florence.) One in the likeneſs of St. *Paul* with thoſe Words over it, Ἅγιος Παῦλος, and under, theſe, *Per iſtum itur ad Chriſtum*; over the other, Ἅγιος Δομινικός, and under, *Facilius itur per iſtum*; it ſeems St. *Paul* was but a very ordinary Preacher, if compared with the Founder of the Order of *Preaching Fryers*. But this Prediction did not ſo plainly ſet him forth, as the Viſion his Mother had near her time of Travail with him, *viz. That ſhe bore a Whelp which carried a fire-brand in his Mouth, which ſet the whole World on Fire*; which had its full accompliſhment, by his being the firſt Author of the bleſſed Inquiſition; for he was a true *fire-brand*, having not near ſo much light as heat in him. *Janſenius* tells us, that he had no kind of Mercy upon Hereticks, that he was rather a Lyon than a Man in his Carriage towards them. And was not this a fit Perſon to be compared with our bleſſed Saviour? As he is moſt blaſphemouſly, by *E. W*'s *moſt modeſt Prelate* Antonin, wherein he is follow'd by *Janſenius*. They might as well have compared Light and Darkneſs, Tenderneſs and Cruelty, a Wolf and a Lamb together. But the moſt blaſphemous Compariſon of all others, is that which St. *Katharine* of *Sienna* ſaid ſhe had by Revelation from God, and is repeated after her, by *Lewis* of *Granada* and *Janſenius*, viz. “That ſhe ſaw the “Eternal Father producing his Son out of his Mouth, and St. *Dominick* out of his Breaſt. Whereupon he ſaid to her, My dear Child, “thou ſeeſt how I have produced theſe two Sons, whereof the one is “my Son by Nature, and the other by Adoption; and ſo proceeds in an admirable Compariſon between them, as *Janſenius* thinks it; but we may well uſe his own Words, though with a far different meaning. *Quis verò hic non miretur ac ſtupeat?* For who can chooſe but wonder and be aſtoniſhed at ſuch horrible Blaſphemy? to ſee a Fire-brand compared in ſuch a manner with the Eternal Son of God. But what was it this *B. Dominick* did to be thought to come ſo near to Chriſt? why forſooth,

Antonin. *Chron.* part. 3. Tit. 23. c. 1. ſect. 1.

Nicol. Janſenii vit. Domini. l. 1. c. 7.

Nicol. Janſenii vit. S. *Dominis.* l. 1. c. 1.

Theod. de Appoldiâ vit. S. *D.* l. 1. *apud Suriam Aug.* 5.

Brev. Rom. Aug. 4. lect. 4.

Janſen. Comment. ad vit. S. *Dom.* p. 252.

Antonin. Chro. p. 3. tit. 23. c. 1.

Janſen. vit. Dom. l. 2. c. 14.

Lud. Granat. conc. 1. *de Feſto S. Dominici Janſen. vit. Dom.* l. 2. c. 14.

forſooth, " Chriſt was laid in a Manger, and St. *Dominick*, when an " Infant, would not lye in his Cradle, but would throw himſelf out " of it, and lye upon the bare Ground: when Chriſt was born, a Star " appeared to the Wiſe Men; and when St. *Dominick* was baptized, his " Godmother fancied ſhe ſaw a Star in his Forehead. Chriſt went at " twelve Years old to the Temple, and St. *Dominick* was carried to " Church by his Parents, and there left to be inſtructed. O admirable Compariſons! But yet further. " St. *Dominick*'s Father's Name " was *Felix*, and his Mother's *Joanna*; now *Joanna*, ſaith *Antonin*, is " as much as full of Grace, and the Angel, in his Salutation, ſaid to " the bleſſed Virgin, *Ave Maria, gratia plena.* Can any thing be now plainer than this Compariſon between our Saviour and St. *Dominick*? *But it may be, he wrought ſome ſpecial Miracles, in which he came near to Chriſt.* I ſhall mention ſome of them, by which we may make a judgment of the credibility of the reſt. One particular thing which St. *Antonin* inſtances in, was St. *Dominick*'s *Power over Devils*; and in truth, he was very extraordinary in this. *Janſenius* hath already put together ſeveral Inſtances to my Hands. It ſeems the Devil uſed to trouble him in ſeveral Shapes; but he was never more vexed with him, than when he flew up and down while he was Preaching to the Siſters (ſo my Author calls them) in the Shape of a *Sparrow*. He perceiving the Devil's cunning, called to Siſter *Maximilla* to catch him, and deliver him to him. She did ſo; who had no ſooner got him into his Hands, but he falls to the pulling him, crying out ſtill, *Enemy, Enemy*. Till at laſt he left not a Feather upon him, and then inſulted over him, bidding him *fly now if he could.* The poor Sparrow hopp'd up and down, till at laſt he got under a Braſs Lamp before the Altar of the bleſſed Virgin, and down he tumbles that: When behold a mighty Miracle; the Lamp hanging by a Chain, fell not to the Ground; and, which was more, not a drop of Oyl ſpilt; but at St. *Dominick*'s command, the Lamp was put in its right place, and the Sparrow diſappeared. But the Devil was never ſo abuſed, as when he appeared in the ſhape of a *Monkey*, when St. *Dominick* was writing late at Night, and the Devil was ſhewing Monkey-tricks about him; St. *Dominick* nodded to him to ſtand ſtill, and hold his Candle for him. The Devil could not yet leave his old Tricks; but at laſt the Candle was almoſt burnt out, and the Monkey's Toes began to burn, then he made a lamentable Noiſe; ſtill St. *Dominick* commanded him by his Nod, (for he would not vouchſafe to ſpeak to the Devil) to ſtand ſtill; which he was fain to do, till his Toe was burnt, and then St. *Dominick* ſoundly laſh'd him, and ſent him going. I would not be thought to pick theſe Things out of *Old Legends*, that are diſavowed by themſelves; but I aſſure the Reader, theſe Things are not only contained in the ancient and approved Writers of St. *Dominick*'s Life; but in *Nicol. Janſenius* the lateſt and moſt elegant of them, whoſe Book was printed at *Antwerp*, A. D. 1622. And he further tells us, that the Devil finding no good was to be done this way, was reſolved to ſet upon him by main force; and finding him once ſo intent at Prayers, that no Noiſe would diſturb him, he takes a huge Stone, from the Top of the Church, and throws it at his Head, but hit only his Cowle. But when he ſaw he could not ſtir him with all this, he went ſneakingly away. *This happened*, he ſaith, *in the Church of St.* Sabina, *where the Stone is ſtill to be ſeen, and is of the bigneſs of a great* Holland *Cheeſe*, ſaith *Janſenius*, *and as black as*

Janſ. ib. l. 2. c. 10.

Theodoric. vit. Dom. l. 3. c. 7.

Pitch. One time, the Devil came to him to Confeſſion; but St. *Dominick* preſently ſmelt him out, and ſo rated him that he ſent him away ſpeedily to Hell. If he met with poſſeſſed Perſons he had a trick that he could make them confeſs what he had a mind to. For we are to underſtand, that the bleſſed Virgin among many ſingular Favours ſhe had ſhewed to St. *Dominick*, had taught him ſuch a way of praying, as was never known before, the moſt effectual againſt Devils and all ſorts of Enemies that could be: Which is ſometimes called the *Pſalter* of the *bleſſed Virgin*, ſometimes only the *Roſary*, conſiſting of one hundred and fifty *Ave Marys*, and fifteen *Pater Noſters*. This excellent Device was revealed to him, after his Body had three days converſation with Bryers and Thorns in the Woods near *Tholouſe*; *when the bleſſed Virgin*, ſaith *Alanus de Rupe*, *commended it to him as the moſt effectual means to reform the World; and therefore commanded him to Preach and inculcate this in all places.* Aſſoon as ever he began to Preach it up, it is not to be thought how the Devils were alarm'd at it; ſtrange Thunders and Lightnings, and Earthquakes immediately happened upon it. St. *Dominick* goes on, and at laſt the Devils were heard to cry out through the Air, *Wo, wo to us, we are bound by this Pſalter with Chains of Fire.* St. *Dominick* having thus found out what would hamper the Devils, he made uſe of it upon occaſion; for finding a perſon poſſeſſed with ſeveral Devils, he ties the *Roſary* of Beads about his Neck, and then made the Devils confeſs what he pleaſed; and at laſt they acknowledged *that no Man that continued in the uſe of the Roſary could go to Hell.* Upon this he bids the People fall to their *Roſary*, and and at every *Ave Maria*, a Devil went out from the Perſon as black as a Coal. Was ever any thing like this done by Chriſt or his Apoſtles? No, I confeſs they underſtood nothing of the miraculous Virtue of the *Roſary* that was reſerved for a new diſcovery to help theſe latter Ages of the World. We read only of *their caſting out Devils by Faſting and ſuch Prayer* as Chriſt inſtructed them in; but they were to ſeek in the way of tying Beads about their Necks, or exorciſing with one hundred and fifty *Ave Marys*. But all the vertue of this admirable *Roſary* doth not lie only in tormenting Devils; for very extraordinary things are reported of it in another way. *Bzovius* ſaith, *That a Lady in* Spain *being carried Priſoner into* Africa, *and there put to lie in among the Cattel, falls to the Roſary of the Bleſſed Virgin, and preſently the Bleſſed Virgin appeared and performed the Office of a Midwife to her; and Chriſt in the habit of a Prieſt came and baptized the Child; not long after an Angel came and invited her to the Churching, and led her to an unknown Church with St.* Anne *and St.* Magdalen, *the bleſſed Virgin being preſent, and Chriſt again in Perſon Performed the Office.* Are not theſe fit things to be inſerted in Eccleſiaſtical Annals? But ſomething muſt be allowed to *Bzovius* for the Honour of St. *Dominick* and the *Roſary* invented by him.

Alanus de rupe de dignit. Pſal. c. 3. Gonon. Chronicon. Deiparæ, A. D. 1213. Bzov. A. 1213. n. 9.

Janſen. l. 1. c. 5.

Bzov. Annals A. D. 1213. 10.

He that can believe all theſe Miracles already reported of St. *Dominick*, need not ſtick at any of the reſt; as his Books being preſerved dry in the midſt of the Water, his walking dry in the midſt of Storms, his raiſing forty Engliſhmen out of the Water at *Tholouſe*, his Bleſſing a Cup of Wine ſo that it ſerved one hundred and four Perſons and not a drop of it miſſing, his turning the Worm that came out of the Woman's Breaſt at *Rome* into a rich Jewel, his raiſing the Cardinal's Nephew from the dead, his being lifted up from the Ground at his Devotion. He that ſees ſufficient reaſon to believe the Reporters of theſe things upon their bare words, muſt reſt ſatisfied that St. *Dominick* wrought Miracles.

Of the Miracles of St. *Franc*is.

Wadding *Annales Min.* A. 1210. *n.* 36.

Wadd. *ib. n.*35. *Id.* A. 1213. *n.* 43.

Id. A. 1222. *n.* 18, 19. *Speculum vitæ* S. Fra. l. 1. c. 76.

Spoelbereh. not. in ſpeculum Franciſc.

Sect. 7. But the Seraphical St. *Francis* did not come much behind him in this pretended Gift of working Miracles. I do not find that he had ſuch *a power over Devils* as St. *Dominick* had; but however he did wonderſul things in his way. It ſeems St. *Francis* himſelf was not ſo terrible to Devils as *Br. Juniper* was; for St. *Francis* uſed to threaten the Devils, that if they would not go out of Perſons *he would bring Br. Juniper to them*; at whoſe Name they preſently flew away, ſaith *Wadding*. For they had ſo great a Conſternation upon them at the approach of *Juniper*, that a poſſeſſed Perſon perceiving at a quarter of a Miles diſtance his coming towards him, ran away for ſeven Miles together, crying and howling; as the ſame Grave and late Author relates. Yet one time the Devil, who owed him a ſpight, was like to have been too hard for him; when he was condemned to be hanged for a Spy; and was upon the Rack, and there confeſſed himſelf a Traytor, but by good Fortune the *F. Guardian*, eſpying him and knowing his ſimplicity, (for *Wadding* confeſſes he was commonly accounted a Fool) procured his releaſe. But the Devil (if the *Franciſcans Annaliſt* may be credited) was not ſo much afraid of coming near St. *Francis*; for finding him once in the Cave of *Monte d' Alverne*, he was like to have tumbled him down headlong from thence, had not the Rock miraculouſly yielded to his Hands, ſo that he left the Impreſſion of his Fingers in the place he laid hold on; which, ſaith *Wadding*, were to be ſeen many Years after, but were at laſt cut away; for fear any perſon ſhould go thither to confute him. But although St. *Francis* had not that power over him that goes about *like a roaring Lion*; yet he had an extroardinary power over a devouring *Wolf*, as appears by the Story of his miraculous Converſion by him: *Wadding* relates the Story very briefly, having a mind to be at the end of it; but he agrees in ſubſtance with the reſt, and refers us particularly to the *Speculum vitæ Sti.* Franciſci, wherein it is related at large; In ſhort, it is this; there was a terrible Wolf not far from *Eugubium*, that ſpared neither Man nor Beaſt, which kept the People in ſo much fear, that they durſt not ſtir out of the Gates of the City. St. *Francis* moved with a pious Zeal not to kill, but to convert this Wolf, out he goes at the Gates of the City, with no other Armour than what he could preſently make with his Fingers, *viz.* the Sign of the Croſs; the People were got upon the top of their Houſes to ſee the iſſue of this Encounter: The *Wolf* comes with open Mouth towards him, St. *Francis* preſently ſhuts his Mouth with the Sign of the Croſs (ſee here ſaith *Spoelberch*, the wonderful Vertue of the Sign of the Croſs.) After this St. *Francis* comes to parly with the Wolf in a familiar manner, and ſays to him, *Brother Wolf, I command thee in the name of Chriſt that thou hurt neither me nor any one elſe*; Upon which he immediately falls on the Ground in the poſture of a Penitent. St. *Francis* takes him to Confeſſion, laying open before him the horrid Cruelties he had committed; but at laſt offers Terms of Agreement between him and the City; the Wolf by the moving of his Tail and Ears plainly ſhewed that he underſtood and accepted his Offer. St. *Francis* then tells him, he knew he did all this to ſatisfie his Hunger, therefore he would take care he ſhould be provided for, if he would promiſe he would never hurt any body again. The Wolf bows his Head in token of Conſent; and when St. *Francis* held out his Hand to make the bargain ſure, the Wolf put his right Foot into his Hand; (very well underſtanding the way of Contracts). Upon this the Wolf quietly walks alone with him towards the City; the People ſeeing that, flocked in great abundance about him. St. *Francis* makes an excellent Sermon

mon on the occaſion, and at laſt aſſures them of the converſion of Brother Wolf, and aquaints them with the promiſe he had made for his maintenance; the Wolf renews his promiſe before them all, as formerly. The People were filled with great joy, and the Wolf lived very innocently and neighbourly among them all the reſt of his days, and the People much lamented his Death. This Story, I confeſs, I did not expect to have met with any where elſe than in the *Golden Legend*, or *the ingenious Book of Conformities*; but not only finding it, in other more creditable Authors among them, but inſerted into their Books of *Annals* by *Wadding*, defended by *Hen. Sedulius* who writ an *Apology for the Book of Conformities*, I thought I had reaſon to produce it: Not knowing but that *E.W.* might reckon this among the Miracles of St. *Francis*, which he parallel'd with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. *Cardinal Bonaventure* doth not particularly relate the Story, but he mentions *his taming of Wolves* among his extraordinary Acts; and tells us of St. *Francis* his great kindneſs to all ſorts of Creatures, calling them *Brothers and Siſters*.

Hen. Sedulii *Apologetic. adverſus Alcoran.* Franciſ. *pro libro conformit. l.* 3. *c.* 29.

Bonav. *vit. S.* Franc. *l.* 1. *c.* 8. *n.* 12.

And although Chriſt and his Apoſtles thought it enough to preach only to Men and Women, St. *Francis* his Charity was ſo much beyond theirs, that he Preached to *Birds* and *Beaſts* as St. *Anthony* of *Padua* his Diſciple did to *Fiſhes*: And I aſſure you with no ſmall Succeſs. For *Wadding* tells us that St. *Francis* was in diſpute with himſelf, whether it were fitter for him to ſpend his time in Praying or Preaching: Being in a great perplexity about it, he ſends to *Brother Silveſter* (the ſame who ſaw the Golden Croſs come out of St. *Francis* his Mouth) and *Siſter Clara*, that they ſhould ſeek to God for reſolution; they both agree that he was to Preach; being thus ſatisfied in his Call; the next Morning early he goes towards *Bevagna*, and ſeeing a place where multitudes of ſeveral kinds of Birds were gathered together, he makes haſt thither, ſalutes the Birds as if they had been reaſonable Creatures. The Birds being big with expectation, turned themſelves and bowed their Heads towards him; then he admoniſhed them all to hear the Word of God, and then ſaid to them; *My Brethren, ye ought to praiſe your Creator that hath given you Feathers and Wings, and good Air, and that provides for you without your care.* At which excellent Inſtructions, the devout Birds ſtretched out their Wings, opened their Bills, and looked earneſtly upon him. Then he walked in the midſt of them, and not one of them ſtirred, till he gave them the Bleſſing, and made the ſign of the Croſs over them, and then they all flew away together. Thus *Cardinal Bonaventure* and *Wadding* both gravely relate the Story of his firſt Preaching, after it was revealed that he ought to preach: But that was not all; but they tell us that being returned to his Diſciples, he blamed himſelf for ſo neglecting the Duty of Preaching to the Birds. From hence he went forward in his Work, and the Swallows (not being I ſuppoſe at his former Sermon) were very troubleſome in making a noiſe to the diſturbance of the Auditory; to whom he thus ſpake, *Siſters Swallows, it is now time that I ſpeak; for you have tatled enough already. Hear the word of God, and hold your peace till that be done*, which they preſently did; and all the People were aſtoniſhed at the Miracle; as well they might. A Scholar of *Paris*, having heard the fame of this Miracle, ſay the ſame Authors, and being very much troubled at the chattering of a Swallow, commanded him in the name of St. *Francis* to come to him and hold his peace, which the Swallow immediately did. Another time, as St. *Francis* was paſſing through the Marſhes of *Venice*, he heard a great number of Birds ſinging

Wadding *An.* 1212. *n.* 29, 30, 31.

Bonavent. *l.* 1 *c.* 12. *n.* 4. Wadding *A.* 1212. *n.* 32.

Bonav. *l.* 1. *c.* 8. *n.* 8.

ing pleaſantly together, he told his Companion, he would go and ſing Prayers among them; which he did; but becauſe the noiſe was ſo great they could not hear Prayers, he bid them leave off ſinging till he had done. Which they did as readily as if they had made the Vow of Obedience. But this Spirit of Devotion did not fall upon the Birds alone; for he inſtructed a Sheep to attend Prayers, which ſhe conſtantly did kneeling, and bleating before the Altar of the Bleſſed Virgin, which was her way of ſaluting her. O, but at the Elevation of the Hoſt, ſhe fell down upon her Knees, in token of her profound Reverence. We need not now wonder at the devout Dog of *Lisbon*, whoſe Story is told with ſo much Circumſtance by *Euſebius Nierembergius*, that belonged to a *Cook* of *Lisbon*, and conſtantly followed the Sacrament wherever it went; and could by no means be drawn off from his attendance; and not only ſo, but would let no perſons be quiet, if they did not pay their Devotion to the Sacrament. I think it would be a hard Caſe to determine whether St. *Francis* his Sheep, or the *Lisbon* Dog, or St. *Anthony's Mule* had the greateſt Devotion to the Hoſt: It is certain they were all very extraordinary in their ſeveral kinds. But it was not only ſuch mild Creatures as Sheep that were thus obedient to St. *Francis*, but being once to preach at *Trevi* in the Market-Place, the young Fole of an Aſs ran up and down, and very much diſturbed him; at laſt St. *Francis* with a pleaſing Countenance ſaid to him, *Brother Aſs, I deſire thee to ſtand ſtill and not interrupt the word of God which I am now Preaching to this thirſty People*. Upon which the Aſs (moved belike to ſee the humility of this good Man in owning his poor Kindred) fell upon his Knees and heard the Sermon quite out. Was any Miracle like theſe ever done by Chriſt or his Apoſtles? But did St. *Francis* work no other kind of Miracles? Yes, we are told of many more; and of another nature, but they are all delivered by the ſame Perſons, and upon the ſame Credit; ſo that if we believe ſome upon their Words, we ought to take all; if we reject ſome and take others, we believe not upon their Teſtimony; but our own Judgement. One thing more is ſo remarkable that we ought not to omit it, *viz.* that St. *Antonin* applying that place of the *Pſalms* to him, *he ſits upon the Cherubim, and rides upon the Wings of the Wind*; makes it plain from thence, that St. *Francis* being above the *Cherubim*, was of the Order of *Seraphim* (for which reaſon, or for none, *E. W* calls him *the Seraphical St.* Francis) and to make this out, they tell us, that he appeared in *a Chariot of Fire* among his Diſciples; but what was more miraculous, he and his *Brother Maſſæus* going to Preach, he was ſo ſet on fire with Zeal and Devotion, that he ſeemed to caſt Flames out of his Mouth; and called his Br. *Maſſæus* to him, crying, A. a. a. with the force of which Breath *Frier Maſſæus* was carried up into the Air many Cubits, ſaith *Wadding*. Nay, it was no extraordinary thing with St. *Francis* himſelf to be ſo raiſed up; for *Frier Leo* who was permitted to be with him in his retirement to *Monte d' Alverno*, found him ſometimes ſo high in the Air in a rapture, that he could juſt kiſs his Feet; ſometimes up to the middle of the Trees, and ſometimes ſo high, that he could hardly diſcern him; (eſpecially in a dark Night.) But the moſt glorious Miracle of St. *Francis* was that of the *bleeding Wounds of Chriſt* in his *Side*, and *Hands*, and *Feet*. As to which it is obſervable, that they were ſo wonderfully concealed, that no Man could ever fully diſcern them in his life-time; only *Frier Ruffin* once thought he ſpied the *Wound* in his Side. And although many ways were uſed to convince

Id. ib. n. 6.

Euſeb. Nieremb. *hiſt. natur. l.* 9. *c.* 94.

Wadding *An.* 1213. *n.* 6.

St. Anton. *Chron. Tom.* 3. *tit.* 24. *c.* 1.

Wadding *An.* 1210. *n.* 25.

Speculum Franciſ. *l.* 2. *c.* 36.

Wadding *A.* 1215. *n.* 12.

Speculum Franciſ. *l.* 1. *c.* 8, 9.

Speculum Franciſ. *l.* 2. *c.* 34.

Men of the truth of theſe Wounds after his Death; yet to me there was none like that of the Image of St. *Francis*, for to convince a certain Frier, from the mark of the Wound in his Side freſh Blood was ſeen to run; from which time he moſt firmly believ'd them. And can we think that St. *Thomas* his putting his Hands into the Wounds of our Saviour's Side, was half ſo ſtrong an Evidence of the Truth of Chriſt's Reſurrection, as the bleeding of an Image was of the Wounds of St. *Francis*? No, no, altho' a Body may deceive, a Picture cannot. Are not theſe now doughty Miracles, and atteſted with ſuch uncontroulable Evidence, that they ought to be compared with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles?

Wadding *A.* 1237. *n.* 5.

Of the Miracles related of the *Britiſh* and *Iriſh* Saints.

Sect. 8. Before I diſpatch this firſt Head, in ſhewing upon what uncertain Reports Miracles are received and believed in the Roman Church; I ſhall give an Account of ſome of them nearer home, by which we may judge how far the Miracles boaſted of by *E. W.* ought, in point of credibility, to be compared with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. I hope none will deny, that there are ſome Bounds to be ſet to our belief of Reports of Miracles: For altho' God's Omnipotency hath no Bounds, yet we are not to think that God doth equally imploy his Power in all Things, nor at all Times, nor as often as Men ſhall pleaſe to ſay he doth it. In many Caſes it is very hard to determine, the fartheſt Extent of the Power of Nature; and punctually to ſhew what is a Miracle, and what not; for the Power of meer natural Cauſes may lye ſecret and hidden from us; yet from a continual Obſervation of the Courſe of Nature, a certain Sphere may be fixed, within which the Effects of Nature are contained. As that a Body being once dead, cannot of it ſelf come to life again; that there are ſome Diſeaſes at ſuch a height as to be incurable by natural Means; in theſe Caſes, the raiſing of ſuch a Body to Life, the curing of ſuch Diſeaſes being done frequently, publickly, and in an inſtant, are great Arguments of a miraculous and divine Power. And this we ſay, was the Caſe of the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: but from hence Men ought not to abuſe Mankind; and becauſe the Power of God is unlimited, therefore to ſay, that the moſt extravagant, fooliſh and idle Imaginations of Men, becauſe they have paſſed, without Proof, for Miracles among credulous People, muſt ſtill be received for ſuch. For, is it reaſonable, that becauſe we believe that nothing is impoſſible with God, therefore we muſt not queſtion that ſo many Saints walked with their Heads off, or did ſuch extravagant Things as the Makers of the *Lives* of the *Saints* tell us? For it was not only St. *Denis* of *France* of whom that is reported; but our own Eccleſiaſtical Stories will acquaint us with many Inſtances of a like Nature. So Mr. *Creſſy* tells us of St. *Juſtinian the Martyr, That when his Head was cut off, his Body preſently roſe, and taking the Head between the two Arms, went down to the Sea ſhore; and walking thence on the Sea, paſſed over to the Port called by his Name; and being arrived in the place, where a Church is now built to his Memory, he fell down, and was there buried by St.* David, *with admirable Hymns and Canticles.* So the ſame grave Hiſtorian relates of St. *Oſitha, That as ſoon as her Head was cut off, her Body preſently roſe; and taking up the Head in the Hands, by the conduct of Angels, walked firmly the ſtraight way to the Churches of St.* Peter *and St.* Paul, *about a quarter of a Mile diſtant from the place of her ſuffering; and when it was*

Creſſy's Church-Hiſtory, Book 11. c. 8. n. 5.

Book 17. c. 15. n. 5.

come there, it knocked at the Door with the bloody Hands, as deſiring that it might be opened, and thereon left marks of Blood. Having done this, it Book 17. c. 3. n. 7. *fell there down to the Ground.* To the ſame purpoſe he tells of St. *Clarus, whoſe Head being cut off, preſently after aroſe, and with his Hands taking up his Head, by the aſſiſtance of Angels, carried it to a Fountain not far diſtant, into which he caſt it: and then carried the ſame back to the Oratory of his Cell; and going on a little further, towards a Village ſeated near the River* Epta, *he there conſummated his* Courſe, *and tranſmitted his* Book 21. c. 3. n. 6. *bleſſed Soul to Heaven.* And of St. Decumanus he writes, *That when his Head was cut off from his Body, the Trunk raiſing it ſelf up, took the Head, which it carried from the place where he was ſlain, to a Spring not* Book 23. c. 9. n. 8. *far off, which flowed with a moſt Chriſtalline Water, in which, with the Hands, it waſhed the Blood away.* So St. *Juthwara, with her own Hands, took up her Head, being cut off, and to the aſtoniſhment of all,* (as we may eaſily imagine,) *carried it back ſteadily into the Church.* Theſe are pretty good Inſtances for one that takes it ſo ill that his Hiſtory ſhould be called the *Great Legend.* What can be imagined more abſurd, and be ſuppoſed to be done to leſs purpoſe, than ſuch foppiſh Miracles as theſe? But I extreamly wonder at his niceneſs in omitting ſome others of a like Nature, delivered by a late infallible Author called *Oral Tradition:* As St. *Maxentia's being beheaded, and carrying her Head in her* *Capgrav. F.* 228. 1. *Hands;* for which *Capgrave* quotes nothing leſs than infallible Oral Tradition; *for,* ſaith he, *faithful People have received this from their Fathers, by certain Tradition.* And have their late Men any better Arguments than this for Tranſubſtantiation, Invocation of Saints, &c. *Why,* forſooth, *can it be imagined that Fathers ſhould go about to deceive their Children? Did not they who ſaw it know the truth of what they ſaw? Would not they ſpeak truth to their Children? How! could then any Error or Miſtake come into the Belief of the Faithful. None certainly. Why then it is a Demonſtration, that St.* Maxentia *did, after her Head was cut off from her Body, carry it in her Hands. Can any thing be more demonſtrative than this?* And by the ſame Argument we are aſſured, that *the Head* of St. *Melorus* being cut off, out of great pity to *Cerialtanus,* his Murtherer, being in a great Thirſt, *bad him thruſt his Staff into the Ground, and he ſhould immediately ſee a Spring to ariſe thence, with which he might plentifully quench his thirſt.* Was not the Head of this Saint very charitable and kind to his Murtherer? Now this, which was a principal part of the Story, Mr. *Creſſy* ſeems in a very ſullen Humour to leave out, altho' he takes the reſt from *Capgrave;* of which I can only give this Account, (for I have no reaſon to queſtion Mr. *Creſſy's* Alford *Annales Eccleſ.* A.D. 411. n. 5. *Creſſy's* Church-Hiſtory, Book 8. c. 26. n. 3. Faith or Good-will;) That *Alford,* from whom he tranſlates his Hiſtory, only refers to *Capgrave,* and doth not relate enough for Mr. *Creſſy* to make up the Legend. The like Omiſſion he is guilty of about another Miracle concerning him, *viz. That when, by the command of his Uncle, his right Hand and left Foot were cut off; and he had a ſilver Hand braſs Foot framed for him;* (as Mr. *Creſſy* confeſſeth) *Capgrave* adds, *That he could move the Fingers, and open and ſhut the Hand, as if it had been made of Nerves, and Fleſh, and Bones;* but this likewiſe is left out in *Alford;* from which it appears how faithfully Mr. *Creſſy* kept to his Author. Upon the ſame reaſon, I ſuppoſe, he omits, St. *Paternus* his calling to his Man when he was dead, and he ſaw his Head cut off before his Eyes; but, behold a Miracle! the Head anſwer'd to him, *Here I am, Sir;* at which the Saint finding out the Head, and joyning it to the Body, it preſently aroſe ſafe and ſound. It is not to be thought that Mr. *Creſſy* did queſtion the latter part of it, who at large relates the Miracle of St. *Winifred's Head being joyned to her Body again, and her riſing up preſently upon it; cleanſing her Face from the Duſt and Sweat, to the wonderful Joy of the whole Congregation.* But, as I obſerved before, *a white Circle remained ever after about her Neck, ſhewing the place where the Section had been made.* And can the Heart of Man doubt of this? When Mr. *Creſſy* ſaith, *That immediately after her Death, her Story was written by the holy Abbot* Elerius, *her laſt ſpiritual Father*; and this Story was conſtantly read upon her Day in the *Breviary, ſecundum uſum Sarum.* But St. *Edmund* had a *red Liſt* about his Neck, when after his Head had been cut off by his Enemies, it was found joyned faſt to his Body in his Grave; and, which was very remarkable, when his Friends ſeeking after his Body in the Wood, had like to have loſt themſelves, and one of them cried to the other, Where art thou? The Head anſwer'd diſtinctly, *Here, Here, Here*; and never ceaſed crying ſo till it had brought them all to it. This Miracle Mr. *Creſſy* very honeſtly gives an account of, and ſaith, *He finds it atteſted, and received by all ancient Authors without exception, particularly by* William *of* Malmſbury. But ſo much he dares not ſay of St. *Winifred*; for he confeſſes *that* Bede *and the* Saxon *Hiſtorians do not mention her*; and among theſe his own *Malmsbury* is one; but both he and *Alford* think *that the* Saxons *hated the* Britains *to that degree, that they would not ſo much as remember their Saints.* Which is a very likely thing. But of all the Miracles of this kind, commend me to thoſe of St. *Cadoc*: One time, when he was building an Oratory, an *Iriſh* Artificer came to his Aſſiſtance, who being envied by his Fellow-workmen, they very maliciouſly cut off his Head, and tied a great Stone to his Body, and ſo threw it into a Pond: Next Morning the beheaded Artificer brings his Head in his Lap, and the great Stone at his Back; and all bloody, ſhews himſelf to St. *Cadoc*: then the Head (to whom it belong'd to ſpeak) thus addreſſed it ſelf to the Saint. *O Servant of God, ſet my Head on my Shoulders again, and I will tell thee all the Things which thou knoweſt not about this Matter.* Which he had no ſooner done, but the Head told the whole Story, and having done ſo, expired. But as remarkable was his raiſing the Gyant *Can* at St. *Andrews* in *Scotland*, who told him that he brought his Soul out of Hell; and being ſo uſeful a Man, upon the Prayers of St. *Cadoc*, he liv'd a notable Digger and Labourer there a good while after. Have we not now very great reaſon to believe theſe Miracles? And is not the Authority of the Legendaries, from whom theſe Things are reported, equal to the Teſtimony of all Chriſtians? And are not the Miracles themſelves as credible, and likely to be true, as thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? But if theſe do not ſatisfie, what can we be able to ſay, to Count *Wallen* Earl of *Northumberland*; who being beheaded for Rebellion againſt *William* the Conqueror, his Head, ſixteen Years after his Death, ſaith *Capgrave*, was found faſten'd to his Body, and only a bloody Liſt about his Neck, where it was cut off. It ſeems Rebels are as capable of theſe Miracles as Saints. We need not at all wonder now, that when he was beheaded, while he was ſaying his *Pater-Noſter*, his Head went through with it, after its being cut off. This would hardly go down for a Miracle, when we have ſuch choice of ſo much better and plainer Miracles, related by thoſe *Authentick Hiſtorians*; from whom Mr. *Creſſy* and others have furniſh'd themſelves with ſuch Traſh.

Capgrav. F. 259. 2.

Creſſy's Church-Hiſtory, *l.*27.*c.*27. *n.* 2.

Capgrav. F. 52. 1.

*Id. f.*54. 1.

Id. f. 278.

Can any one deny it to be a great Miracle for a Man to make a whole Basket full of broken Eggs whole again? Yet this *Capgrave* tells us St. *Swithin* did to the poor Woman's Eggs that were broken by his Workmen, while he was building the Bridge on the Eaſt-ſide of *Wincheſter*; and this notable Miracle was performed only with making the Sign of the Croſs over them. Now I appeal to the Conſcience of any Man, whether we ever read that Chriſt or his Apoſtles did any ſuch thing? Or did ever Chriſt or his Apoſtles hang their Garments upon the *Sun-beams*; yet this was done, ſaith *Capgrave* by St. *Aldelm* in the *Lateran Church, and the Beam of the Sun held his Garment a long time:* Which was kept for a Sacred Relick in the *Monaſtery* of *Malmsbury*. It had been a ſtranger thing if they had preſerved the *Sun-beam* too. But he was not alone in ſo ſtrange a Miracle; for St. *Cathro*'s Staff was ſupported by a *Sun-beam*, as *Colganus* tells us in his Life. And that we may not be ſurprized at the ſtrangeneſs of this Miracle, in his Notes, he refers us to the *Life* of St. *Deicola* and St. *Brigid*. In the Life of St. *Deicola* I find, that being weary with travelling; he had a mind to put off his upper Garment, which the Servants ſeeing, ran as faſt as they could to take it from him; he told them, *by no means; for he had a Servant that would be ſure to keep it*; and behold a wonderful thing! He eſpyed a Beam of the Sun coming in at a Window, and came towards it, and laid his Garment upon it, where it continued for two or three Hours till he took it away. *Bollandus* relates the ſame Story, and that it may not appear incredible, he ſaith, *the ſame thing was done by St.* Goar, St. *Florentius*, and St. *Amabilis*, St. *Brigid* hung her Garment upon the Shadow which it ſeems was ſtronger than a Sun-beam, for her Cloaths were heavy being dropping wet, and ſhe miſtook the Shadow for a great Tree; (I am much afraid this was not the only miſtake in this Matter.) But however they hung there a drying, ſaith *Cogitoſus* in the Life of St. *Brigid*, whom *Bollandus* calls *an excellent Writer, and a Man that Writ not only what he heard, but what he ſaw.* (I would he had told us whether he had ſeen this Miracle or no.) And yet *Bollandus* thinks *he did not live at the ſame time with* St. Brigid. But it may be this muſt paſs for another Miracle that he ſhould ſee things that were done before he was born.

Id. f. 278. 2.

Id. f. 10. 1.

Colgan. *Acta Sanctorum Hiber.* 6. *Martii. vit.* S. Cadroe *n.* 27.

Colganus 18. *Jan. vit. Deicola n.* 4.

Bolland. *Acta Sanctorum. Jan.* 18. *vit. Deicolæ* c. 4.

Meſſingham *Florileg. Sanctorum Hibern. vit.* 1. *Brigidæ* c. 3. Bolland. *Acta Sanctorum Feb.* 1. *vit.* 2. *St. Brigidæ* c. 2. *n.* 9. Bolland. *Comment. præv. ad Acta* Brigi. *ſect.* 2. *n.* 9.

We think the preſervation of *Moſes* when a Child, was extraordinary; but what was that, to the miraculous Preſervation and Education of St. *Kyned*? The Son, ſaith *Capgrave*, of a Prince of little *Britain*, by his own Daughter; who being delivered ſhe expoſed him to the River in a Wicker-Cradle, in which he was carried to the Sea, and at laſt was caſt upon an Iſland called in the *Britiſh* Tongue *Heniſweryn*; and on a ſudden the Sea Fowl gathered about him, and by their Bills and Claws took him out of the Water and carried him into the Air, and at laſt placed him upon a Rock, making a Bed of Feathers for him and driving away Serpents and hurtful Creatures, and ſhelter'd him from Wind and Hail and Snow, by joyning their Wings together over him. While the Child lay thus, before nine Days were paſſed, an Angel came to him, and brought him a Braſs Bell, and put the Child's Mouth to it: And when the Child was hungry it turned it ſelf and ſucked of the Bell; which afforded nouriſhment ſweeter than any Milk: And of ſo ſubtle a nature, that he voided no Excrements. Thus he continued till he could walk, and the Swaddling-cloaths in which he was wrapt, grew to him as Bark to a Tree, juſt as he grew. Afterwards a wild Doe

Capgrave f. 205.

came twice a Day and filled the Bell with Milk; thus he continued eighteen Years, being taught to read by an Angel. But although he changed his place, yet ſtill he continued an Eremitical Life: Once St. *David* deſired him to go to a Council with him, he excuſed himſelf becauſe of his Deformity; St. *David* prayed for the Cure of it, and he was heal'd, St. *Kyned* Prayed for the return of it, and he was as bad as ever. This Miracle *Alford* relates, although he thinks, *the Writers of his Life have exceeded a little too much in his Miracles.* But to my mind St. *Kneyd's* ſucking of a Bell, was not ſo ſtrange as St. *Berach's* ſucking St. *Froegius* his Ear; which *Colganus* very gravely relates. *No ſooner was St.* Berach *born, but St.* Froegius *his Uncle, took care of him, and told his Mother, God was able to bring him up without the help of Milk; and he gave him his right Ear to ſuck, by which he was as plentifuully nouriſhed as if he had ſucked all the while at his Mother's Breaſt.* If *Capgrave* had had the trimming of this Story, he would have added that this was *ſweeter than any Milk.* *Colganus* (as he had reaſon) is very angry with thoſe that ſay, St. *Froegius his Ear gave Milk: for although,* ſaith he, *it were poſſible for God to make his Ear give Milk, yet it is not probable; becauſe other ways might ſerve as well for his nouriſhment.*

Alford *Anales Ecleſ. A.D.* 529. *n.* 3.

Colganus *ad* 15. *Jan. in vit. St.* Berach. *n.* 4.

We read not of any Miracles wrought by Chriſt himſelf, till he entred upon his Preaching; but theſe Saints began very early and ſome of them held out to a mighty Age; for St. *David* lived to 147. St. *Fintan* to 125. St. *Mochaius* to 150. and St. *Cathubius* as long, St. *Finnian* to 180. St. *Kentigern* to 185. but St. *Kieran* for 300 Years, ſaith the Author of his Life, near 300. ſaith the Leſſon upon his Day, St. *Abban* 300. St. *Mochteus* 300. *In all which time he neither ſpake an idle word, nor eat fat Meat,* ſo the Author of his Life ſaith; but the old Verſes cited by *Colganus* ſay, *That in all that time he neither ſpake nor eat;* and others that ſpeak more moderately, ſay, *That in one hundred years he eat nothing:* A pretty reaſonable Faſt for any Man! But to be ſure much exceeding that of Chriſt himſelf: But that is not our preſent Buſineſs; which is, to ſhew how very early they began to work Miracles. It is hardly conceivable they ſhould begin ſooner than in their Mothers Wombs; and while St. *Furſey* was in his Mothers Womb, he very ſeverely rebuked his Grandfather for thinking to condemn his Mother, without any reaſonable Cauſe. *Colganus* confeſſes that this was a very great Miracle, but juſtifies it as the Author of his Life doth, from God's Omnipotency. Yet *Bollandus,* would fain in his Notes, have it ſoftened and made more probable, *viz. That a Voice was heard to that purpoſe, and that ſome thought the Child ſpake in his Mothers Womb;* but he confeſſes the ancient *MSS.* are expreſs that it was the Child; and the Hymns of the Church are are plain to that purpoſe.

Colganns 5. *Martii* p. 466. 16. *Martii.* p. 627.

24. *Martii* p. 734.

V. Furſæi 16. *Jan. apud* Colg. *n.* 5.

Bollandus *not. in vit. S. Furſ.* 16. *Jan. c.* 2. *n.* 7.

Matris intra viſcera
Loquens, avi nequioris arguebat ſcelera.

Which were Sung upon his Day, ſaith, *Arnoldus Wion,* from whom *Bollandus* had them: And we hope they were more honeſt than to praiſe God for that which they did not believe. Was St. *John Baptiſt's* leaping in his Mothers Belly to be compared to this? But they have a better inſtance to parallel this, *viz. St.* Nicholas *his faſting Wedneſdays and Fridays while he ſuckt his Mothers Breaſts;* or which is all one, *ſucking but once on thoſe days,* which I ſuppoſe being after *Veſpers,* made it a

Wion. *Lign. vit.* l. 3. p. 26.

Vit. S. Furſæi c. 2. *n.* 8.

Colganus 24. *Martii* *v.S.*Mochtei *n.* 1.
Colganus 8 *Martii* p. 544. *v.* *St.* Cathaldi *n.* 1.
Capgrave f. 11.
Id. f. 10. *Vit. S.*Aldelm *apud* *Surium*25. *Maii.* Creſſy's *Church* *Hiſt.* l.19. c.12. *n.* 4. *Portifor* *Sariſb.*25. *Maii. lect.* 3. Capgrave f. 242.
Id. f. 275.
Colganus *vit. S.*Kieram 5. *Mart.n.*3
Capgrave f. 208.
Bolland. *Acta ſectorum Jan.* 13.p.816.
Bolland. *præf. gen.* c.1.*ſect* 7.

Faſt: But methinks in honour to the Church of *Rome*, *Saturday* ſhould have been one of his *Faſting-days*. But commend me for Devotion to St. *Mochteus* that leapt in his Mothers Womb at *Canonical Hours*; a good Preſage certainly of his future Devotion. For a Child new-born ſcarcely any went beyond St. *Cathaldus*: for aſſoon as he was born he ſtruck his Head againſt a piece of Marble, and the Marble yielded like Wax to him; and when his Mother Expired at her Delivery, the Child raiſed up himſelf without any help, and embracing his Mother in his Arms he raiſed her to Life again. Was not this a towardly beginning for a a Child? Had not St. *Alred* a very *clear Complexion*, whoſe Face *Archdeacon William*, in *Capgrave*, ſaw ſhining like the Sun, with ſuch bright Beams, that his Hand gave a Shadow being held towards him; from whence he had reaſon to think he would prove an extraordinary Man in his time. It ſeems to be now no great matter that St. *Aldelm* ſhould make a Child to ſpeak at nine days Old, to vindicate the Innocency of the Pope; and although Mr. *Creſſy* ſpeaks doubtfully of this matter; yet ſurely there is no more reaſon to queſtion it than many other Miracles related by him and his Authors; for it was read in the Leſſons upon his Day. *Capgrave* ſaith, that St. *Ninian* commanded a Child who was but few days Old to declare who was his own Father, the Child preſently obeyed, and pointed with his Finger, and openly ſaid ſuch a Man was his Father. Was not this an early Sign of a wiſe Child! But never was there certainly a more early Confeſſor than St. *Romwold* of whom *Capgrave* relates, that being newly born, he cryed out he was a Chriſtian, and preſently made a moſt elaborate Confeſſion of his Faith hradly ſhort of that of *Athanaſius*, in its Exactneſs in the point of the Trinity; but he was too ripe to hold long, for after three Days he died. St. *Kieran* in his Child-hood raiſed by his Prayers a Bird half killed by a Kite; but St. *Kentigern* (being perhaps a Year or two older) exceeded him: for when his School-fellows had pulled off a *Robin red-breaſts Head*, he took the Head and put it to the Body, and by his Prayers and the Sign of the Croſs raiſed the Bird to Life again: ſo not only *Capgrave*, but *Bollandus* relate the Story; and *Bollandus* in his Preface particularly vindicates *Capgrave*'s Authority with relation to the Life of St. *Kentigern*.

Are not theſe now pregnant Inſtances how much theſe Saints exceeded Chriſt and his Apoſtles in their beginning to work Miracles ſo much before them?

Capgrave f. 1.
Id. F. 43.

But withal we never find that Chriſt and his Apoſtles wrought ſuch trifling Miracles. To paſs over the Reſurrection of a *Robin-red-breaſt*, methinks it was an occaſion ſomewhat with the meaneſt to ſave School-boys from whipping, as *Capgrave* tells us ſome of his Saints have done. Witneſs the Boy at *Canterbury* that ran for Sanctuary to St. *Adrian's* Tomb at St. *Auguſtins*, whither his Maſter purſued him; and reſolved to whip him, till a white Dove appeared on the top of the Tomb, and by ſtretching out his Neck and Wings begged pardon for him: then the Maſter fell upon his Knees to the Saint and confeſſed his fault; and ſo the Dove flew away. But he eſcaped better now than at another time, (if he were the ſame Maſter) when whipping the Boy however that had fled thither, his Arm was held ſtretched out all that Day till he fell upon his Knees to the Boy, and asked him pardon and by his Interceſſion he recovered the uſe of his Arm. The truantly Boys that ran to St. *Bregwin's* Tomb for Sanctuary from their Maſters, became inviſible to them there, if *Capgrave* may be believed. A Boy that ran to St. *Erkenwald's* Tomb from St. *Paul's* School, got his Leſſon by Inſpiration there; and when his Maſter purſued him thither, he repeated it exactly to him. But never was poor Maſter ſo puniſhed for whipping Boys, as he was that preſumed to Chaſtiſe thoſe that had fled to St. *Ermenild's* Tomb; for the next Night the Saint appeared to him, and bound him Hand and Foot ſtronger than with Irons, ſo that he could not move himſelf; next Morning he ſends for the Boys, begs their pardon and deſires them to intercede for him; and being carried to the Tomb of the Saint, he was reſtored to his former Condition. Were not theſe very important occaſions for God to imploy the Power of Miracles upon?

Id. F. 134.

Id. F. 135.

The nature of this laſt Puniſhment inflicted on the School maſter, puts me in mind of St. *Ivo's* *Boots* which he put the poor *Abbot* of *Ramſey* into for not believing the Carpenter *Ezi's* Revelation concerning his Body. The whole Story is worth Reading, as Mr. *Creſſy* relates it in his *Church-Hiſtory*. *This St.* Ivo *was born in a City of* Perſia *called Frianeos* (no matter whether *Ptolemy* or others mention it, for who can tell but ſuch a City might have been in the World, and they not know it?) *That his Father was a Prince there named* Yomos, *and his Mother* Iſitalia, *and his only Brother* Athanatos (a *Perſian* Word doubtleſs) *lived an Eremitical Life in a certain Wood and was Illuſtrious for Miracles.* But how came theſe particulars to be ſo well known to our Monks in *England?* I ſuppoſe *Ezi* informed them all (by the Viſion of St. *Ivo*) Well, *but St.* Ivo *was elected Biſhop in the Town where he was born, and not long after Tranſlated to the Archiepiſcopal See of the City* Aſitanea: (a huge City in *Perſia* I ſuppoſe) *Which See he governed with great Sanctity and Prudence, till a terrible Famine ſo deſolated the Country, that Parents were compelled to devour their Children. By reaſon whereof St.* Ivo *with eleven more devout Companions, forſook that Region and paſſing through many Countries, at laſt came to* Rome: (Now what a croſs thing is this? That *William* of *Malmsbury* ſaith, *that he left his Country to avoid the pleaſures which his rich Biſhoprick afforded him; that he only had three Companions, and never mentions his coming to* Rome; but Mr. *Creſſy* had the Wit to take no notice of this, although *Alford* had not.) *At* Rome, *by the Pope's advice they ſevered themſelves; and St.* Ivo *by divine diſpoſition, together with his Nephew* Sithius *and his Kinſman* Inthius (two pretty *Perſian* Names) *and ſome others came into* Britany. (Obſerve it, good Reader, the *Pope* ſent St. *Ivo* into *Britain*; for fear, we ſhould derive our Chriſtianity from the *Aſian* Biſhops; and I aſſure thee, *Alford* not a little glories in this.) *And at laſt died in a Town called* Slepe, *at three Miles diſtance from* Huntington, *ſerving God all his days in Watching, Faſting and Prayers.* But all this while, not one Word is ſaid of any acquaintance this good Biſhop had all his Life time in *England*; not one Perſon is pretended to have known who he was, or whence he came till the Carpenter *Ezi's* Viſion; therefore we come to that. Mr. *Creſſy* confeſſeth *his ſacred Body remained ſeveral Ages in the Place of his burial, in ſo much as his Memory was loſt in that place. But at laſt,* A. D. 1001. *a certain Husband man as he was plowing the Ground, light upon his Tomb, which being taken up and opened, the Body of a Biſhop in his Pontifical Ornaments was ſeen in it. The Night following the ſame Biſhop St.* Ivo *appeared in a very reverend Form, and with great brightneſs to a Carpenter called* Ezi, *and told him who he was; commanding him to ſignifie to* Ednoth

Creſſy's Church-Hiſtory *l.* 13. *c.* 9. *n.* 3.

Malmsbury *F.* 292.

Alford *Annal.* A. D. 600. *n.* 7.

Id. ib. n. 1, 2.

Abbot of Ramſey *that he ſhould tranſlate his and his Companions Bodies from thence to his Monaſtery. But the poor Man not having the boldneſs to relate this Viſion, he appeared to him the ſecond time repeating the ſame Commands; which he ſtill neglecting to perform, at the third Apparition the Biſhop ſmote him on the Side with his Croſier, telling him that the pain of that ſtroke ſhould remain, till he had performed what had been enjoyned him. The Man awaking preſently after, found a grievous pain in his Side as if a Sword had pierced it. Thus was he compelled to declare his Viſion to the Abbot, which, as ſoon as he had done, he was freed from his pain. But the Abbot would give no Credit to what the Man told him, but calling him Clown and Fool, ſaid, muſt we Tranſlate and Venerate the Aſhes of I know not what Cobler? the Night following the holy Biſhop appeared to the Abbot, and ſaid, riſe quickly, for I whom thou ſcornfully calledſt Cobler, have brought thee here a pair of Boots that will laſt a good while. Theſe thou muſt put on and wear for my ſake. Having ſaid thus, he ſeemed to draw on his Legs a pair of Boots with care to make them ſit ſmooth and handſom. Preſently the Abbot waking felt ſuch horrible pain in his Legs, that he was not able to walk or ſtand, and fifteen Years did he remain under this Infirmity* (of Boots.) *By this Miracle*, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy the Sanctity of the Holy Biſhop was approved.* A wonderful diſcovery of Sanctity! To revenge himſelf ſo ſeverely upon the Abbot for his reaſonable Suſpicion of an Impoſture; methinks however a pair of ſtreight Shooes might have been fair puniſhment at firſt for calling him Cobler; and if thoſe had not convinced him, he might then have proceeded to the *Scotch* ſeverity of the Boot. But we are to conſider that a great deal depended upon the honour of the Body that was to be Tranſlated; for the reſort would be made accordingly; and therefore a long Gout upon an old Abbot might by an eaſie Metaphor paſs for St. *Ivo's Boots*. I wonder Mr. *Creſſy* omitted another Miracle wrought, no doubt, *in approbation of the Sanctity of the Holy Biſhop* too; for in my opinion the Story of St. *Ivo's Girdle* is as good as of his *Boots*; for which we muſt underſtand theſe Saints were very ſevere towards all Perſons who neglected their Feſtival-days. Now it ſo happened, that a Monk commanded his Servants to work upon his day, and ſpake not very kindly of the Saint. (It may be queſtioning whether ever there was any ſuch Saint or no; or calling him *Girdler*, as we may think by his puniſhment.) To him The Saint replied, *I am* Ivo *whom thou lately ſaid'ſt thou didſt not know, and hindered'ſt Men from keeping my Feaſt; Here, take this Girdle, and by this Token remember me*; and girding it about him, he left him. The Monk waking, found himſelf as it were girt with an Iron Girdle, and with horrible Pains and Diſeaſes; till by viſiting St. *Ivo*'s Monument he recovered his Health. Thus, theſe Miracles end in ſome honour to a Shrine or Monument, which may reward the *Monks* well for the uſe of their Inventions to delude the People. But did ever Chriſt or his Apoſtles teſtifie their Sanctity, by giving Men ſuch *Boots* and *Girdles* as St. *Ivo* did? Did they ever vindicate the Honour of their Feſtivals in ſuch a manner? It's true, when Perſons openly lied and cheated, they were once ſtruck dead upon the place; and when others profaned the holy Inſtitution of the Lord's Supper they were ſeverely puniſhed; but what is this, to the queſtioning the Body of ſuch an unknown Saint as St. *Ivo*? What is this, to the hindring Men from keeping his Feſtival? Were the other ſuch fit ends for God to imploy his Power in working Miracles as theſe? Could any think, the aſſerting the Apoſtolical Power,

Capgrav.
F. 260.

er, or the Holineſs of Chriſt's own Inſtitutions were fit to be compared with the owning of the Body of St. *Ivo*, or making Servants work upon his Holy-day? If they do, they muſt have different Apprehenſions of the Chriſtian Religion, from what ſome would ſeem to have in the Church of *Rome*. But to proceed,

Was ever any thing done by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, like the turning a Pound of Butter into a Bell? Yet this is related, from the ſame Storehouſe from which they had St. *Ivo*'s *Boots* and *Girdle*, viz. *Capgrave*, who ſaith, that St. *Oudoceus* Biſhop of *Landaff*, travelling, deſired of ſome Women that were waſhing Butter, a Diſh of Water; they told him they had no Diſh but their Butter; the Biſhop took their Butter, and made it in the faſhion of a Bell and drank out of it, and it remained in that faſhion as a *Golden Bell*, and was preſerved as a ſacred Relique in the *Church* of *Landaff* for a Teſtimony of the Miracle. Did ever any of Chriſt's Apoſtles meerly with Breathing, and the Sign of the Croſs, change a Perſon from looking young and freſh, to be Gray-haired, and wrinkled? yet this Mr. *Creſſy* delivers (as he ſaith) *from our more ancient credible Hiſtorians*, St. *Modwenna: Who intending to retire, appointed Abbeſs over her Monaſtery a certain Virgin named* Orbila; *who by reaſon of her Youth and Beauty being in great Apprehenſion to undertake that Charge; She binding her with her own Girdle, and making the Sign of the Croſs upon her, preſently all her Hair became White, and her Countenance wrinkled as if ſhe had been very Aged; yet without any dimunition of her Health or Strength.* Mr. *Creſſy* omits a neceſſary Circumſtance of this Miracle, *viz.* that *ſhe breathed upon her*; for who can tell but there might be as great Vertue in that, as in the Sign of the Croſs or her Girdle? When was there ever ſuch a Miracle ſeen in the Apoſtolical times, as in the letting down the Bolt of a Door to St. *Neotus*? For as Mr. *Creſſy* obſerves, *he was of a ſtature ſo very low and dwarfiſh, that in celebrating Maſs, he was obliged to make uſe of an Iron-footſtool*; Now, ſaith *Capgrave*, ſome great Man knocking haſtily at the Door, St. *Neot* endeavoured to open it, and the Bolt was much too high for him; and behold a Miracle! The Bolt was let down to his Girdle that he might with eaſe open it. Had it not been as well, for the Door to have opened it ſelf by a Miracle? But then St. *Neot* would have had no Hand in it. Did ever any of them revenge Perjury as St. *Quintin* did? Who pulled a Man by the Noſe in the Night for it, and as *Capgrave* ſaith, the next Morning touching his Noſe, it dropt off into the Baſon where he was waſhing; or as St. *Egwin*? When an old Man ſware by his Beard, that the Land was his own, which belonged to St. *Egwin*, immediately his Beard fell to the Ground, and ſo he loſt his Land and his Beard too. Did ever any of them Curſe a whole Trade in a Town as St. *Egwin* did: For St. *Egwin*, we muſt know, went often from his Monaſtery of *Eveſham* to *Alnceſter* to Preach to the People; which place was very full of Smiths, who beat their Anvils ſo loud while he was Preaching, that he could not be heard; upon that he ſolemnly Curſed the Trade of Smiths in that place, ſo that, ſaith *Capgrave*, never did any one thrive by it ſince. Did ever any of them bind themſelves in Iron Chains for their Sins and go in Pilgrimage in them, as St. *Egwin* did from *England* to *Rome*? (As Mr. *Creſſy* relates the Story from *Ancient Authors*.) And were any of them aſſured of the pardon of their Sins by ſuch a Miracle as he was; *viz. As ſoon as he had faſtned his Chains he caſt the Key which locked them together into the River* Avon, *publickly proteſting that he would never eſteem*

Capgrav. *vita St.* Oudocei *F.* 258.

Creſſy's Church-Hiſtory *l.* 28. *c.* 2. *n.* 4, 7.

Capgrav. *F.* 235.

Creſſy's Church-Hiſtory *l.* 29. *c.* 2. *n.* 3.

Capgrav. *F.* 239.

Id. F. 125.

Id. ib.

Creſſy's Church-Hiſtory *l.* 21. *c.* 5. *n.* 4, 5.

himſelf ſecure of the pardon of his Sins, till either the Key were reſtored to him, or the Chains unlooſed by a Power Supernatural. And now behold the Miracle. While he was at his Devotions in the Church of St. Peter *in* Rome, *his Servants going to the Rivers ſide to buy Proviſions for their Maſter, they found in a Fiſhes Belly the Key which locked his* Chains, *and then in the preſence of a great Multitude, he unlocked the ſaid* Chains, *perceiving*, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, *that ſuch was the divine Will and Mercy:* Or rather the cunning of one of his Servants who might very eaſily convey the Key from *England* to *Rome*, to gain reputation to his Maſter by ſo Glorious a Miracle; as it ſeems this made him eſteemed a Saint at *Rome*. If it were in his return between *France* and *England*, as *Malmsbury* ſaith, the Miracle is juſt as great as it was; only I obſerve that they ſometimes differ in the Circumſtances of their Relations.

We read indeed that one of the Apoſtles was *taken up into the third Heaven, and heard unutterable things there*; but I dare ſay, none of them ever Dreamt of ſeeing the Angels *ring Bells in Heaven, to the praiſe of the bleſſed Trinity* as St. *Walſtan* did. *Pythagoras* his Muſick of the Spheres, was nothing to the *Peal* of *Angels* which he heard; Which ſo raviſhed him that he gave over his Work, and called his Companion *to come to him, and devoutly to ſet his own Foot upon his, and believe ſtoutly, and he ſhould ſee the Heavens opened, and the Angels ringing Bells to the praiſe of the ever bleſſed Trinity.* Methinks, the *Monaſtery* of *Barking* had been a good place to have ſeen this ringing of the Angels; for over that, *Capgrave* ſaith, *the Heavens are ſeen open after a peculiar manner.* It was a thing which frequently happened, to hear Angels ſinging at the Death of their Saints: So St. *Munis* heard them ſinging all Night about a Tree, where St. *Patrick's* Leper lay Dead, ſaith *Jocelin* in the *Life* of St. *Patrick*; St. *Ænguſſius* ſaw as many about another Body as reached up to Heaven, who were all ſinging over the Body; but they accompanied the Body of St. *Abbanus* to his Burial, with Rays of Light inſtead of Torches, as bright as the Beams of the Sun. But this was not all; for the Angels were extraordinarily ſerviceale to them upon all occaſions, above any thing we read concerning Chriſt or his Apoſtles. I ſhall not mention their Appearances; for it was common for Eremites and ſuch Saints to ſee Angels, as for us to converſe one with another: Angels brought Wood for St. *Moedoc* for the building of a Church, till one of his Diſciples againſt his command was reſolved to ſee them, and he eſpied a beautiful young Men with Golden Locks to their Shoulders; but from that time a Voice was heard forbidding them to bring any more; otherwiſe the whole Church would have been built by Angels. Then was St. *Moedoc* hard put to it, not being able to procure an exquiſite Work-man; he takes an unskilful Fellow and Bleſſeth his Hands, upon which he was enabled to finiſh the Work which the Angels began. They helped St. *Finnian* to bring Timber from the Wood, both more and quicker than others of his Brethren; and *Cathmœlus* heard the noiſe of Angels about him. An Angel helped St. *Senanus* to grind in a Mill for a whole Night together: Several of them ground at the Mill for *Eugenius* and *Tigernachus* while they were reading. An Angel carried a Letter from St. *Columba*, who upon receiving it, went ten Days Journey in one Day: Another brought a Candle to St. *Abban* in a dark Night to Conduct him in his Way, and when he had done, took it of him again. Many other ſuch Offices we read they performed to theſe Saints, of which we read nothing in the Lives of Chriſt or his Apoſtles. I ſuppoſe

Capgrav. *F.* 296.

Capgrav. *F.* 180. *vit.* Hildelithæ.

Joel. *in vit. St.* Patricii *c.* 113.

Colgani *Acta Sanctorum* Hibern. *p.* 579. 10. Martii.

Colgan. 31. Jan. *vit. S.* Mailoci *n.* 93.

Id. 23. Feb. *vit. S.* Finnian *n.* 6.

Id. 8. Martii *n.* 13. *v.* Senani.

Id. 1. Mart. *p.* 438.

Id. 23. Feb. *p.* 404.

Id. 16. Martii *n.* 31.

poſe it was an Angel that tolled St. *Goodric*'s Bell for him, to Prayers; for they tell us it was miraculous; and when others took notice of this Miracle, he prayed *that he alone might hear it*, which happened accordingly. But it is no wonder the Angels ſhould toll the Bell, when the Bleſſed Virgin taught him to Sing. For ſhe appearing one Night to him at her own Altar, came and laid her Hands upon him; and afterwards begun a Tune before him as Maſters uſe to do to Scholars. The very Song is extant in *Capgrave*, which contained only an Invocation of her ſelf; which no doubt ſhe extreamly deſires. In my judgment it was a great kindneſs the Angels did to St. *Finian*, when they gave him three round Stones, which ſerved him inſtead of Candles in the Night, to Read, and Write, and pray by all his Days. But the Author of his Life in the late Jeſuits Collection, tells us, that the Fingers of St. *Finian's* left Hand ſerved him inſtead of Candles; which a poor Country Fellow eſpying, loſt one Eye for his Curioſity. But St. *Patrick's* Fingers did mightily outſhine his; for in a very dark Night his Coachman not being able to find his Horſes, St. *Patrick* out of great compaſſion towards him, lifts up the Fingers of his right Hand; and behold, ſaith, *Jocelin, a very wonderful thing!* His five Fingers did ſhine like the Beams of the Sun, and turned Darkneſs into Light, and Night into Day. This, I confeſs, was very extraordinary; but in another kind St. *Elfleda's* Fingers did well, when, we are told, ſhe aroſe one Night to Prayers and her Candle going out, the Fingers of her right Hand did give ſuch a Light, as not only ſerved her ſelf, but all about her to read by. And can any of theſe be parallel'd by any Miracles done by Chriſt or his Apoſtles? Theſe are a ſort of *New Lights*, beyond what any of our *Fanaticks* have pretended to.

Capgrav. *F.* 160.

Capgrav. *F.* 168.

Acta Sanctorum 16. Martii *n.* 7.

Jocelin *vit. St.* Patricii *c.* 157.

Capgrav. *F.* 126.

Now if We conſider the Miracles done either by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, we ſhall find that theſe Legendary Saints did very much exceed them in the ſame kind of Miracles. Our Saviour, we read, only faſted forty Days and forty Nights; we have met with one already that faſted a hundred Years: But if that ſeem too *Romantick*, we ſhall find ſome of them faſting the ſame time of forty Days, but with the Addition of a very pretty Circumſtance, that they grew fatter and taller by it. So we read in *Colganus* of St. *Moedoc*; but St. *Aidanus* in *Capgrave*, out pitched him; for he faſted fifty Days and fifty Nights, and grew fatter alſo. St. *Bartholomew* of *Durham*, for ſeven Years and a half before his Death drank nothing; if he had not eaten in that time neither, it would have been a perfect Miracle.

Colgan. 31. Jan. *n.* 36.

Capgrav. *vit.*St.Aidan. *p.* 3.

When our Bleſſed Saviour Preached, he did not make a Mountain on purpoſe, but went up into the next at hand; but when St. *Kentegern* was to Preach in *Wales*, (though there was no want of Mountains there,) a Mountain roſe up under his Feet, which abideth to this Day, ſaith Capgrave. *Bollandus* in the Notes on his Life, tells us, *the ſame is ſaid of St.* David, but with more particular Circumſtances, thus related by Mr. *Creſſy*; "When all the Fathers aſſembled, aſſigned St. *David* to "Preach, he commanded a Child which attended him, and had lately "been reſtored to Life by him, to ſpread a Napkin under his Feet: "And ſtanding upon it, he began to expound the Goſpel and the Law "to the Auditory. All the time that his Oration continued a Snow-"white Dove deſcending from Heaven, ſat upon his Shoulders; and "moreover the Earth on which he ſtood raiſed it ſelf under him, till "it became a Hill, from whence his Voice like a Trumpet was clear-

Acta Sectorum Jan. 13. *c.*6. *n.* 33.

Capgrav. *F.* 210.

Creſſy's Church-Hiſtory, *l.*11. *c.*11. *n.* 2.

“ ly heard and underſtood by all, both near and far off. It ſeems St. *David* wanted St. *Columba*'s Voice; which, ſaith *Capgrave*, when he was ſinging Service, might be heard diſtinctly above a Mile without the help of a Hill.

It is true *that Chriſt did cure the lame and the blind, and cleanſed the Lepers:* But was ever any withered Arm cured by him, as the Woman's was at the Tomb of St. *Erardus*, which made ſuch a noiſe at its firſt ſtretching, as was heard in every corner of the Church? Were ever Lepers cleanſed by Chriſt or his Apoſtles in ſuch a manner as is related of ſome *Iriſh* Saints, by *Bollandus*, and *Colganus*? St. *Munnu* in the Life of St. *Mochua* in *Bollandus*, wanting the daily Converſation of an Angel, which he had before, fell into diſcontent about it; the Angel told him he muſt be humbled. St. *Munnu* deſired that he might have a Leproſie for his Humiliation; his Prayer was heard, and he had it for ſeven Years; at the end whereof the Angel came to him, and told him he ſhould go to St. *Mochua* to be cured. St. *Mochua* was not preſently to be found; in the mean time St. *Munnu* imployed himſelf in ſweeping together the Lice that dropt from him; and putting them in their places again (according to the Rule of *Frier Bartholomew* of *Durham*, that Men muſt have *naſty Bodies*, if they would have *pure Souls*) at laſt St. *Mochua* comes to him and embraces him, and by licking him all over, perfectly cured him; but the hardeſt part of his task was *the ſucking his Noſtrils*; which he did three times, and drew out three tough pieces of Phlegm, and (behold a Miracle indeed!) Theſe *three Pieces* were turned into *three Talents of Gold*, which were preſerved in his Cabinet like three Golden Apples. I confeſs, *Bollandus* ſeems a little ſtartled at theſe Miracles; but he ſaith, *they were uſual in that ſimple and Holy Nation as may appear by the lives of other Saints.* I wonder the *Jeſuit* durſt make a reflection on the whole Nation, for the ſake of the Folly of the Monks. *Colganus* in the Life of St. *Fechinus* relates, that he put *Dermitius* his *Queen* upon this naſty way of curing a Leproſie; and the ſame Miracle followed; for the *Phlegm* was turned into *pure Gold*, with part of which he purchaſed Land for his Church, and the other he put into his Staff to be preſerved to Poſterity. This Story is three times related in *Colganus*, that he might be ſure to preſerve the Memory of it. But we muſt not ſuppoſe our own *Country Monks* to come behind the *Iriſh* either in *ſimplicity*, or this faculty of working Miracles: For *Capgrave* tells us, that St. *Egbin* the *Monk* uſed the ſame way of Cure to a Leprous Perſon; but inſtead of Gold (O horrible Blaſphemy!) That which he ſuckt out, proved to be the very Fleſh of the Son of God. For he found this Leprous Perſon to be Chriſt himſelf, and while he held him by the Sides he looked and ſaw the Heavens opened, and he ſaw a Croſs upon his Head and Angels coming to meet him; and as he raiſed himſelf up into the Air, he ſpake very kind words at parting. But what will not theſe Men ſay to make the naſty Monks workers of Miracles!

Colgan. *Acta Sectorum* Hibern. *p.* 27. *Acta Sectorum* 1 Jan. *c.* 3. *n.* 6, 7.

Capgrav. *F.* 32.

Bolland. 1 Jan. *p.* 45.

Colgan. 20 Jan. *vit.* Fech. *n.* 13. & *p.* 151.

Cagrav. *F.* 122.

It was propheſied that in the Days of the Meſſias, *the Wolf and the Lamb ſhould lie down together and the Leopard and the Kid*, i.e. that the Chriſtian Doctrine ſhould be the effectual Means to remove Animoſities out of the World, and to bring in univerſal Peace and Charity. But the *Monks* who wrote the Lives of theſe Saints, fearing they ſhould in any thing come behind what is ſaid of Chriſt himſelf; have filled their Legends with prodigious Stories about the taming of Wolves, and the Power they had over all ſorts of living Creatures. It was very common with theſe Saints, when the Wolfes had devoured the Calves, to make them come and ſuck the Cows in their places, for fear they ſhould loſe their Milk. So the Author of the Life of St. *Gerald* affirms, that at his Command, the Wolf came and did his Duty; *But, after a while, by the inſtinct of Nature, or rather by the Motion of the Spirit of God* (ſaith the ſame Author) *the Wolf went to a Hill, and there called a Fawn to ſupply his room; by which means they got both the Doe and the Fawn to the Monaſtery; and from hence the Name of the Monaſtery was called* Elitheria, Elith, *in* Iriſh, ſaith he, *ſignifying a Doe.* St. *Fechinus* his Mother ſet him to keep ſeven Cows and a Calf; but he being buſie at his Contemplation, a Wolf came and killed his Calf, and eat him up to the Bones; his Mother chid him for his Neglect; he preſently runs after the Wolf, and calls to him, as his Acquaintance and Friend; the Wolf preſently ſubmits; he takes him and ties him to a hollow Stone, whither the Cows came at their time to the Wolf, as if he had been the Calf, and gave down their Milk as freely; which Stone hath ſince done great Wonders. Another time he was ſhrewdly miſtaken; for, inſtead of milking a Cow, he went to a Bull, and ſadly complain'd he could get no Milk; *But behold*, ſaith the Author of his Life, *a wonderful Miracle!* The Bull gave more Milk than any Cow of them all. And for this, he appeals to God's Omnipotency as *Baronius* doth for the *Chappel* of *Loreto.* Another Life of St. *Fechinus*, relates this Miracle concerning *Paſtolus*, his Cook; but withal adds, *That the Bull afforded as much Milk as all the ſeven Cows.* St. *Kentigern* wanting Oxen to plow with, commanded two Stags to come out of the Wood, and do their Work: the Stags preſently obey'd; and when they had done their Days Work, returned to their Paſture again. At laſt a Wolf ſeizes on one of them, and devours him. Then St. *Kentigern* ſtretched forth his Hand towards the Wood, and ſaid, *In the Name of the bleſſed Trinity, I command the Wolf to come out and make me Satiſfaction:* And, behold, the Wolf came howling, and fell at his Feet. To whom the Saint thus ſpake; *Ariſe, and in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, I command thee to go to Plow in the place of the Stag;* which Command the Wolf obey'd: and tho' he was unequally yoked, made a ſhift to plow nine Acres, and then went his way. But his Sowing was as miraculous as his Plowing; for one time, wanting Grain, he ſowed Sand inſtead of it, and at Harveſt he reaped excellent Wheat. Theſe Miracles of St. *Kentigern*, I the rather inſtance in, becauſe one being offended at the Miracles contained in the Lives of theſe Saints, as publiſhed by *Capgrave*; *Bollandus* offered him the Life of St. *Kentigern* for a tryal; and ask'd him, what he diſlik'd in it, as he had publiſh'd it? *When he had read it*, ſaith *Bollandus*, *he confeſſed, if the Lives of the Saints were ſo publiſhed. they could not but pleaſe Learned Men.* I deſire ſuch Perſons to give their Opinions by theſe Inſtances; and let them then judge whether the *New Legends* be not altogether as bad as the *Old.*

Colgan. 13. *Martii n. 7. p.* 600.

Colgan. 20. *Jan. vit. Fech. n.* 7.

N. 9.

Vit. 8. Fechini *n.* 36. p. 137.

Acta Sanctorum 13. *Jan. vit.* Kentig. c. 4. n. 20

N. 21.

Bolland. *præf. gen.* c. 1. *Sect.* 4.

When a Wolf had devour'd a Calf belonging to St. *Modwenna*, ſhe ſent her Boy, with her Staff, to him, to command him to come to her; the Boy found the Wolf yet eating the Calf, and told the Wolf his Errand: The Wolf follow'd him like a Dog, and fell down before her, and begged Pardon. She firſt chid him, and then bad *him keep that Cow out of Danger all his Days:* Which the Wolf punctually obſerved, and was ever after belov'd by the Cow, as if he had been a Calf. Yea, all the Wolfs that were of his Race, kept the Cows there abouts for three Miles compaſs; and *Capgrave* ſaith, *They are leſs than others, and have white*

Capgrav. *vit. S.* Modwennæ *f.* 234.

Spots in their Foreheads, and hurt no Body. When St. *Neot's* Oxen were ſtolen, the Stags came and offer'd their Service to Plow for him; at which the Thieves were ſo aſtoniſh'd, that they brought his Oxen again; and ſome ſay, That all the Stags that are deſcended from them, have white Marks where their Harneſs was put on: But of this, *Capgrave* ſaith, *He neither affirms it, nor, becauſe of God's Omnipotency, dares to deny it.*

Capgrav.
vit. S. Neoti f. 240.

St. *Bernac* made uſe of Stags to draw his Carriage when he pleaſed; and then ſent them back to Forage: He committed his Cow daily to the keeping of a Wolf, which led her out, and brought her home every Day. The King of *Wales* ſends to St. *Bernac* to provide him a Supper; he returns a rude Anſwer, (as any Man, but one of their Saints, would have thought) That he ow'd him not ſo much Service; the King, being angry, ſends his Servants, who chopp'd his Cow to pieces; but they could never make the Water hot, wherein the Meat was to be boyl'd; the King then ſubmits, and very humbly ſues for Pardon; then St. *Bernac* raiſes his Cow, altho' cut to pieces, and commits her to the Wolf again; and the Monk being in a good Humour, (as it was dangerous to Princes to have them to be otherwiſe) invites the King to Supper; and having nothing provided, he goes to the next Oak, and, inſtead of Leaves upon it, he found as many Manchets as he had occaſion for; (the firſt Manchets, I am confident, that ever grew within a Mile of an Oak;) then to the River he goes, which ran with Wine inſtead of Water, and all the Stones in the River were turned into Fiſhes: The King requited him well for this cheap Entertainment, by exempting his Lands from all Taxes. By theſe few Inſtances, out of very many which might be produced, we ſee what Subjection Wolves and other Creatures were in to them in thoſe Days; for, ſo far as I can learn, this ſort of Miracles is now wholly ceaſed.

Id. vit. S.
Bernaci,
f. 37.

Colgan.
Acta Sanctorum Hibern 5.
Mart. n. 7.

Colgan.
p. 464.

Capg. *vit.*
S. Pirani.
f. 267.

Colgan.
vit. S. Abbani 16.
Mart. n. 5.

But we muſt not think, that ſince they were ſo much civiliz'd, they took no farther care of their Education. For St. *Kieran* intending to make himſelf a Cell, the firſt Diſciple (ſaith the Author of his Life in *Colganus*) which came to him, was a wild Boar, which brought him Rods and Hay with his Teeth towards his Cell; then came a Fox, a Brock, a Wolf, and a Doe; and *lived very ſtrictly under his Government, and obeyed him in all things, like ſo many Monks*; which are the Expreſſions of the Author; and are juſtify'd by *Colganus*, in his Notes, who appeals to the *State* of Innocency, the Power and Goodneſs of God, and other ancient Inſtances of a like Nature, and the Obedience which the Birds and Beaſts ſhewed to St. *Francis*. But the Fox never thought, I dare ſay, of any State of Innocency, for he ſtole the good Abbot's Shoes; and wickedly forgetting his Vow of Obedience, carried them to his old Kennel; the Abbot knowing this, ſends *another Monk*, viz. *the Brock*, after him, who finds the Fox ready to eat up the Shoes; and with much ado brings him to Penance: The devout Abbot lays open the greatneſs of the Fault before the Fox, (as certainly it was a great Fault in a Fox, to ſteal Shoes, with a deſign to eat them) who ſubmits to Penance, and faſted till St. *Kieran* bid him eat: He faſted three Days, ſaith *Capgrave*, who tells the ſame Story, only calling the Abbot *Piranus*. St. *Abban* took ſuch Pity towards the lean Wolves that came out of the Wood, that he commanded them to take one of the Calves; upon which they made a preſent diſpatch of him; the Wolves came and gave him thanks for their good Dinner: the Men that were ſet to keep the Cattel, finding a Calf deſtroy'd by Wolves; made very lamentable moan to St. *Abban*; at which he fell to his Prayers, and ſign'd the ſmall remainders of the Carkaſs with the Sign of the Croſs, and immediately Skin and Fleſh covered the Bones, and the Calf roſe up juſt of the ſame Colour and Bigneſs he was of before: And the Author of his Life conjures us to believe him, *becauſe all Things are poſſible with God.* Another time, as he was ſitting in his Cell, the Wolves ran in among the Cattel; he cry'd out, *let them alone*; and from that time, the Wolves not only forbore to devour them, but liv'd very neighbourly with them. Thus we ſee what Command they had over theſe Creatures; but, in my Mind, St. *Colman's Flea* was as great a Miracle as any of theſe; for he had brought a *Flea* to ſtand juſt upon the Line where he left, when he was called away from his Book; as he had done a *Mouſe* and a *Cock* to wake him to Mattins: but as all theſe Things are mortal, it happen'd that theſe three dy'd; at which the good Man was ſo diſconſolate, that he ſent to St. *Columba* to comfort him. *Colganus* uſes ſuch Expreſſions about theſe miraculous Attendances of the *Flea* and the *Mouſe*, that I am aſhamed to repeat them; calling them, *The familiar Condeſcenſions and Sportings of Chriſt with his People, which can only ſeem incredible to thoſe, who do not conſider how wonderful God is in his Saints.* Are ſuch as theſe, indeed, the *Favours and Condeſcenſions* of Chriſt? Pitiful Souls! that can think ſuch Fopperies as theſe, the Expreſſions of God's wonderful Goodneſs to his Saints. I confeſs, ſome of their Miracles upon dead Cattel were Extraordinary; as when St. *Mochteus* raiſed up a Calf after it was eaten; when St. *Moedoc* diſcovered a Man that had ſtolen one of his Cattel, and afterward deny'd it, by making the Ear of it hang out of his Mouth: And when St. *Patrick* made the Goat, that was eaten, cry out in the Belly of the Man who had ſtolen and eaten him. Theſe were very wonderful Things, and were they not delivered by ſuch ſubſtantial and grave Witneſſes, as theſe Legendary Writers, could hardly be believed.

N. 8.

N. 28.

Colgan. *vit. S.* Colmanni. p. 244.

Colgan. 24 *Martii n.* 14. *Id.* 31. *Jan. n.* 55. Jocelin. *vit. L.* Patric. c. 27.

We read that Chriſt and his Apoſtles did frequently caſt out Devils, and that, preſently, publickly, without any Ceremony; but we never read they play'd ſuch ridiculous Pranks with one another, as the Devils and theſe Legendary Saints did. St. *Fintan* pull'd the Devil out of a Man, by putting three Fingers in his Mouth; and when he had done, he confin'd him to a certain Rock, where, for all we know, he continues to this Day; for the Author of his Life ſaith, He did ſo till his time, and hurt no Body. To defend this, *Colganus* flies to God's Omnipotency, which indeed makes every Thing poſſible, but barely of it ſelf proves nothing. Frier *Bartholomew* of *Durham*, was hugely moleſted with the the Devil, in ſeveral Shapes; as of a Mouſe, a Lyon, and an Ape; ſometimes leaping upon his Legs, ſometimes being ready to choak him, ſometimes pulling him by the Cowle, and caſting him on the Floor; at laſt, after many Tricks, the ſtout Frier takes a whole Pot of Holy Water, and throws it in his Face, and then he ſneak'd away horribly aſham'd and confounded. St. *Benignus* was going one Night to the Church of St. *Mary* in *Glaſtonbury*; upon the Bridge he eſpies a Devil making towards him; after ſome ſharp Words that paſſed between them, the *Saint* caught hold of him, with his left Hand, and with the Staff in his right Hand, beat him as long as he could ſtand over him; and, at laſt, threw him into a Well, out of which he never aroſe again. But no Perſons ever durſt come near that Well ſince that time,

Colgan. 1. *Jan. vit. S.* Fintani *n.* 10.

Capgrav. f. 33.

Id. f. 36.

time, ſaith *Capgrave.* The Devil, watching his Opportunity, ſtole
Capgrav. *F.* 55. from St. *Caradoc* the *Eremite*, his Girdle and Purſe; and when the good
Man was looking for them, he ſaw the Devil ſtanding not far off with
them, fleering and laughing at him; but he ſoon made him reſtore
them again. We muſt not forget St. *Dunſtan*'s holding the Devil by
the Noſe with a red hot pair of Tongs; which, although Mr. *Creſſy*
Capgrav. *F.* 90. Alford *Annales*, A.D. 935. *n.* 4, 5. ſliely paſſes over, yet his Friend *Alford* honeſtly remembers it; and
ſpeaks of it as an heroical Act in him (as no doubt it was) in the
beginning of his Converſion; a Thing, without Parallel, from the
time of the Devil's fall from Heaven, to this Day. No wonder it made
him cry out, *What hath this bald pate done?* But for all that, the Devil
would not give him over ſo; however, he thought fit to change
Capgrav. *F.* 92. his Shape into a Bear: St. *Dunſtan* finding who he was, falls upon
him unmercifully with his Paſtoral Staff, and never gave him over,
till he had broken his Staff upon him into three pieces. The Devil
Id. f. 163. play'd forty Tricks with St. *Goodric*, which *Capgrave* relates: Once he
perſuaded him to dig for a Treaſure; and when he had digged a little
way, up roſe ſeveral little black Boys, with ſhorn Heads, which
mocked him, and threw ſtinking Pellets in his Face: But from that
time he would never mind Money more; and therein he was too hard
for the Devil. Another time, the Devil and he wreſtled ſo long together,
that the Combat endured nine Hours, and the Noiſe of it
was heard by others abroad; for it ſeems they were at it both with
F. 194. Words and Blows. But at laſt, St. *Goodric* ſaid, *With the help of the
Croſs, he feared the Devils no more than he did the Motion of the Air.*
Id. f. 170. Never was poor Man ſo uſed by them, as St. *Guthlac*, in his Retirement
at *Crowland*; for they made nothing of binding him, and toſſing
him in the Air, and throwing him into Lakes and Ponds, and
whipping him, till, at laſt, kind St. *Bartholomew* came to his Aſſiſtance,
and made them carry him ſafe again to the Place where they
F. 172. took him up. Afterwards he had ſufficient Revenge upon ſome of
them; for ſome he made to ſerve him in his Buildings, and one he
ſhut up in a boyling Pot. Thus we ſee how far, in their ways of combating
with the Devils, theſe Legendary Saints out-did Chriſt and his
Apoſtles.

It was a ſmall matter with them to raiſe the Dead, as *Chriſt* did
Lazarus; but when the Head of *Beoanus* was cut off by his Enemies,
Colgan. 15. *Jan. n.* 15. and not to be found, at St. *Ita*'s Prayers, *the Head came poſting thro'
the Air*, and ſtood by the Body, and ſhe joyn'd them as faſt together,
as if they had never been ſeparated; and, in the ſpace of an
Hour, he aroſe as ſound and vigorous as ever he was in his Life: And
P. 71. theſe things are written, if we believe *Colganus*, by *a faithful and ancient
Author.*

Jocelin. *vit.* Patricii, *c.* 82. But what ſhall we ſay to St. *Patrick*, of whom *Jocelin* ſpeaks, that
he raiſed up a Man that had been dead one hundred Years, being
Grandfather to him, for whoſe ſatisfaction he was raiſed. *Jocelin* doth
not expreſs the number of Years; but St. *Ewin*, in *Colganus*, doth.
c. 78. *Jocelin* elſewhere mentions his raiſing one that had been *ten Years
dead*; but we are to remember by what Inſtrument St. *Patrick* is ſaid
to do theſe Things, *viz. By the Staff of Jeſus*, which is ſuppoſed to
have been delivered to him, by one, who ſaid, he had it from Chriſt
c. 74. himſelf, and was the very ſame he uſed upon Earth.

Nothing more uſual with the *Iriſh Saints*, than to raiſe dead Cattle as well as Men, *viz.* Oxen and Horſes, Calves and Hogs, as may be ſeen abundantly in *Colganus*. One thing I have yet omitted which was very extraordinary; *viz.* that the King's only Daughter being dead; they ſent to St. *Gerald* to raiſe her from the Dead, who not only did it, but with this pleaſant Circumſtance, to the great joy of the King, turned his Daughter into a Son at her Reſurrection. *Colganus* confeſſes, *That nothing like this occurs in Story, and yet though it ſeem never ſo incredible, we ought not to queſtion God's Omnipotency*; eſpecially when the matter of Fact is ſo ſtoutly atteſted. That which comes neareſt to this, is St. *Abban's* changing the Sex of a Daughter by Baptizing her; as the ſame *Colganus* reports it; methinks he need not have troubled himſelf, to have heap'd together ſo many Srories of natural Tranſformations, to make theſe credible: For they who can believe the other Miracles contained in the Lives of the Saints publiſhed by him, need not ſtick at any thing in the World. They who could turn Acorns into Pork, and which is more, a Swerd of Bacon into a Coulter to Plow with, both which be reports of one of their Saints; why ſhould not they be able to transform one Sex into another? No Men can tell what bounds to ſet to the power of ſuch, who could bring a Man from *Rome* to *Caſſells* with the ſound of a Bell, as St. *Fechinus* did *Tyrechanus*: or that could feed a whole Army with one ſmall meaſure of Grain for three Days together; and, which adds much to it, he divided that meaſure into two parts, whereof the one ſerved for Drink, the other for Meat: As is related of the ſame wonderful Saint. Next to him is St. *Kieran's* feeding a whole Army with a Cow and a Hog; as is contained in the Leſſons to be read upon his Day; but the Author of the Engliſh Martyrology, makes the Miracle more conſiderable; for he ſaith, *That with three Cows he fed ten Armies for eight Days.* I commend a Man that will make ſomething of a Story when he hath it in his Hands.

Colgan. 13. *Martii vit.* St. Gerald *n.* 6.

Id. 16. *Martii vit. S.* Abban. *n*, 23.

Id. 20. *Jan n.* 31. 42. *vit. St.* Fechini p. 136, 138.

Id. ib. n. 14.

N. 34.

Colgan. 5. *Martii* p. 468. lect. 9.

Martyrolog. Anglic. ad 2 *Maii.*

I ſhall mention but one thing more, *viz. Miraculous going upon the Water as our Saviour did*; and then we ſhall ſee that theſe Legendary Writers will leave the Honour of no one Miracle entire to our *Saviour*, excepting that of his own Reſurrection from the Dead, which was the greateſt of all others; and to which I do not find that any of them ever ſo much as pretended. But for paſſing upon the Waters in a miraculous manner, nothing was more common among them; and ſcarce any of them did it but exceed our Saviour in ſome Circumſtance or other. The *Sea* of *Galilee* on which our *Saviour* walked, was but one League over, and three in length; and upon this he walked only till he came to his Ship; but theſe Legendary Saints made nothing of paſſing from *Ireland* to *Britain*, and ſo back again. St. *Fanchea* had a great mind to ſee her Brother *Endeus* at *Rome*, and took three other Virgins with her; but commanded them to carry no manner of Utenſils with them; but one of them tranſgreſſed her Command, and carried a Braſs Baſon with her; when they came to the Sea-ſhore to paſs for *England*, they miſſing a Ship to tranſport them, St. *Fanchea* ſpreads her Mantle upon the Sea, and walked bodily upon it dry Foot, and ſhe and her Companions ſeated themſelves upon it; and the Wind blew to their minds but on a ſudden one part of the Mantle ſinks under Water. Then St. *Fanchea* bid them confeſs their Sins, which when ſhe had done who conveyed away the Baſon, the Saint takes the Baſon and throws it into the Sea, and they came ſafe to their Port in *Britain*. But for

Quareſm. elucid. terræ ſectæ l. 7. c. 3.

Colgan. 1. *Jan. vit.* S. Fanchæ *n.* 8, 9.

all this, the Baſon comes again miraculouſly to her; for St. *Darercha* finding it on the ſhore of *Ireland*, and knowing how uſeful it would be to St. *Fanchea* for the waſhing her Hands, beſeeched Almighty God (in ſo important a buſineſs) to imploy his Power that it might be conveyed to her: She tied another to it, and ſo diſpatched them by Sea, and both came ſafe to St. *Fanchea*; who ſends back her own to St. *Darercha* again the ſame way; and ſhe receiving it, gave great thanks to God and his Holy Angels. Was not God's Almighty Power in the mean time very much at the beck of theſe Female Saints? Whereas, If I be not deceiv'd, the Scripture never mentions any Miracle wrought by a Woman, no, not even by the Bleſſed Virgin her ſelf. St. *Fanchea* having found this eaſie Colgan. 2. *Jan. vit.* S. Schotini *n.* 5, 6. paſſage, returned to *Ireland* again after the ſame manner. St. *Schotinus* was paſſing over from *Ireland* to *Wales*, walking upon the Sea; and he meets a Ship wherein St. *Barra* was, who asked, him *why he walked upon the Sea?* *Schotinus* told him *he walked in a flowry Meadow*, and putting down his Hand took up a handful of reddiſh Flowers, which he caſt into his Boſom to convince him. St. *Barra* on the other ſide, took a Fiſh out of the Sea, which he threw towards *Schotinus* to prove it was the Sea; and *on both ſides*, thus playing with Miracles, and *glorifying God* *N.* 7. *in his wonders, they departed from each other*, ſaith *Colganus*. Another time he paſſed over to St. *David* from *Ireland*, on the back of a monſtrous great Beaſt in the Sea, when he was ſent in haſte by the Angel to prevent St. *David*'s being Poiſoned. But it is no great wonder he ſhould have ſo quick a paſſage by Sea, ſince *Colganus* ſaith of him, that *N.* 8. having great buſineſs at *Rome*, he was carried from *Ireland* thither in a Day: And having diſpatched his Affairs, returned to *Ireland* in another Colgan. 31. *Jan. vit.* Maidoci *n.* 20. Day. St. *Moedoc* was one Day troubled that he had not asked St. *David*, who was to be his Confeſſor in *Ireland*; upon this weighty Buſineſs away he walks over the Sea, towards *Wales*; an *Angel* met him upon the Sea; and chid him for his boldneſs, he told the Angel he truſted to God's Omnipotency and Goodneſs. But the Angel (who it ſeems by the Story was a Heretick) further told him he went upon a needleſs Errand, for he need no Confeſſor beſides God himſelf; but if he would have a Witneſs of his Conſcience, he ſhould chooſe *Molua*. Upon this he returns. But he bethinks himſelf that his *Bell* was in *Britain*; (for we muſt know that the Saints in thoſe times made great account of little tinkling *Cymbals*; ſo we read of St. *Gildas* his *Bell* Capgrav. f. 54. *Id.* f. 188. Colgan. 20. *Jan. vit.* S. Molaggæ *n.* 17. *Id.* 4. *Feb. vit.* Cuannæ *n.* 12. *Id.* p. 149. Conſecrated by the *Pope*, and ſent to St. *Cadoc* for Men to ſwear by; of St. *Iltutus* his Bell, and the Miracles done by it; of St. *David's* Bell, and the curing the *King* of *Dublin* by applying it to his Cheek: But moſt wonderful was the Bell of St. *Furſeus*, that when St. *Cuanna* and his Diſciples were together in the Fields, came hovering over them like a Bird; and in token of Fraternity was ſent by him from *Peron* in *France*; which comforted them very much: Theſe Bells the *Iriſh* have a ſtrange reverence for to this Day, (as *Colganus* tells us, and their moſt ſolemn Oaths are by them.) And aſſoon as he had occaſion for his Cymbal, *Id.* 16. *Martii vit.* S. Abbani *n.* 15. he ſaw it a ſwimming over the Sea to him; which he receiving ſo miraculouſly, gave God thanks for it. St. *Abban* put his Staff under his Feet and marched into the midſt of the Sea; where he was met with a Troop of Devils, who threatened to drown him; but while he was ſinging Pſalms in the midſt of them, he heard the Angels ſinging, who came to his relief; then an Angel told him he ſhould be the Patron of all thoſe who paſs the Seas; and whoſoever entring into a Ship ſhould call upon him, and ſay, ſuch an *Iriſh* ſaying, there mentioned, ſhould not be drowned: At which he more rejoyced than at his own preſervation. Another time St. *Ibarus* had a mind to go to *Rome*, and St. *Abban* deſired to go with him, but the other denyed him; while he was ſleeping on the ſhore, the Ship puts to Sea; when he wakes he ſees it ſailing at a great diſtance, he prays and runs into the Sea after the Ship as faſt as he could, and the Ship ſtood ſtill, till he came into it, and then they came ſpeedily and ſafely to *Britain*. St. *Moeode's* Chariot and Horſes went over a great Lake as if he had been on dry Ground. This was pretty well (if it were in hot Weather) but I am miſtaken if St. *Walſtan's* Herſe did not however very much exceed his Chariot; for *Capgrave* tells us. *That it not only went upon the ſurface of a very deep Water, as if it had been firm Ground; but the very prints of the Wheels are ſaid to appear to this Day.* I confeſs, I was ſomewhat fearful *Colganus* would have quite put down *Capgrave*, or *John* of *Tinmouth*, or any other of our brave Writers of the Lives of the Saints; but this one paſſage puts me in good hopes of the *Engliſh* ſide. To have made the print of Wheels remaining upon a firm ground, for ſo many Years would have ſounded well; but to have them ſeen upon Water and in the ſame places too (for elſe the Impreſſion would ſoon have been carried into the Sea) eſpecially if it were a running Stream, is a Miracle I think can hardly be parallel'd by *Colganus* himſelf. When St. *Modwenna* and her three Virgin Companions, wanted a convenient paſſage from *Ireland* to *England*, an Angel did them an extraordinary kindneſs, ſaith *Capgrave*, for he cut off that ſnip of Land which they ſtood upon from the reſt, and removing it from its own place, conveyed them to *England* upon it; and when he had done he ſettled that Iſland near the Caſtle *Daganno*, in which *St. Modwenna* built a Church. *St. Decumanus* paſſed over from *South-Wales* to *Somerſetſhire* near *Dunſtar*, on a bundle of Rods; but St. *Bernac* went much beyond him; for he paſſed over the Sea, from little *Britainy* to *South-Wales* upon a piece of a Rock, which carried him on the ſurface of the Water. This I think is ſomewhat beyond bare walking on the Sea; but *Colganus* hath ſomething to out-match this, (as if they writ the Lives of the Saints for the Whet-ſtone) for St. *Cuanna*, and eight of his Diſciples ſtanding upon a Rock, were carried over the Sea to their own Country: Which Rock was afterwards carryed to his Cell, and he kept ſeven Lents upon it. St. *Hya* went ſomewhat eaſier upon a ſmall Leaf ſhe ſaw in the Sea, and paſſed upon that from *Ireland* to *Cornwall*, ſooner than St. *Fingar* and all his Companions could reach it. This not only is delivered by *Colganus*, but by St. *Anſelm*, and is publiſhed among his Works by *Picardus*. *St. Patrick's Altar* ought not to be forgotten, for its excellent faculty not only of ſwimming it ſelf, but tranſporting others over the Sea: For when *St. Patrick* was to go over from *Britain* to *Ireland*, a certain Leper ſtanding on the Shore, begged earneſtly to be admitted into the Ship with him; the Seamen abſolutely denyed him. St. *Patrick*, out of great pity, threw over a Stone Altar the *Pope* had given him, and bad the Leper ſit upon that: Upon which he went ſafely to *Ireland*, and landed the ſame moment with them in the Ship. *David Roth* in his *Elucidations* upon *Jocelin*, Confeſſes this to be ſomewhat an odd Miracle, becauſe, as he very Philoſophically ſpeaks, it is the nature of a heavy Body to tend downwards; but ſtill this, and all other fabulous Miracles muſt be defended by God's Omnipotency. From which Argu-

N. 10.

Colgan. 51. *Jan. n.* 41.

Capgrave f. 296.

Capgr. *vit* S. Modwennæ. f. 237.

Capgr. *vit.* S. Decum. f. 86.

Id f. 37.

Colgan. 4. *Feb. vit.* S. Cuannæ *n.* 7.

Colgan. 23. *Feb. vit.* Guigneri *n.* 12.

Jocelin. *in vit.* S. Patricii c. 27.

David Roth *Elucid. in* Jocel. c. 1.

Colgan. *vit.* S. David 1. *Martii n.* 18.

ment we muſt believe every thing that is told us; becauſe *all things are poſſible with God.* How can we then queſtion St. *Barr's* riding in the Sea on St. *David's* Horſe, as if it had been a Meadow? And his meeting St. *Brendan* upon the Back of a Whale; and after they had ſaluted each other, and St. *Brendan's* ſaying, *Mirabilis Deus in Sanctis ſuis*, they parted; St. *Bar* Landed a Horſe-back in *Ireland*, and told this wonderful Voyage to his Diſciples; and in memory of this Miracle they ſet up a brazen Horſe over the Image of St. *Bar*. The ſame Argument, I ſuppoſe, will defend the ſeven Years Voyage of St. *Brendan* in queſt of Paradiſe, which in all reſpects was the moſt extraordinary, that ever was made on the Sea. Which I ſhall briefly relate out of *Colganus*, *Capgrave*, and *John à Boſco*. St. *Barinthus* coming to viſit St. *Brendan*, was deſired by him to tell what Wonders he had lately ſeen in the Sea; then St. *Barinthus* related how his Diſciple *Mernoc* had found an Iſland near a great Rock, called *The delightful Iſland*, whether he had drawn many *Monks*, and many Wonders were done among them: Which he underſtanding, had a great mind to viſit them; after three Days Voyage they came out to meet him like a ſwarm of Bees, his coming being revealed to them before; they had no Food but Apples and Nuts, and Fruits, and Herbs; after he had obſerved their Orders and Diſcipline, and viewed the Iſland, his Diſciple *Mernoc* led him to the ſhore, where a Boat lay ready, into which they went and made Weſtward, towards an Iſland which is called the *Land of Promiſe, which the Saints are to inhabit in the laſt times*; a ſudden Darkneſs and a glorious Light ſucceeding it, they came to the Iſland, where all Herbs were in Flower, and all Trees bore Fruit, and no Stones in it but Jewels; after fifteen days Travel they came to a great River running Eaſtward; while they were debating how to paſs it, one comes to them in great Glory, and calling them by their Names commanded them to fly back, for it was not lawful for them to paſs over. While they were ready to ask him impertinent queſtions, he deſcribes to them the Glory of the *Iſland*, that there was no need of Meat, Drink, or Cloathing there; that there was perpetual Day, for *Jeſus Chriſt was the Light of it*. Aſſoon as this Perſon had conducted them to their Boat, he vaniſhed out of their ſight: And they return'd to *the delightful Iſland*; and by the ſmell of their Garments, their Brethren found they had been in Paradiſe; for that ſmell laſted above forty Days, (as it ſeems it uſed to do with thoſe who had been in *Paradiſe*.) Here *Barinthus* ſaith, he continued with his Diſciple two whole Weeks longer, and although they neither eat nor drank all that time, yet they ſeemed as full as if they had been drunk with new Wine. After which time he took his leave of *the delightful Iſland*, and returned to his own Cell. St. *Brendan* was ſo ſtruck with admiration at this pleaſant Story, that *he fell upon his Face and praiſed God for the great diſcoveries he had made to his People.* Forthwith St. *Brendan* reſolves upon a Voyage thither, and out of 3000 Monks making choice of 14 to go with him, he propoſes the keeping a Faſt of 40 Days, by three Days at a time, to prepare themſelves for it. After this they prepare a ſmall Veſſel for themſelves (for it ſeems they durſt not venture to walk on the Sea ſo far) very light the Veſſel was, and covered over with tanned Hides, greaſing all the ſeams with Butter (which the ancient *M. S.* in *Colganus*, and *Capgrave*, expreſly mention) thus taking in Proviſion for 40 Days, they ſet ſail, and had a good Gale for 15 Days, then they tugged at their Oars till they were all weary, which St. *Brendan* obſerving, bad them hoyſe their Sails, and *let God drive them whither*

Colgan. 21. *Martii* p. 721. Capgrav. *vit.* S. Brendani f. 45. Joh. à Boſco, *Bibliotheca Floriac.* *viis* S. Machut, c. 6, 7.

ther be pleaſed; after 40 Days, their Proviſion was quite ſpent, and then they eſpyed a high Rocky Iſland, in which after three Days, they went on Shore, and found a ſpacious Hall furniſhed with Beds, and Seats, and Water to waſh with, and all ſorts of Utenſils of ſeveral Metals, Horſes Bits, and Horns done with Silver. Here one of the Brethren could not hold his Hands; but although expreſly againſt St. *Brendan's* Command, he had ſecretly put up a Silver Bitt, but upon ſtrict Examination he confeſſed his fault, and threw it before them; then a little black Devil went out of him, and railed at St. *Brendan* for diſpoſſeſſing him; but he commanded him to hurt no one till the Day of Judgment. Being refreſhed here, they put to Sea again, and came to another Iſland, and after that to one called the *Paradiſe of Birds*, and for three Months after ſaw nothing but Sea; at laſt they came to the *Iſland of Silence*, where the *Monks* never ſpake but at Prayers; only the *Abbot* gave an account to the Strngers of their miraculous way of living; for every Day they had twelve Loaves ſent them from Heaven, and upon Feſtivals and Sundays twenty four, every one then having a whole Loaf: Which Cuſtom had continued for eighty Years with them, ever ſince the Days of St. *Patrick*, and they never felt Cold or Heat, and the Lamps in their Church were kindled from Heaven, and never diminiſhed with burning; the Altars and all the Veſſels were made of Chryſtal. When any of the Monks wanted any thing, they went and kneeled before the *Abbot*, but ſpake nothing. The *Abbot* by *Revelation* knew what they deſired, and writ down his anſwer in a Table-book, and in all that eighty Years the Abbot proteſted to St. *Brendan*, he had not heard the Voice of a Man but only at Prayers: And they had none of them felt any Infirmity of Body or Mind ſince their coming thither. While they were thus diſcourſing, a Fiery Arrow came from Heaven, and kindled all the Lamps. Many other *Iſlands*, they came at with great variety of Accidents too many to be Tranſcribed: as their meeting with a great Whale that caſt Fire and Water out of his Mouth, which St. *Brendan* killed by his Prayers, and gave them a third part of him to eat; (which I ſuppoſe by the Fire and Water that came out of him, they believed to be well ſodden already) the ſtrange Bird that brought them a Bunch of Grapes as big as Apples; the Griffin that was deſtroyed by that Bird; the Glaſs Sea, in which they could ſee to the bottom, the Chriſtalline Pillar that reached up to the Sky, covered with ſo thin a Canopy that their Ship paſſed through one of the holes of it, every ſide of which Pillar contained 1400. Cubits; the *Iſland* of *Black Smiths*, where they heard the Anvils as loud as Thunder, which proved at laſt to be the Suburbs of Hell, as they gueſſed by the Howlings they heard, and the Stench they ſmelt: The *Iſland of* Paul *the Eremite*, when he lived forty Years without Food, and was all Hairy, and as white as Snow. In the ſeventh Year, ſaith the Life of St. *Machutis*, they came to a certain Iſland where they found a Tomb of a wonderful length; then becauſe of the Infidelity of ſome, who would hardly believe that there ever was a Man of that prodigious height, St. *Brendan* and the reſt deſired St. *Machutis* to raiſe him out of his Grave, which when he, to ſatisfie their curioſity, had courteouſly done, they asked him who he was; he told them he was a Giant (which I ſuppoſe they were convinced of by their Eyes) and that his Name was *Mildun*, that he had lain in Hell ſo long, but now he was a Chriſtian, and deſired to be Baptized;

Vit. St. Machut. *c.* 6.

Baptized; which was performed by St. *Machutis*; if it were by dipping, it muſt be done in the Sea doubtleſs.

C. 7. This Giant gave them the firſt Diſcovery of the *Iſland* of *Paradiſe*; for once walking in the Sea, he ſaid he had ſeen it; that it was compaſſed about with a Golden Wall, and yet as clear as Chryſtal; but, he being a Heathen, could ſee no Entrance into it. They deſired him to conduct them thither; he takes the Cable of the Ship, and walks into the Sea, and drew the Ship after him; (which, as the Author of St. *Machutis* his Life well obſerves, is a thing one would hardly believe; but *Joh. à Boſco* thinks he hath fully cleared all, in his Notes, to which I refer the Reader for his further Satisfaction) preſently a mighty Storm aroſe, ſo that they were forced back to the ſame *Iſland*, where the Giant died. While they were now debating about their return home, they beheld a ſmall Iſland in the Sea; when they were landed upon it, they deſired St. *Machutis* to ſay Maſs; and when they came to *Pater Noſter*, they found the *Iſland* give a terrible *ſhrug*, which put them all into a Fright; at laſt they diſcovered their Iſland to be a great Whale; or, as the moſt Judicious among them thought, the *Leviathan*; we may well think they made haſt with their Maſs, and wiſhed themſelves well off of this new Iſland; upon St. *Machutis* his Prayers, *Leviathan did not ſport himſelf in the Waters*, but ſtood ſtill, till the Monks were got clear of him; then they ſung *jubilate* in their Ship, and, as that Author ſaith, return'd home. But he was certainly miſtaken; for *Capgrave* ſaith, They did at laſt find the *Iſland* of *Paradiſe*, and all Things anſwerable to St. *Barinthus*'s Deſcription; and ſtaid there forty Days; and then a young Man bid St. *Brendan* "load his Ship with Jewels, "and return home; for that Iſland was reſerved for their Succeſſors, "when times of Perſecution ſhould happen. Now, to prove the Truth of this Story, (for it ſeems there were ſome Infidels that preſumed to queſtion it,) *Colganus* reckons up abundance of the *Acts* of the *Saints*, wherein it is mentioned; and not only ſo, but a *Book* of *Litanies*, above 800 Years old, wherein *the Companions of St.* Brendan, *in ſeeking the Land of Promiſe, are ſolemnly invocated*; and the very Day is ſet down in their ancient Martyrology: And when St. *Brendan* was returned, he gave an Account of his Voyage to St. *Abban*, which he did by the Command of an *Angel*, ſaith the Author of his Life; which *Colganus* calls *an illuſtrious Teſtimony of the Truth of it*. Thus, having given an Account of this miraculous Voyage, and deſpairing to meet with any Thing like it, I here give over my Enquiry into the *Miracles* which have been receiv'd and believ'd in the Roman Church, in the moſt conſiderable Parts of *Europe*.

Colgan. 16 Martii *vit.St.* Abbani *n.*43.

And now, without farther Reflections upon them, I leave the Reader to judge, whether the Teſtimony on which they have been received, ought to be compared, in point of Credibility, with that Teſtimony on which the Chriſtian Church hath believed the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Only one thing I deſire may be obſerved, *viz.* That I have not raked their Kennels, nor made uſe of the *Authorities* of *Jacobus de Voragine*, *Petrus de Natalibus*, *Claudius Rota*, *Cantipratanus*, and ſuch like: No, nor yet of *Cæſarius ab Heiſterbach*, *Dauroultius*, *Marulus*, *Gononus*; or ſuch as have made Collections to my Hands; but have taken their moſt approved and late Writers, and ſuch whoſe Authorities themſelves make uſe of in other Things. *Capgrave* is ſuppoſed to have taken moſt of his Lives out of *John* of *Tinmouth*'s *Sanctilogium*, *ſtilogium*, whom Pits commends for *his Excellent Learning*; and that Work particularly, *for his Diligence, Exactneſs, Wit and Judgment, which he ſhewed in it; that he cut off many ſuperfluous Things with Diſcretion*; and, if *Capgrave* took out of him, we may ſuppoſe, that after ſo many Strainings, we have only the beſt left; conſidering the Character that is given of *Capgrave*; *An Excellent Divine*, ſaith *Poſſevin*; *The Chief of his Time for Piety and Learning*, ſaith *Harpsfield*; *The moſt learned Man that ever was of his Order in* England, *ſay* Joſephus Pamphilus, *and others, in* Pits; *A Man of ſuch excellent Parts, and Wit*, ſaith Pits himſelf, *that he had ſcarce any Equal, none Superior, in* England, *in his time*: And, among other Things, he commends him *for his Judgment*; and therefore his Authority will not be rejected, as mean and contemptible among themſelves. Colganus *his firſt Tome of the Acts of the Saints in* Ireland, which I have only made uſe of, was publiſh'd at *Louvain*, A. D. 1645. with great Approbations from the *General* of his Order, at *Rome*, from the *Profeſſors of* Lovain, from the *Ordinary Cenſor Librorum*, from four *Jeſuits*, and by commendatory Epiſtles from *Vernulæus* and *Erycius Puteanus*, who highly applauds him for his Induſtry, Piety, and Faithfulneſs; therefore my Adverſaries cannot pretend, that I have pick'd up ſome old Worm-eaten Stories, with which to diſgrace their Miracles: No, they are ſuch as are thought fit to be publiſh'd with as great Approbation, as ever any Books come forth among them. And for the *Jeſuits Collection at* Antwerp, which I have ſometimes made uſe of, begun by *Bollandus*, and continued by *Henſchenius* and *Papebrochius*; it was publiſhed ſince *A. D.* 1642. and with as much Oſtentation of Care and Judgment, as ever any thing was ſet forth in that kind; the laſt Volume, I have yet ſeen, came forth *A. D.* 1668. with ſufficient Approbations. So that whatever judgment be paſſed upon the Miracles, they cannot deny the Books I have made uſe of to be of greateſt Authority, of any extant in this kind; and yet, after all, I am apt to think, they will meet with a great deal of Infidelity, from all that have not captivated their Underſtandings to the Obedience of the *Roman Faith*.

Pitſeus *de Scriptoribus Angliæ*, *A.D.* 1366.
Poſſevin *in Apparatu v.* Capgrav.
Harpsfield. §. 15.
Pit. *De ſcrip.* Ang. *A. D.* 1484.

Sect. 9. Having t[illegible]s far ſhewed how much the Miracles, boaſted of in the Roman Church, fall ſhort, in point of credibility, of thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, from the different Nature of the Teſtimonies, and of the Miracles themſelves; I now proceed to the ſecond Thing, viz. *To ſhew that the credibility of the Witneſſes, in the Roman Church, is taken away by the Teſtimony of Perſons much more credible than themſelves.* For if the moſt impartial Witneſſes utterly deny, that there is any Compariſon to be made, between the Miracles wrought in the Church in latter-Ages, with thoſe wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: If Perſons living in the Communion of that Church, have aſſerted ſuch Things concerning their Miracles, as ſufficiently diſcover, that their Teſtimony is not to be relied upon; then I appeal to the Judgment of any Man, whether it be not intolerable Impudence in any, to parallel the Miracles of that Church with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles?

Of the Teſtimonies of St. *Chryſoſt.* and St. *Auguſt.* againſt the Continuance of the Power of Miracles.

1. The moſt impartial Witneſſes have aſſerted the direct contrary to *E. W. viz.* by affirming, that no Compariſon is to be made between the Miracles of after-Ages of the Church, and thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. The moſt impartial Witneſſes, in this Caſe, muſt be Men of approved Sanctity on both Sides; Perſons of great Judgment and Experience,

perience, and that lived at ſuch a time when no Intereſt could byaſs them to favour one Side more than the other. And ſuch, in all reſpects, were St. *Chryſoſtom* and St. *Auguſtin*; to them, therefore, we appeal in this Matter.

Chryſoſt. *in 1 Ep. ad* Corinth. *Hon. 6. Tom. 3. ed.* Savil. *p.* 275, *&c.*

St. *Chryſoſtom*, not once or twice, but ſeveral times, and upon very different Occaſions, delivers his Opinion upon this Subject. In his Commentaries upon the firſt Epiſtle of St. *Paul*, to the *Corinthians*, and the five firſt Verſes, puts this Queſtion, Τίνος ἕνεκεν τὰ σημεῖα κεκώλυται νῦν; *For whoſe ſake is the Power of Miracles now forbidden?* Which he at large diſcuſſes in that place. The Subſtance of his Anſwer is this; "Either "the Perſons who put that Queſtion, do believe the Miracles wrought "by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, or they do not; if not, let them give an "Account how the Chriſtian Religion, which is ſo contrary to the pre- "ſent Intereſts of Men, ſhould prevail ſo much in the World, as it "hath done: For, if they believed, without Miracles, that would ap- "pear to be a far greater Miracle. But, *ſaith he*, becauſe no Miracles "are wrought now, make not that an Evidence, that none were wrought "then; for then it was uſeful there ſhould be Miracles, and now it is "uſeful there ſhould not. Can any Teſtimony be plainer and more expreſs than this? Is it poſſible he ſhould believe as great Miracles were done in the Church afterwards, as by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that not only aſſerts, that there were none; but ſaith, it would not be uſeful to the Church there ſhould be any? Becauſe, as he adds immediately after, "Thoſe who Preach now, do not Preach by Inſpiration, as the Apoſtles, "but only that Doctrine which they received from them: And there- "fore make uſe of their Miracles to confirm the Truth of what they "ſpake. But why, *ſaith he*, were Miracles uſeful then, and not now? "Becauſe the continual working of Miracles would leſſen Faith; and "our Saviour ſaith, *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and yet have be- "lieved.* But if thou wilt not be convinced, without Signs, thou may'ſt "ſee Signs, altho' not ſuch as Chriſt and his Apoſtles wrought, *viz.* The "Accompliſhment of Propheſies; *ſeveral of which he there mentions.* "Why then, *ſaith he*, do not all believe now? *To which he gives this Anſwer*, "That the firſt Chriſtians did not believe only on the Account "of the Miracles they ſaw, but by ſeeing the H[illegible]y and Exemplary "Lives of thoſe who wrought them: It is, *ſaith he*, therefore, the "want of the primitive Sanctity, rather than Miracles, which makes "Men yet continue in their Infidelity: Let thoſe that have a mind to "be ſaved ſearch the Scriptures, wherein they will find, both the Mi- "racles they wrought, and the Holy Converſations which they led. "But if a Man be found, that hath any foot-ſteps left of the ancient "Wiſdom, he preſently leaves the City and Converſation, and betakes "himſelf to the Mountains; a fair Pretence is made for this, to pre- "vent the deadning of Devotion; as tho' it were not better to be duller, "and to gain others, than remaining in a Mountain, to ſee round about "thee thy Brethren deſtroy'd. As he excellently ſpeaks, tho', I doubt, with little Satisfaction to the Monaſtick Pretenders to Perfection in the Roman Church.

Μὴ τοίνυν τὸ μὴ γίνεσθαι νῦν σημεῖα, τεκμήριον ποιοῦ τοῦ μὴ γεγενῆσθαι τότε· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τότε χρησίμως ἐγίνετο, καὶ νῦν χρησίμως οὐ γίνεται.

Chryſoſt. *in* 1 *ad* Tim. λόγ. [illegible]. *p.* 288. *De Sacerdot. l.* 4. *p.* 37.

Elſewhere, complaining of the degenerate Lives of Chriſtians; "From whence now, *ſaith he*, ſhall Chriſtians be perſua- "ded to believe? From Miracles? ἀλλ' οὐ γίνεται ταῦτα, but thoſe are not now "wrought. Who is there now a-days, *ſaith he*, *in another place*, to be "compared with St. *Paul*, who had ſuch a Divine Power going along "with him in his Preaching; who was terrible to Devils, if he only

“ appeared and ſaid nothing; but if all we were met together with a thou-
“ ſand Prayers and Tears, we could not do ſo much as St. *Paul*'s Handkerchief did. And is it poſſible to believe that St. *Chryſoſtom*, ever thought the Miracles of after Ages could be compared with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? No, he utterly blaſts the Teſtimony of ſuch who afterwards have pretended to Miracles, unleſs they can ſhew a plain reaſon why Miracles ſhould ceaſe in St. *Chryſoſtom*'s time, and be ſo common again afterwards. It is evident that the World was not ſo fully converted to Chriſtianity then, but there was as great occaſion for Miracles, as could be pretended in ſucceeding Ages; all the difference that I can find was, that Men were honeſter and wiſer then; but as the Chriſtian World degenerated from the Piety and Goodneſs of the primitive Times, it pretended to come nearer to the Age of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles in doing Wonders. To the ſame purpoſe with St. *Chryſoſtom*, ſpeaks the Author of the imperfect Work upon St. *Matthew*, who hath ſometimes gone under St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name: And herein differs not at all from him; for he ſaith, “ That formerly true Chriſtians were differenced from the falſe,
“ by the Miracles which they wrought; the falſe Chriſtians either not
“ being able to work any, or not ſuch as the true Chriſtians wrought;
“ but empty ſigns ſuch as cauſed admiration, but brought no benefit
“ with them. But now, *ſaith he*, this working of Miracles is wholly
“ taken away and only pretended to by falſe Chriſtians. Let *E. W.* and ſuch as he, conſider theſe words, and ſee who they are that pretend to Miracles ſince the primitive Days, *Carolus Scribanus*, who undertook to write of *Lipſius* his *Virgo Hallenſis*, thinks to eſcape this Temony by ſaying, *that this Author only denys ſuch kind of Miracles to continue ſtill as were in the Apoſtles times*, viz. *The ſpeaking and underſtanding Tongues*. But, *E. W.* makes no limitation at all; nay, he not only ſaith *the ſame*, but *greater Miracles have been done in the the Roman Church*; and it is apparent that theſe very Miracles have been pretended to in the Roman Church, as not only concerning St. *Vincentius Ferrerius*, but many others before him. We are told by ſome that *Ephræm Syrus* underſtood the Greek Tougue, by the Prayers of St. *Baſil*; but *Baronius* himſelf explodes it for a Fable, however it be ſtill believed by others. If *Capgrave*, and ſuch Writers may be credited, St. *David*, St. *Paternus*, St. *Thelia*us, all Preached at *Hieruſalem*, in their own Language, and the People underſtood them, as if they had ſpoken in theirs. Some ſuch Expoſition they had heard of the Apoſtles, ſpeaking in ſtrange Tongues on the Day of Pentecoſt; and becauſe theſe were at *Hieruſalem*, the ſame muſt be related of them. But methinks, they ſhould not have loſt the Gift they had of ſpeaking in the Languages, of the ſeveral Countries they paſſed through, which is likewiſe attributed to them; for if God gave them ſuch a miraculous Gift, only for the conveniency of Travelling, it ſeems hard they ſhould want it when they were to Preach at *Hieruſalem*. St. *Goodric*, ſpake *French* to a Monk on the Day of *Pentecoſt*, ſaith *Capgrave*, although he never underſtood that Language before; which is not very probable, in ſo great a Traveller as he repreſents him to be. But the greateſt Inſtance of this kind is, *E W*'s *admirable Saint*, St. *Vincentius Ferrerius*, of whom two ſtrange Miracles are related; one, that ſpeaking in one Tongue, he was underſtood by his Auditors of ſeveral Countries in their own Languages, another that although People were at never ſo great diſtance from him, (for they ſay, he had ſometimes 80000. Auditors) yet he was eaſily heard by them all.

Auctor imperfect. op. in Matth. *hom.* 49.

Nunc autem ſignorum operatio omnino levata eſt: magis autem & apud eos invenitur, qui falſi ſunt Chriſtiani fieri ficta.

Carol. Scribanii *Orthodox. Fidei Controv. l.* 4. *c.* 2.

David Roth. Elucid. *in* Jocelin. *p.* 120.

Baron. *A. D.* 370. *n.* 56.

Capgrave *vit. St. Thel. f.* 281.

Colgan. *vit. St.* David *n.* 20.

Capgrave. *vit. St.* Goodric *f.* 144.

Lud. *Bail. Bibliotheca Concionatorum. p.* 3. *c.* 65.

Raynald.

all. Had not this Man an admirable Voice, or the People admirable Ears! *Mariana* ſaith, this happened to none but him, from the Apoſtles Days. And yet *Ribadineira* relates the very ſame thing of St. *Anthony* of *Padua*; and that he was heard at two Miles diſtance; which is likewiſe affirmed by the Writer of his Life, Printed before his Works, and by *Hermanus Schidel*, *Sedulus* and others. Nay, *Ribadineira* tells, that St. *Ludgard* ſpeaking Dutch, was perfectly underſtood by ſome French Women, that underſtood only their own Language. It ſeems then this was not St. *Vincentius* his peculiar Gift, if it were his at all. I find that *Raynaldus*, and *Spondanus* appeal to the Teſtimony of *Necol. de Clemangis*, concerning this miraculous Gift: Who was Secretary to Pope *Benedict* the thirteenth, to whom St. *Vincentius*, had been Maſter of the Palace at *Avignon*. Of him *Clemangis* ſaith, *That it is not improbably believed that he had the Gift of Tongues:* He dares, not we ſee, abſolutely affirm it, although he heard him Preach at *Genoa*. But what Arguments doth he produce for it? One is, *That although he were a* Spaniard, *he ſpake* Italian *ſo readily and diſtinctly, that even the Women underſtood him.* And is it ſuch a Miracle for a *Spaniard* to ſpeak *Italian* well, that it ought to be compared with the Apoſtles Gift of Tongues? But the great Wonderment is yet behind, *viz. that though he ſpake* Italian *Words, yet all People of other Nations underſtood him:* And for this he only tells us, *He heard a* German *ſay ſome ſuch thing, and for his own part, although he did ſcarce half underſtand* Italian, *yet he perfectly underſtood what he ſaid.* Which is no ſuch great wonder, conſidering chiefly on the Subject of the Day of Judgment, which requiring the uſe of ſuch Words as are taken from the *Latin*, may eaſily be underſtood by a Perſon who thorowly underſtands *Latin*, though he be not perfect in *Italian*. The whole Credit therefore of this Miracle, depends upon the Teſtimony of this *German*; and who can tell how much he underſtood either of his Sermon or of the *Italian* Tongue? For he ſaith no more, *than that he underſtood him as well as if his words had been ſpoken in his own Tongue:* Which ſurely he might do without a Miracle, unleſs it were a Miracle for a *German* to underſtand *Italian*. But concerning this, and all the other ſuppoſed Miracles of *this admirable Saint*, we have a remarkable Teſtimony of one of the ableſt Men of that Age, (that knew *Vincentius*, and a Letter of his is Extant which he writ to him; wherein he expreſſes no ſuch admiration of him) and that is, the famous Chancellor of *Paris*, *John Gerſon*. He wrote a Diſcourſe *againſt the Sect of Whippers*, (which by the Preaching and encouragement of *Vincentius*, was again revived, and 10000 ſaith *Rauzanus* in his Life, followed him up and down, many of which did ſo ſoundly laſh themſelves, according to *Vincentius* his Inſtructions, that he ſaith, *ſome account it a Miracle that none fell into any Sickneſs by it.*). In which Diſcourſe he lays open the folly of this Sect, and ſaith, *Men might as well brand themſelves with hot Irons, or caſtrate themſelves, as hope to expiate their Sins by ſuch bloody Whippings of their Bodies.* But beſides this, *Vincentius* Preached of the very near approach of Antichriſt, and the Day of Judgment, both which *Gerſon* diſlikes in him; but, *ſaith he,* "If "any Man offers to bring new Miracles, to confirm the near approach "of Antichriſt, let him know that the World is in its dotage, and there"fore is as eaſily impoſed upon by the Apparitions of falſe Miracles as "an old Man is troubled with Dreams in his Sleep; therefore, *ſaith* "*he*, Miracles are now to be vehemently ſuſpected unleſs a very deligent

*A.D.*1414 *n.* 20. Mariana *de rebus Hiſp.l.*19. *c.* 12. Ribadineira *Flos Sectorum* 13. Junii *Vita St.* Antonii *c.* 15. 17. *ed. de la Haye* 1641. *Scheidel.* 6. *at mundiet* Seduli. *tract.de Sanctis Or.* Ribaden 16. Junii 114. *St.* Antonin. *Chron. Ton.* 3. *tit.* 24. *Sect.* 2. Spondan. *A.D.*1403 *n.* 7.Nicol de Clemangis*op.* 113.

Rauzan. *vit. St.* Vincentii *apud*Bzov. *A.D.*1419 *Sect.* 20. *apud Surirum* 5. Aprilis.

Joh. Greſon *c. Sectam ſe flagellantium Tom.* 1. *p.* 641.

gent Examination he firſt made of them. See now what Judgment this truly great Man in that Age, paſſes upon theſe pretended Miracles of *this admirable Saint!* However, it hence appears that in the Church of *Rome*, they have not pretended to any one ſort of Miracles alone; but let them be of what kind ſoever, ſome among them (ſetting only aſide their own Reſurrection from the Dead) have challenged to themſelves the Glory of them. But after all, this is a miſerable ſhift to avoid this Teſtimony; for this Author makes no other difference of Signs; than, "That the Miracles of falſe Chriſtians were only in ap-"perance, and brought no advantage to the World; whereas the Mi-"cles of the true Chriſtians were real and beneficial to the World; but "now, *ſaith he*, this working of Miracles is wholly taken away: And "only falſe Chriſtians pretended to it. Which Teſtimony is ſo ſtrong, that I expect no other anſwer to it, than calling the Author of it Heretick and Arrian.

Chryſoſt. *in* Babylas λόγ. β.

But againſt St. *Chryſoſtom*, he objects more plauſibly, *viz. from the daily Wonders which he confeſſes are wrought by the Martyrs: And particularly by* Babylas, *when the Devil told* Julian *his Mouth was ſtopt at the Oracle at* Daphne, *ſince* Babylas *his Bones were laid there.* It is not to be denied, that St. *Chryſoſtom* did look upon this as a wonderful thing; and ſaith afterwards, "That the Devils ſtill expreſſed ſuch Conſternation "at the Shrines of the Martyrs, as might convince the impudence of ſuch who diſbelieved the Miracles of the Apoſtles. But St. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaking of theſe extraordinary things, which were done by the Martyrs, calls them, θαύματα and not σημεῖα as he does the other; for he ſaith expreſly, *that the* σημεῖα *were ceaſed*, i. e. all ſuch Miracles as gave any Teſtimony to the infallible Commiſſion, which Perſons had from God to deliver his Doctrine; but yet there were many θαύματα *ſtill done by the Martyrs*, i. e. ſuch extraordinary things which we ſuppoſe God would not permit to happen, if theſe Martyrs had not been highly in favour with God; and therefore theſe were only atteſtations of their Sanctity, in a time when they were ſo much deſpiſed as they were by *Julian* and his Followers, and when Paganiſm began to recover again; and it was very agreeable, with the Wiſdom and Methods of Divine Providence, in an extraordinary manner to vindicate the Innocency of the Martyrs; as he did in the caſe of *Babylas* to *Julian* himſelf, by ſtopping the Oracle by the nearneſs of his Bones to the *Temple* of *Daphne*; and when they were removed, by ſetting the Temple on Fire, in ſo wonderful a manner as is at large related by St. *Chryſoſtom*, and the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians of that time.

Auguſt. *de verâ Relig. c.* 25.

The ſame Account we are to give of St. *Auguſtin's* Opinion in this matter. In his *Book of true Religion*, having ſhewed how neceſſary Miracles were to confirm the Authority, of thoſe who were ſent by God to declare his Will, he adds, "That by their working Miracles they "are become unneceſſary to us now: *For, ſaith he*, ſince the Catholick "Church is now eſtabliſhed and diffuſed through the World, Miracles "are not ſuffered to continue to our Times; that we may not always "ſeek after viſible things, and leſt Cuſtom ſhould abate the eſteem of "them. Much to the ſame purpoſe he Diſcourſes in his *Book of the Uſefulneſs of Believing* againſt the *Manichees*; where he ſhews, "the ne-"ceſſity that there was of Miracles to confirm the Chriſtian Faith at "firſt, and the nature of the Miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Apo-"ſtles, and then puts the Queſtion as St. *Chryſoſtom* did, *Cur, inquis,*

De utilit. cred. c. 15, 16.

“ *iſta modo non fiunt?* Why are not ſuch Miracles wrought now? To which he anſwers, “ becauſe Miracles would not move Men, if there “ were not ſomething wonderful in them; and there would be nothing “ wonderful if they were common. It is true that St. *Auguſtin*, did Retract. l. 1. c. 13. conſider both theſe places in his *Book* of *Retractions*, (not as though he Recanted every thing which he handles there, for *Retractare* in St. *Auguſtin's* Senſe was no more than to *review*) for mentioning the former ſaying; he adds, *that it is true*; *for*, ſaith he, “ the miraculous Gifts “ of Tongues are not now poured out, when Hands are laid on the “ Baptized; nor are ſick Perſons healed at the Shadow of the Preachers “ of Chriſt; and many other ſuch things, which it is certain are now “ ceaſed. But he would not have it ſo underſtood, as though *no Miracles at all were then wrought in the Name of Chriſt*; *for then*, he ſaith, “ he knew that a blind Man was healed at the Shrines of the Martyrs “ of *Milan*; and ſo many other ſuch things were done, that they could “ neither know them all, nor enumerate thoſe he did know. And to Ib. c. 14. the other place, *he ſaith*, “ that he gave that Anſwer, becauſe neither “ ſo many nor ſo great Miracles are wrought now as were by Chriſt “ or his Apoſtles. And can any ſayings, be more contradictory than this of St. *Auguſtin's*, and *E. W's*. aſſerting, *that as many and as great* (nay *greater*) *Miracles are wrought ſince, as ever were in their Days*. It is true that St. *Auguſtin* doth there ſay, *that there were ſome Miracles ſtill left in the Church*, and he produces ſeveral Inſtances elſewhere; but in De Civit. Dei l. 22. c. 8. the ſame place he denies the *neceſſity of theſe Miracles, ſince the large propagation of Chriſtianity in the World, and accounts him a Prodigy that yet ſeeks after Prodigies to confirm his Faith.* Only he ſhews God's extraordinary kindneſs to his Church in that time, (while there were ſo many Pagans yet left among them;) that he did not leave them without ſome Teſtimonies of his miraculous Power, in *the cure of Diſeaſes at the Memories Martyrs*, or *upon the Prayers of the faithful*, of which In Pſal. 130. v. 1. he there gives ſeveral Examples: But elſewere he ſhews, *That the Miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, were wrought for the benefit and ſatisfaction of future Ages, as well as their own, that ſo none might complain for want of a power of Miracles*. And when the *Donatiſts* afterwards appealed to the De unit. Eccleſ. c. 16. Miracles wrought by *Donatus* and *Pontius*, and to *Viſions* and *Revelations*; St. *Auguſtin* very ſmartly bids them, “ lay aſide thoſe feigned Miracles “ or Diabolical Impoſtures; For either they were not true, or if they “ were, we have ſo much the more reaſon to beware of them; becauſe “ our Saviour hath foretold, *That falſe Prophets, ſhould ariſe working Signs and Wonders, that if it were poſſible they ſhould deceive the very Elect.* But it may be ſaid, “ That in all this St. *Auguſtin*, doth only upbirad “ Schiſmatical Donatiſts with lying Miracles, and not take away the “ evidence of Miracles to prove the true Church; *to that St.* Auguſtin “ *himſelf anſwers*, that the Catholicks don't bring the evidence of Miracles to prove the true Church by, nor yet of Viſions and Revelations; for, *ſaith he*, all ſuch things are to be approved, becauſe they “ are done in the Catholick Church; and not that the Church is prov'd “ to be Catholick, becauſe ſuch things are done in it: And therefore ſaith, *that Controverſie of the Church muſt be ended by the Scriptures*. From whence it neceſſarily follows, that St. *Auguſtin*, could never think the Miracles done in his time, were to be compared with thoſe wrought by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, or could give equal evidence of Credibility, either concerning the Doctrine, or the Church which delivered it. Never did Two Men more plainly contradict each other in this Point than St. *Auguſtin* and *E. W.* who appeals to Miracles for Proof of the Catholick and Infallible Church, and ſuch as are equal to thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; but whether St. *Auguſtin* or *E. W.* deſerve the greater Credit, that is another Controverſy, which I am not now at leiſure to engage. To the ſame Purpoſe St. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks in another place, *viz.* "That Miracles are no Proof of the true Church, "for tho' *Pontius* and *Donatus* might do Wonders and ſee Viſions, yet "Chriſt hath now forewarn'd us, *Quia & miraculis decipi non debemus*, "We ought not now to be deceiv'd by Miracles. The force of which Argument from our Saviour's Caution depends upon this, *viz.* That the Chriſtian Religion being once eſtabliſh'd by plain and evident Miracles, there would be no Neceſſity in After-Ages to have recourſe to Miracles again; for if no new Doctrine be deliver'd, what need can there be of new Miracles? "Let no Man therefore now complain, ſaith the ſame "St. *Auguſtin*, becauſe Chriſt doth not work the ſame Miracles now "that he did in former Times; for he hath ſaid, *Bleſſed are they which "have not ſeen and yet have believ'd.* Whom doth he mean, ſaith he, but "us, and thoſe who are to come after us? But thoſe Miracles were "wrought by Chriſt to draw Men to Faith, and this Faith is now ſpread "over the World; and now altho' he does not work the ſame Cures, "he does greater; now the blind Eyes do not receive Sight by a Mi-"racle of Chriſt, but the blind Hearts do ſee by the Doctrine of Chriſt; "now dead Bodies are not rais'd, but Souls that are dead in living Bo-"dies do riſe again; now deaf Ears are not open'd, but deaf Minds are "by the Power of God's Word; ſo that they believe, and live well, who "were Unbelievers, and wicked and diſobedient. Could any Man of common Senſe have us'd theſe Expreſſions if he had thought there was either any Neceſſity of Miracles being wrought in his Time, or that there were ſuch Miracles then wrought which might be compar'd with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? And as he elſewhere fully ſpeaks to this Purpoſe: "Signs and Miracles were wrought by the Apoſtles to "bring Men from Infidelity to Faith, that Men ſeeing thoſe Things "done which are impoſſible with Men, may acknowledge that the "Preaching is from God, by which Power they were to prove that "there was reaſon to believe. Among Believers then Signs and Mira-"cles are not neceſſary, but only a firm Hope.

Tract. 14 *in* Joh. c. 3.

De verbis Dom. Serm. 18.

Quæſt. Novo Teſtam. c. 63.

From theſe Teſtimonies of St. *Auguſtin* thus laid together we obſerve theſe things. 1. That the main Intention of Miracles was to convince Unbelievers. 2. That the Chriſtian Faith being eſtabliſh'd, there was no longer any Neceſſity of the Power of Miracles. 3. That tho' there were not any ſuch Neceſſity, yet God out of his abundant Kindneſs was pleas'd to do ſome extraordinary Things among them in their Time. 4. That in Diſputes about the true Church they never appeal-ed to the Power of Miracles, but to the Scriptures, whoſe Doctrine was already confirm'd by Miracles. 5. That thoſe out of the true Church might make as great a Pretence to Miracles, Viſions and Revelations as thoſe who were in it, as appears by the Donatiſts. 6. That ſome kind of Miracles were wholly ceas'd then in the Church, as the Gift of Tongues, and the common miraculous Cures of Diſeaſes by thoſe that preach'd. 7. That thoſe which did then remain were not in any reſpect for Number or Quality to be compar'd with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apo-ſtles, as the Cure of the blind Man at *Milan*, or thoſe other Cures of a

Cancer, a *Fiſtula*, or the Two ſhaking Perſons in *Africa*; for when himſelf ſpeaks moſt favourably of the Miracles then wrought, he ſaith they were not ſo great nor ſo many as thoſe done by Chriſt or his Apoſtles.

Of the Teſtimonies of their own Writers againſt the miracles of the Roman Church.

Sect. 10. But what ſhall we now ſay to the ſucceeding Ages of the Church? For after the firſt 600 Years were paſs'd, and there were no more St. *Chryſoſtoms*, or St. *Auguſtins*, and one of *the greateſt Prodigies*, (as *Tully* ſaid of old) *was a wiſe Man*, the Pretence of the common working of Miracles was again ſtarted by thoſe who undertook to give an Account of the *Lives* of the *Saints*; for they thought they ſaid nothing in effect of them if they did not attribute the Power of Miracles upon any Occaſion to them. Then St. *Gregory* and St. *Bede* ſhew'd the way to the reſt, and by their own Credulity and want of Judgment gave a Pattern and Encouragement to all the Monkiſh Tales and Impoſtures afterwards. But we muſt acknowledge our Obligation to ſome more ingenuous and judicious Men in the Roman Church, who in ſeveral Ages have blaſted the Credit, and diſcover'd the Impoſtures of theſe *Legendary* Writers, which is the next thing I am to prove, *viz.*

Lud. Vives de Trad. Diſcipl. l. 5.

2. *That the Credibility of their Miracles in the Church of* Rome *is deſtroy'd by the Teſtimony of their own more judicious Writers. Ludovicus Vives*, after he hath diſcours'd of all other Hiſtories, comes to that of the Church, and particularly the *Lives of the Saints*, of which he ſaith, “That they are generally corrupted with abundance of Lies, while the Writer indulges his own Paſſion, and ſets down not what the Saints did, but what he would have had them done, ſo that in their Lives we ſee the Mind of the Writer, and not the Truth; for there have been thoſe who thought it a piece of Piety to tell Lies for Religion, which is a very dangerous thing, leſt by that means the true be rejected for the ſake of the falſe.

Melch. Can. loc. Theol. l. 11. *c.* 6.

This Saying of *Vives Melchior Canus*, a Man highly eſteem'd in the Church of *Rome*, recites and approves, with a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe, wherein he ſaith, “That the Lives of the Philoſophers are more ſeverely written by *Laertius* than the Lives of the Saints by Chriſtians, and that *Suetonius* hath with more Honeſty and Integrity deliver'd the Acts of the *Cæſars* than the Catholicks have done the Acts of Martyrs, Virgins and Confeſſors. And afterwards he charges them with wilful falſifying, either only to deceive or to gain by it, of which the one is ſordid, and the other pernicious. And he produces ſome Inſtances of ſuch Miracles, which he ſaith *are without Number*. Neither doth he only underſtand this of ſuch Men as the *Author of the Golden Legend*, or of the *Speculum Exemplorum*, but he plainly confeſſes, “That their moſt grave Writers in reporting the Miracles of Saints, have follow'd uncertain Reports, and convey'd them to Poſterity, in which they either gave great Liberty to themſelves or yielded too much to the Deſires of the People, whom they found not only ready to believe theſe Miracles, but to be fond and greedy of them; therefore, ſaith he, they have reported ſome Signs and Miracles, not that they did willingly believe them themſelves, but becauſe they would not be wanting to the pious Deſire of the People, which was, it ſeems, that they ſhould tell Lies to pleaſe them; and if they had not their Deſires fully anſwer'd in this, they were very inſatiable. After this he particularly inſtances in *Bede* and *Gregory*, the one of which in his Hiſtory, the other in his Dialogues, he charges with relating Miracles upon common Reports, which the Criticks of this

Age will judge to be uncertain; and we may be ſure *Canus*, who tells us what an excellent Wit his Maſter *Victoria* ſaid he had, was one of them. But is now the Credibility of the Miracles in the *Roman* Church to be compar'd with that of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? Did they who writ the Miracles recorded of them, indulge their own Affections, and make Tales to pleaſe the People, as we ſee *Canus* ſaith their graveſt Writers of Miracles did? Or did they take up Things upon common Rumours, and from thence divulge them to Poſterity, as we ſee *Canus* charges even St. *Gregory* and St. *Bede* with doing? What would become of our Chriſtianity if we had no better Grounds to believe the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? If any ſhould ſay ſo of the Reporters of their Miracles, they would be juſtly charg'd with betraying the Doctrine of Chriſtianity, and making it ſuſpected to be a Fourb, an Impoſtor, a fabulous Story, as *E. W.* ſpeaks in the Caſe of the Miracles related by St. *Antonin*. And yet *Melchior Canus* expreſly ſaith of him, "That he did not make it his Buſineſs to write what was true and certain, but to let nothing paſs that he could meet with; and that he and *Vincentius Belovacenſis* were ſo far from weighing what they writ in an exact Ballance, that they did not ſo much as make uſe of a common Judgment. Whereas our critical *E. W.* ſaith, "And who dares ſay that ſo great a Doctor and moſt modeſt Prelate as St. *Antonin* was ſo frontleſs as to write that we read without Aſſurance and Certainty? We ſee *Melchior Canus* dares ſay it, and that not only of St. *Antonin*, whom he looks on as far inferior to the other, but of his *venerable Bede* too, whom *E. W.* calls a great Scholar, and a Man highly eſteem'd the whole Chriſtian World over. I ſhall not go about to diminiſh his Reputation in other Things, but he had need of a good eaſy Faith that can ſwallow the Miracles related by him, whether thoſe of St. *Cuthbert*, which *E. W.* mentions, or others. What muſt we think of the Angel's appearing to S. *Cuthbert* a Horſeback when he was a Boy, and preſcribing him a Poulteſs to cure his ſore Knee, and of his ſeeing the Gates of Heaven open'd, and the Soul of St. *Aidan* convey'd thro' them by a Troop of Angels? Of his receiving Three hot Loaves from an Angel that were whiter than Lillies, and ſmelt beyond Roſes, and taſted ſweeter than Honey? Of his frighting the Crows from ſtealing the Thatch off from the Convent, and the Penance they ſubmitted to for the Injury they had done, and the Satisfaction they made by bringing him a good piece of Lard, with which he us'd afterwards to greaſe his Boots? Of the Vertue of his Shooes in curing a Man of a Palſy after St. *Cuthbert*'s Death, being put on upon his Feet? Of theſe I ſhall only aſk *E. W*'s Queſtion, *Are any ſuch ſeen now a days wrought among Proteſtant Biſhops? No, God knows their Faith is a Stranger to ſuch kind of Miracles.*

Loc. Theolog. l. 12. *proœm.*

Reaſon and Religion *Diſc.* 2. *c.* 8. *n.* 6.

S. Cuthberti vita Auctore Beda Tom. 3. & *apud Colg.* 20. Martii & *Bolland.* 3. *Tom.* Martii. C. 2. C. 4. C. 7. C. 20. C. 45.

But what ſhall we ſay to *Canus*, who takes away the Authority of St. *Gregory* too as well as *Bede* in this Matter of Miracles? I know *Baronius* falls very foul upon *Canus* for ſpeaking ſo freely of St. *Gregory* in this Particular, eſpecially becauſe he doth not mention thoſe Miracles which he looks on as undeſerving Credit; but I think he ought to have thank'd him for his Modeſty and Silence herein, in not expoſing *Gregory*'s Credulity to Contempt by inſiſting upon them. But in truth St. *Gregory* in thoſe Books of Dialogues, (for I ſee no Reaſon to deny them to be his own) was the Father of Legends, and moſt of the others afterwards were made in Imitation of his, as might be particularly made appear by many Inſtances; and *Bede* follow'd the Copy which

Baron. not. in Martyr. Decemb. 23.

which *Gregory* had ſet him; and from hence ſuch a ſwarm of *Legends*
aroſe, that in the ſucceeding Ages, it is hard to ſay, whether there
were more Ignorance or Wonders. To give only a taſt of ſome of the
Greg. Dialog. l. 1. Miracles reported by *Gregory*; the firſt is of “*Honoratus* the Abbot,
c. 1. “that ſtopt a great Stone in the middle of its falling from a great Mountain,
“by making the Sign of the Croſs towards it, and there it is ſeen
“hanging as it were in the Air. But in my opinion St. *Dunſtan* outdid
Capgr. f. “him, who not only, ſaith *Capgrave*, ſtopt a piece of Timber ſo
92. 1. “falling, but with the Sign of the Croſs made it, return back to the
“place from whence it fell. This was the greater Miracle although
the other had more to ſhew for it; if the Stone had hung quite in the
Air; which I confeſs, I do a little queſtion. “*Libertinus* raiſed one
“from the Dead by *Honoratus*, his Shooe being laid upon his Breaſt,
Greg. l. 1. “ſaith *Gregory*, as St. *Cuthbert's* Shooes in *Bede*, cured a Man of the
c. 2. “Palſie. The Gardener of the Monaſtery, being troubled with a Thief
c. 3. “that came over the Hedge, and ſtole his Herbs, commanded a Serpent
“to follow him, and to lie juſt croſs in the way he was wont to
“come over; the Serpent preſently obeyed, the Thief was taken and
“the Serpent releaſed. From hence afterwards, he ſcarce Deſerved the
Name of a Saint of whom they could not tell ſome extravagant Stories,
of the Power he had over Serpents: Of which multitudes of Inſtances,
may be ſeen in *Colganus*, and *Capgrave*, beſides many other
more ancient than than the Story of St. *Equitius* in *Gregory*, and St. *Elias*
in *Capgrave*. “*As* to the way of their being delivered from all luſtful
C. 4. “Thoughts, by an Angel appearing in the Night and ſeeming to caſtrate
“them, is the very ſame: By which we ſee out of what Magazine
the later *Legendaries* took their Materials, which they altered and
adorned with ſuch varieties of Circumſtances as would beſt go down
with the People. Methinks then *Baronius*, might have let alone *Canus*
in this matter, and not provoked others to give an account of the foppiſh
Ib. Miracles contained in that *Primitive Legend*, ſuch as, “The Devils
“entering into a Nun, becauſe ſhe eat a Lettice in the Garden
“without croſſing it; and when St. *Equitius* demanded of him what
“he did there, the Devil anſwered, he was ſitting upon the Lettice
“and ſhe came and eat him up; but it was well for her that St. *Equitius*
ſent him going, without preſcribing her a Vomit? As, *Nonnoſus his*
C. 7. *removing a Stone by his Prayers, which fifty Yoke of Oxen could not ſtirr,*
Ib. and all this for no other end, but only *to make way for a little Kitchin-Garden
for the Monks*: As, *the ſame Man's Praying the pieces of a Glaſs
Lamp whole again, only for fear of the diſpleaſure of his Superior:* Which
Ib. was a ſubſtantial reaſon for ſo pretty a Miracle. “And his multiplying
“Oyl by a Miracle, rather than the lazy Monks ſhould go out to
C. 9. “gather Olives: *As, Boniface's* receiving 12 Crowns by a Miracle, becauſe
“his Nephew complained he had opened his Cheſt, and had taken
“away ſo many from him to give to the Poor; and his adjuring all
“the *Eruc's* in his Garden, in the Name of Chriſt to be gone and not
“eat up his Herbs, which they immediately did, and not one remained:
“And making the Fox by his Prayers bring back the Pullet he had
“ſtollen, becauſe he complained to God Almighty in the Church,
“(*whither he ran upon this ſad diſaſter*) that he could eat none of his
“Mothers Poultry: As, *Martirius* his ſigning the Cake in the Embers
C. 11. “with the Sign of the Croſs, without touching it; only making it
“towards the Fire, at which it gave a crack and was perfectly Signed

"with the Croſs, when they took it out. Theſe may ſerve only for a taſte of the kind of theſe Miracles, out of his *firſt Book*, that Men may judge with what reaſon *Canus* made ſuch Exceptions to *Gregory's* Authority, in this point of Miracles. It would be too tedious to give an Account of the Miracles, in his three other Books; but they are ſo much alike, that by ſeeing theſe, we may judge of the reſt.

Thus we ſee the Opinion of *Vives* and *Canus*, about the Teſtimony on which Miracles are believed in the Roman Church; but we muſt not think theſe Perſons were ſingular in this Opinion; for in ſeveral Ages, Men of any Honeſty and Judgment, have complained of the *pious Frauds* which have been uſed in theſe Matters: And that ſome thought them lawful to be uſed, as long as they were for the Honour of the Church, or the Saints. So *Petrus Damiani* ſaith, *There were ſome who thought they honoured God, by making Lies, to extol the Virtues of his Saints*; which Words he uſes upon this Occaſion of Miracles; and goes about ſeriouſly to confute them, by telling them, *that God doth not ſtand in need of our Lies*: And to the ſame purpoſe he ſpeaks, in the Preface to the Lives of St. *Maurus* and St. *Dominicus Ferratus*, written by him. What Security can there be then, of the Miracles reported by them *who think it lawful to invent Lies for the Honour of the Church, or of the ſuppoſed Saints who live and die in it?* If the Primitive Church had made lying, for the ſake of Chriſtianity, lawful, it would have been the moſt reaſonable Pretence, for Infidelity, that could be ſuppoſed. For how can any Man think himſelf obliged to believe another, that doth not think himſelf oblig'd to ſpeak truth? If the Primitive Chriſtians had made lying an indifferent Thing, all their Sufferings could have given no Security of the Truth of their Teſtimony; for, notwithſtanding the Falſhood of their Teſtimony, they might then hope, however, to be rewarded in another World, and conſequently might ſuffer any thing here; but when they declared, at the ſame time, That lying was utterly unlawful, and yet ventur'd to ſuffer the utmoſt Extremity to atteſt the Truth of their Teſtimony; this gives the higheſt Credibility to the Things aſſerted by them. But we have no Satisfaction, as to either of theſe Things, in the Witneſſes of the Miracles in the Roman Church: No Man hath ever loſt ſo much as a Finger, to give Teſtimony to one Miracle among them; and ſuppoſing they ſhould ſuffer, we have no aſſurance but they might think it lawful to lie for their Religion; and, therefore, all their Sufferings could not prove the Truth of their Teſtimony. We have no Sentence, or Declaration, of their Church, againſt *pious Frauds*; but we have large Confeſſions, from their own Writers, of the practice of them, and the good End they are deſign'd for, *viz.* to keep up the Devotion of the People. *John Gerſon* honeſtly confeſſes "this to be the End of the Legends and Miracles of the Saints, "and their Viſions and Revelations ſo much talk'd of in the Roman "Church, *viz.* To ſtir up the Piety and good Affections of the People: "For theſe Things, *ſaith he*, are not propoſed by the Church, to be "believed as true; but they are rather to conſider them as Things "that might be done, than as Things that were done. And it is no "matter, *ſaith he*, if ſome Things that are really falſe, are piouſly be"lieved; ſo that they be not believed as falſe, or known to be falſe at "the ſame time. And I wiſh he had added one Condition more, *viz.* That the Infallibility of the Church be not to be proved by them; for, in that Caſe, I hope it is of ſome little Concernment, whether they

Pet. Damiani *vit. St.* Romuald. *prolog.*

John. Gerſon declar. veritatum *Tom. 1. p.* 415.

be true or falſe. But are we not like to meet with credible Teſtimonies in ſuch Things, where the moſt honeſt and learned among them think it is no great matter, *whether they be true or falſe?* No wonder then, that *Lyra* complains *of the Frauds uſed by the Prieſts in the Churches, to make the People believe that Miracles were wrought*; no wonder, that *Cajetan* ſo much ſlights the Argument drawn from *modern Miracles and Revelations*, and ſaith, *It is only fit for old Women.* Could any Man have done this, that had believed them to be any other than *Cheats and Impoſtures?* Eſpecially in ſo ſolemn a Matter, as the immaculate Conception, and in a Diſcourſe addreſſed to *Leo* X. and prepared for the *Lateran Council.* By which we ſee, that the learned and wiſe Men among themſelves, when they are put to declare their Minds, ſpeak as freely of theſe Matters, as we can do; but ſtill they think it fit, the common People ſhould be cheated and deceived by them; ſo a learned and ingenuous Writer of the *French Church*, and *Doctor* of the *Sorbon*, tells us, “That he was ſo far from receiving Thanks from many, for laying open the Fables and Impoſtures of the Monks, that they referred him to *Polybius* his Judgment about theſe Matters; who determines, That allowance ought to be given to thoſe Writers who invent Miracles and Stories to keep up the Devotion of the People. The occaſion of *Polybius* delivering this Judgment of his, was this; It ſeems the Heathen Prieſts made almoſt as many, and as fooliſh Stories of Miracles about their Images, as they are wont to do in the Church of *Rome*; among the reſt, it was verily believed among the *Bargelietæ*, that the Image of *Diana*, being expoſed to the Air, could receive no Injury, either by Snow or Rain; and the ſame was believed of the Image of *Veſta* among the *Jaſſians*: And theſe Miracles were written by their Hiſtorians. But *Polybius* declares his great Oppoſition to theſe Follies; ſuch, ſaith he, as the Miracle *Theopompus* relates of *Jupiter's* Temple in *Arcadia*, that the Bodies of thoſe who are in it, never caſt any Shadows. Yet he yields, “that ſomething of this Nature muſt be done, to keep up the Devotion of the People; but he would have it within Bounds; altho', *he ſaith*, it be very hard to determine thoſe Bounds. “Now, *ſaith* Launoy, this Saying of *Polybius* I have been often told of, by all ſorts of Men; who pretended hereby to ſecure Chriſtian Piety, but I found them worſe than *Polybius*; for he would have Bounds ſet, but theſe will allow none: For they judge of all Things by the Abſoluteneſs of God's Power; and regard not whether the Things were done or no, as long as they might be done. But, as he excellently adds; “A falſe Religion indeed, according to *Polybius*, ſtands in need of ſuch Cheats and Tricks to ſupport it; but true Religion wants no ſuch Helps; the more ſimple, pure, and innocent it is, it is ſo much the greater and more glorious; it is corrupted, when it hath any thing unlike it ſelf mixed with it. They who think otherwiſe of Chriſtian Religion, do not know it; but deſign to make a Religion out of Truth and Falſhood. Thus far that ingenuous Man. By whom we ſee, what the Opinion is, which the more ſagacious Perſons, in the Roman Church, have of theſe *Monkiſh Tales and Impoſtures*; yet they generally are for keeping them up in as much Credit, with the People, as they can; and diſcountenance thoſe who go about to undeceive them. But is not the Teſtimony of theſe things, by their own Confeſſion, very credible the mean while, and fit to be compared with the Teſtimony upon which the Miracles of Chriſt

Lyra *in c.* 14. Dan.

Cajetan. *opuſc. tract.* 10. *de Concept.* B. V. *ad* Leon. 10. *c.* 5.

Joh. Launoy *de curâ Eccleſ. pro venerat. ſſ. Art.* 30. *Coroll.* 1. Polyb. *Hiſtor. l.* 16. *p.* 732. *Ed. Caſaub.*

and his Apoſtles is receiv'd in the Chriſtian Church? It is hard to think that ſuch Men do believe Chriſtianity in their Hearts, that dare publiſh ſuch impudent Compariſons. When the Impoſtures of this Nature, in the Church of *Rome*, have been, like *Aſtrology* in Old *Rome*, always complain'd of, and always practiſ'd; as will eaſily appear to any one that will peruſe the Teſtimonies brought by *Launoy*, in that Diſcourſe concerning counterfeit *Saints*, *Relicks* and *Miracles*, which I ſhall not tranſcribe. The whole Chriſtian World is oblig'd to the Ingenuity of ſuch Men, who have taken Pains in the Diſcovery and Confutation of ſuch Impoſtures, as the Monks have abuſed the People with.

But we are not only beholding to ſuch learned Men who have purpoſely done this, but to thoſe who have lately publiſh'd ſuch Writings of the *middle Ages*; whereby we underſtand their Hiſtory far better than we could do before. As for inſtance to our preſent purpoſe: Among other very uſeful Things, publiſh'd by *Lucas D'achery*, we have the Works of *Guibert*, Abbot of *Nogent* in *France*, who liv'd in the beginning of the 12th Century, a time brim full of Miracles and Superſtition. In his Works we have a Diſcourſe of the *Relicks of the Saints*, which was occaſion'd by a Pretence the *Monks* of St. *Medard* made to a *Tooth of our Saviour*, wherein he begins *with a complaint of the Diſhonour which is put upon the Saints, by the falſe Stories which are made of them*, and then proceeds to *the falſe Saints* which were worſhipp'd by them; as, *St.* Piron, *whom, upon Enquiry, he found to have fallen drunk into a Well, and ſo dy'd; yet this Man was worſhipp'd*, he ſaith, *both in* Britain, *and in* France: And, after telling ſome ridiculous Miracles, which he was willing however to believe to be true, he falls upon the falſe and counterfeit ones; *of which*, he ſaith, *that they who aſcribe to God that which he never thought to do, as much as in them lies make God a Lyar:* And he produces this Inſtance of his own knowledge; "A "certain Boy, that belong'd to a Soldier, happen'd to dye upon Good-"Friday; the People were ready to attribute great Sanctity to him, "for dying upon that Day; and of a ſudden, great reſort was made "to his Tomb, and many Oblations were made, and Wax-Candles "offered, and his Tomb compaſſed about with great Devotion, the "People coming out of *Britain* to it. The Abbot and Monks ſeeing "the People make ſuch reſort thither, were willing to have it be-"liev'd that Miracles were wrought there. And preſently ſome of "the People feign'd themſelves Deaf, others Mad, and others Lame, "to bring greater Credit by their Cures to the young Saint; that was but newly ſet up, and *the good Abbot gave Encouragement to them.* But *Guibert* deteſts his *Nebulonity* for it, as he calls it, a Word, tho' hardly to be met with elſewhere, yet very fitly expreſſes ſuch horrible cheating and deluding the People. Another Inſtance he gives immediately after, done in his preſence, *viz.* "A Preacher, in a famous Church, "had a mind to draw Cuſtom to it; and finding it neceſſary to tell "them what excellent Relicks they had, produces a Box, and ſhews "it to the People; and tells them they were to underſtand, that with-"in that Box was kept a piece of the Bread which Chriſt himſelf did "eat; and if you do not believe this, behold a very learned Perſon "among you, pointing to *Guibert*, will bear witneſs, if it were need-"ful, to the Truth of what I ſay. *Guibert* ſaith, "He bluſhed at the "Man's Impudence, and had a good mind to have contradicted him; "but he ſtood too much in awe of the Perſons about him, who were his

Guibert Abbas *de Pignoribus Sanctorum l.* 1. *c.* 1.

C. 2. §. 5.

Sect. 6.

"his abettors in ſo advantagious a Lie to them. *But he ſaith*, neither Monks, nor Clergy Men did abſtain from this baſe way of bringing gain to their Churches, *viz.* by abominably cheating and abuſing the People. I hardly think any of the Frauds of the Heathen Prieſts, in their Temples and Oracles at *Delphi*, *Dodona* and other places could exceed theſe.

Cap. 3. *Sect.* 1.

Afterwards, he ſaith, "That the Acts of ſeveral of their Saints were taken out of old Womens Tales and Songs; and ſome things were written of them which were not fit for Plowmen to hear. And when they make their Saints to be of great Antiquity, yet they deſire new Lives to be written of them. Which he confeſſes was a requeſt often made to himſelf; but, *ſaith he*, I am apt to be deceived in the things I ſee, what truth then could I write of the things which no Man ever ſaw? If I ſhould yield to ſuch a requeſt, both I that write or Preach ſuch things, and they who deſire them, ought to be branded with publick Infamy. But ſuppoſing the Saints to be true, yet they make Lies about their Relicks: ſo *John Baptiſt's* Head is ſaid to be in two ſeveral places; and what can be more ridiculous than to make the Baptiſt have two Heads? One or other muſt cheat and deceive the People. His own Predeceſſor, St. *Godfridus*, had a mind to make a Tranſlation of the Body of St. *Firmin*, as the People were to believe; after all the ſearch they could make, they found not one Syllable of any intimation of ſuch a Body as St. *Firmin's* lying there; But the Biſhop of the City cauſed an Inſcription to be made upon the Leaden Coffin. *Firminus* Martyr Ambianorum Epiſcopus. *This*, he ſaid, *he had from the Mouth of the ſaid Biſhop and another.* Were not theſe Men fit to be made *Saints* of, who could turn the Body of any, though it may be the moſt wicked Perſon, into the Relicks of a Saint or a Martyr, and ſo into an Object of ſacred Veneration among the People? But to make the Story of this Tranſlation yet more pleaſant, *Guibert* tells us, *that about the ſame time the Monks of St.* Denys, *made a ſolemn Tranſlation of the ſame Body of St.* Firmin; and *D'achery* takes great pains to prove that the Monks had the true Body; and yet the *Author* of the Life of St. *Godefrid*, ſaith, "That the People were invited by that Saint, to prepare themſelves for the Tranſlation at *Amiens*, and to bring their Gifts, and ſuch a concourſe of People came to it, that one would have thought all *Europe* had been there. Then the Biſhop with the Prieſts went to the place where the Sacred Treaſure lay, and expoſed the Holy Relicks with great trembling, to the Veneration of the People. Are not theſe rare doings for Saints and Holy Biſhops, thus horribly againſt their own Conſciences to abuſe the People, After theſe *Guibert* relates, how "*Odo* Biſhop of *Bayeux* Brother to *William* the Firſt, bought the Body of a Countryman called *Exuperius*, of a Sexton for 100 Pounds, and made a ſolemn Tranſlation of it for St. *Exuperius*: But, *he ſaith*, the Inſtances of this kind are ſo numerous, that he had neither ſtrength nor time, to relate the things which were done in this manner, by thoſe who made gain their godlineſs. It was a common thing in thoſe Days to ſteal and ſell Relicks, (of which *Capgrave* gives ſeveral Examples) and to fight for them, as we find in *Colganus*; and there was a ſort of wandring Monks called *Circelliones*, who made a trade of this; *Greg. Turonenſis* tells us, of one *Deſiderius* in the City of *Tours*, that pretended to work Miracles, and that there were Meſſengers paſſed between St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul*, and him; to whom a-

Sect. 2.

Lucas D'achery *not. in* Guibert *p.* 567.
Nicol. *vit. St.* Godefridi *l.* 2. *c.* 26.

Sect. 4.

Hugo Menard *not. in Concord. Regul. c.* 3. *p.* 125.
Greg. Turon *hiſt. l.* 9. *c.* 6.

bundance of People flocked, carrying the Blind and the Lame to him to be healed, and that he deceived the People by his Art. Another, (who was afterwards found to have been a Biſhop's Servant,) went about Cloathed in White, carrying a Croſs, at which hung two Veſſels in which he ſaid Holy Oyl was contained; this Man pretended to have come out of *Spain*, and to have brought ſome Relicks of *Vincentius* and *Felix*; he went to *Paris* and drew the People after him; but the Eccleſiaſtical Officers cauſing him to be ſearched, inſtead of his Relicks found the Teeth of Moles, the Bones of Mice, the Claws of Bears, and the Roots of Herbs, with which they ſuppoſed he made Enchantments for the People; and of ſuch Perſons *Gregory* ſaith, our Saviour's Words are to be underſtood, *that many falſe Prophets ſhall ariſe doing Signs and Wonders*. But of theſe Impoſters more afterwards.

Afterwards *Guibert* vehemently diſputes againſt thoſe who pretended to the *Tooth of our Saviour*, and the *Milk of the Bleſſed Virgin*, and make them *guilty of Lying and Forgery*: And *derides the Miracles that were wrought by the Monks as vain, and fooliſh, and uncertain*, and concludes his Diſcourſe with ſaying, *that to make gain with carrying about or ſhewing the pretended Relicks of Saints, is a profane thing*.

Lib. 3. *c.* 1. *c.* 3. S. 4. *C.* 5. *S.* 1, 3, 4. *Sect.* 5.

Thus we ſee from the Authentick Teſtimony of ſo conſiderable an Author in his time, how little credit was to be given to the *Lives of the Saints*, or *their pretended Relicks and Miracles*. Yet ſtill this way of abuſing the People hath been upheld and practiſed, and their moſt ſolemn Offices of Religion corrupted with ſhameful Lies; for the Story of the ſeven Sleepers, and the 11000 Virgins, of St. *Criſtopher* and others, the moſt ridiculous Fables, were preſerved in their *Breviaries* and *Leſſons* of them read upon their Days; as may be yet ſeen in the *Saliſbury Breviary*, which was moſt in requeſt in *England*. And, which deſerves to be taken notice of, while they would by no means ſuffer the ſacred Bible to be in the Hands of the People, they were well enough contented that ſenſeleſs Book of the *Golden Legend* ſhould be publiſhed in *Engliſh* to be Devoutly read by them. So much more did they think it their Intereſt to feed the People with Lies and Fables, than with the Holy Word of God; ſo much more advantageous was it, for them to deceive than to ſave their Souls. But, it may be, now they will pretend, *That things are otherwiſe with them, that the Golden Legend is out of requeſt, that the Breviaries are Reformed, the Martyrologies corrected, the Acts of the Saints ſet forth pure and free from Fables*. This laſt I have already ſhewed to be very far from being true, and we need no more to ſhew how little credit they deſerve, than what the Collections of *Surius*, *Ribadineira*, *Bollandus*, *Colganus* and ſuch like, will afford us. Their *Breviaries* and *Martyrologies*, I grant, are in ſome things reformed, but there are many Fables ſtill remaining in them, and ſome of the late Correctors of them, inſtead of amending them, have inſerted Tales that were never in before: As *Launoy* hath at large proved in ſeveral Diſcourſes. One pleaſant paſſage, often mentioned by him, it may not be amiſs here to inſert, to ſhew the skill of the *Roman Correctors*. In the *Roman Martyrlogy* on the twenty fourth of *January*, in the Edition Corrected by *Galeſinius*, and approved by *Gregory* XIII. with his *Bull* before it; theſe Words were inſerted, *Atque Antiochiæ Sanctæ Synoridis Martyris*: And *Baronius*, in his Learned *Anotations* upon this Place, ſaith, *that St.* Chryſoſtom *ſpeaks of her*, Homil. 4. de Lazaro, *and St.* Hierom, *of another of that Name, famous for Nobility and*

Joh. Launoy *diſq. diſquiſ. de Magdal. Maſſil. p.* 157.

and Piety. How can they ever want *Martyrs* in the *Roman* Church, that can turn *Words* into *Martyrs!* For this Martyr *Synoris*, in thoſe Authors, is no more than the Greek Word Ξυνωρὶς which ſignifies a *Pair joyned together*, or *a Chariot drawn by a Pair*; and ſo St. *Chryſoſtom* there uſes it of *Juventius* and *Maximus*, calling them τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων ξυνωρίδα, and St. *Hierom* of *Juliana* and *Proba*, calling them *Sanctam Chriſti Synoridem:* This was *Baronius* his Noble Martyr *Synoris*; it was ill for her, that ſhe happen'd to be firſt known in ſo unlucky a time, when ſome learned Men (of *France*, as I take it) ſent *Baronius* notice of this new Martyr; who, being aſham'd of her, expung'd her out of all Editions of the *Martyrology*, ſince *A. D.* 1586. notwithſtanding the *Pope's Bull* in Approbation of that Edition: But if it had been her good Fortune to have been heard of a little ſooner, by this time we might have had an excellent *Legend* of her, diſtributed into ſeveral Leſſons in the *Breviary*, and the *Office* of a *Martyr* perform'd for her; we might have heard many pretty Stories of her Childhood, and of her very early Devotion to the Bleſſed Virgin, for the ſake of her Sex; how many ſtrange Miracles ſhe had wrought; and, without doubt, ſhe had been at leaſt the Daughter of a Prince, and, it may be, the youngeſt Daughter of King *Coſtus*. But ſo unhappy a thing it is to come into the World out of due time! for ſhe appeared but for a time, and then vaniſh'd quite out of ſight. Whereas, if ſhe had come abroad ſome Ages before, who knows what a World of Good ſhe might have done by this time, being ſolemnly invocated, and might have been thought as proper for all that go in *Coaches*, eſpecially *with two Horſes*, as *St.* Antony *is for ſtollen Goods*, or St. *Apollonia* for the *Tooth-ach*; or St. *Viarius* for the *Loyns*. This St. *Viarius* was another very pretty Saint, ſolemnly worſhipp'd near *Ebora*, for a *Biſhop* and a *Martyr*, eſpecially for *the Cure of the Loyns*; when, God knows, it was only the Name of an *antient Roman* Curator of the High-ways, which they had met with in ſome Inſcription, as *Andreas Reſendius* tells us. Who having the Curioſity to ſearch the Antiquities of the Church where this *High-way Saint* was worſhipp'd, a grave Prieſt told him all the *Legend* of his *Martyrdom*; *Reſendius* deſired to ſee what Monuments of it they had, he preſently produces a *Roman Inſcription*, wherein were theſe Words, VIARUM CURANDARUM. Now, ſaid the cunning old Prieſt, VIARUM, that is plain his Name was *Viarius*, and CURANDARUM is as much as if he ſhould have ſaid, *Cura curarum*, and that belonging only to a Biſhop, it was evident, this Martyr *Viarius* was a Biſhop. *Reſendius* kept his Countenance, and complained, he ſaith, to the Biſhop, of this worſhipping the Roman *Curator* for a Saint; but the People curſed him ſufficiently for it, they having receiv'd much help from him. But, methinks, they ſhould have ſet out his Life with all the Circumſtances of it, as well as have known for what Diſeaſe he was proper to be invocated. And *Beatus Rhenanus* tells us, how ſuch a thing might have been ingeniouſly done: for a certain Monk publiſh'd the Life of St. *Beatus*, and call'd him *Suetonius*, and deſcrib'd many Paſſages of his Life; and ſaid, he had a Companion called *Achates*. *Beatus Rhenanus*, being more than ordinarily inquiſitive after his Name-ſake, goes to the Man, and asks him whence he had this Information, ſuppoſing he had ſome good Authority for it; but, upon enquiry, he told him, that he call'd him *Suetonius*, because he heard he came out of *Sweden*; and he called his Companion *Achates*, becauſe that was the Name of *Æneas* his *Fellow Traveller*:

Andreas Reſend. de Martyr. Eborenſ. Ep. ad Barth. Kebed. p. 1007. *Tom.* 2. *Rerum Hiſpanic.*

Beat. Rhen. rer. Germ. l. 3. *p.* 161.

ler: And yet this admirable Story, *Rhenanus* ſaith, was not only printed, but painted in Churches too. And, which adds ſomething more of Grace to it, *Dempſter*, in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, derives the Ancient and Noble Family of the *Seatons*, in *Scotland*, from this St. *Suetonius*.

Dempſter. Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 2. n. 156.

But what if, after all theſe Pretences to Miracles in the *Roman* Church, ſome of their own Members that muſt know them, and were no way inconſiderable, either for Authority, Judgment, or Learning, ſhould declare, that they believe no ſuch thing as the continuance of the Power of Miracles in the Church? Can any thing more invalidate the Teſtimony of thoſe who aſſert theſe Miracles, than this? There was hardly a greater Man for Learning and Judgment, in his time, than *Toſtatus*, Biſhop of *Avila* in *Spain*; and he purpoſely diſcuſſes this Queſtion, about the continuance of Miracles in ſeveral places. In his Commentaries upon *Leviticus*, he ſhews, "That God made uſe of the Power "of Miracles, in the beginning of an Inſtitution, as of the Aaronical "Prieſthood, by Fire coming from Heaven to conſume the Sacrifices; "but when the Prieſthood was already confirm'd, there was no need "of any more Miracles in the Conſecration of the following Prieſts: "So, *ſaith he*, was it in the New Law; for in the beginning of it, "many Miracles were wrought, by and upon the New Converts: but "now there are no ſuch things ſeen. The reaſon whereof, is, becauſe "at firſt the Faith of the Goſpel was not confirmed, in the Minds of "Believers, as it is now: And few believed in Chriſt; therefore, to "bring Men to Faith, this Power of Miracles was neceſſary, the Matters of Faith being uncapable of Demonſtration; but now the Chriſtian Faith is ſufficiently confirmed, there is no need at all of Miracles. The ſame he aſſerts more largely, in his Commentaries on St. *Matthew*; and in one place put this Queſtion, "Why the Biſhops "and Preachers of the Church, who ſucceed the Apoſtles, do not work "Miracles, as the Apoſtles did, ſince Miracles are for the Confirmation "of the Chriſtian Faith? *To which he anſwers*, "That Chriſt doth not "beſtow the Gift of Miracles, but when it is neceſſary, or at leaſt "very uſeful; but now the Gift of Miracles, in theſe Perſons, is neither profitable nor uſeful; becauſe we have Arguments enough to "perſuade us to believe, without that; and therefore he determines, "that Miracles now would not be for the Profit of the Church, but "only for Curioſity; *and ſaith*, that it is not meet that God ſhould "give this Power of Miracles, nor doth he. Nay, he puts the Caſe of "Heathens to be converted to the Faith; *and to that he anſwers*, That "it might be either through their Demerits, or of thoſe who go to them, "that God denies this Power of Miracles to convert them: *But withal*, "*ſaith*, that the Converſion of Infidels is not ſo neceſſary now, as in "the Apoſtles times; and therefore God doth not, in this, ordinarily "beſtow this Gift on Men, altho' he may do it in ſome extraordinary "Caſes. What ſhall we ſay now to the Teſtimony of this learned Biſhop? Had he never heard of St. *James* of *Compoſtella*, and the Miracles pretended to be wrought there? And could he believe them, and write theſe things? Had he never heard of St. *Vincentius Ferrerius*, who liv'd in ſome part of the ſame time with him, and if he had believed the Miracles reported of him, he would neither have put the Queſtion, nor anſwer'd it ſo as he did. After him, I ſhall produce the Teſtimony of *Fiſher*, Biſhop of *Rocheſter*, in his Anſwer to *Luther*, who, to prove the

Toſtatus in Levit. c. 9. q. 14.

Comment. in Matth. c. 3. q. 12. in Matth. 10. q. 21.

Roffenſ. c. Luther de captivit. Babyl. c. 10. Sect. 4.

neceſſity of interpreting Scripture by the continued Senſe of the Church, and not by the bare Letter, offers to produce “ ſuch Words of Chriſt, in which, beſides the Matter of Fact, and the Command, there is a Promiſe annex'd; and yet, *ſaith he*, in our Days no effect of this Promiſe is ſeen: And then brings the Words of Scripture, wherein it is ſaid, “ That Chriſt cured the Blind and the Lame, and caſt out Devils; and he commanded his Diſciples to do the ſame, and makes a Promiſe to them that ſhould believe in Chriſt, *Mark* 16. that many Signs ſhould follow them: And yet this Promiſe, *ſaith he*, hath no effect now; for no Man now caſts out Devils, nor heals Diſeaſes, and yet no one queſtions but there are many that believe. But what then, was the Promiſe of Chriſt of no effect? No, *ſaith he*, Chriſt intended it only for the firſt Ages of the Church; but when the Chriſtian Faith was diſperſed over the World, there was no longer need of Miracles. Can any Teſtimony be more plain or weighty in our Caſe, than this, it being from one who undoubtedly knew all the pretences to Miracles that were then made? *Eraſmus* expreſly ſaith, “ That the Gift of Miracles (which was neceſſary to the firſt Ages of the Church, for the Converſion of Infidels; as ſpeaking with ſtrange Tongues, miraculous Cures, Propheſying, and ſuch like Miracles) is now ceaſed. *Stella* not only ſaith, “ That the Power of Miracles is ceaſed; *but he ſaith*, that the receiving it would do more hurt than good; for Men would ſay, that the Chriſtian Faith was not ſufficiently confirmed before. Of all Caſes we might moſt reaſonably ſuppoſe, that God ſhould, if ever, renew this Gift in the Converſion of Infidels; and yet *Franciſcus à Victoria* ſaith, “ That he heard of no Miracles or Signs that were wrought for the Converſion of the Indians. *Joſephus Acoſta* at large celebrates this Caſe, *why God doth not now give the Power of Miracles among thoſe who preach to Infidels, as he did of old?* And he offers at ſeveral Reaſons for it, of which this is the chief, *That Miracles were neceſſary in the beginning of Chriſtian Religion, but not now.* And if the Church be defective in the Power of Miracles, where it is the moſt neceſſary, what reaſonable ground can there be to think that God ſhould imploy his Power, not for the Satisfaction of the Infidels, but of the Credulous and Superſtitious? As God never works Miracles to convince obſtinate Atheiſts, ſo neither doth he to gratify the Curioſity of old Women and Pilgrims; but, if ever he does it, it is to lay a ſufficient Foundation for thoſe to believe, who are otherwiſe deſtitute of the Means of Faith. But if ſuch Perſons, who are imploy'd upon the Work of converting Infidels, do want the Teſtimony of working Miracles, I know no reaſon to believe that he imploys it for other Ends. And, if theſe Perſons had believed that the Power of Miracles had been any where elſe in the Church, they would have made that conſiderable Objection to themſelves, why God ſhould give it where there was leſs need, and deny it where there was greateſt?

Eraſm. in 1 Ep. ad Corinth. 13. 13.

Stella in Luc. 11. 29.

Victoria Relect. 5. *p.* 200.

Acoſta de procurandâ Indorum Salute l.2.c.6,10.

But what then ſhall we ſay to the Miracles pretended to be wrought by Xaverius, *and others, in the* Eaſt-Indies? I ſay, that if they were ſufficiently atteſted, we might be much more inclined to believe the truth of thoſe Miracles, than of the *Lady of Loretto*, or St. *James of Compoſtella*, or any of the reſt which *E. W.* refers us to. For if it were at any time reaſonable to expect a Power of Miracles, it would be for the Converſion of Infidels, and ***Xaverius*** and his Companions, going upon ſo generous a Deſign, might be favoured in it by ſome extraordinary Effects of Divine Power. But then, in all reaſon, the Miracles would be ſuch as were moſt accommodated to that Deſign; as, the ſpeaking with the Tongues in which they were to preach the Chriſtian Religion: But, by the Letters of *Xaverius* himſelf, we find that he was extreamly put to it for want of this Gift of Tongues, both on the Coaſt of *Commorin*, and eſpecially in *Japan:* For, in one of his Letters, " he laments his Condition very much, becauſe the People being willing " to learn, and he as willing to inſtruct them, for want of the Language, they converſed with each other like Statues; and when they " ask'd him Queſtions, he could give them no Anſwer; but by degrees, *he ſaid*, he learnt to prattle like a Child among them. Can any now imagine, that God had beſtow'd the Gift of Miracles upon *Xaverius*, for propagating Chriſtianity, and yet ſhould deny him that, without which all other Miracles would be to no purpoſe, if he could not deliver that Doctrine thoſe Miracles were to confirm, ſo as to be underſtood by the People? But, in truth, I do not find that *Xaverius* himſelf, in any of his *Epiſtles*, did make any pretence to the Power of Miracles: After his Death, indeed, the *Jeſuits* in thoſe Parts, to increaſe the Glory of their Society, and their Brethren in theſe Parts as readily concurring to ſuch a Deſign, publiſh'd ſome Miracles, which they ſaid were Wrought by Him. So *Melchior Nuneſius*, in his *Epiſtle* to *Ignatius Loyola*, where he gives an account of the Death of *Francis Xaverius*, ſaith, *That many things were diſcovered ſince his Death, which were not known while he was alive.* And is not this a very probable Circumſtance that he had a Power of Miracles? Would the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles have converted Infidels, if they had not been known while they were living? And yet theſe Miracles he reports are very few, and delivered on the ſingle Teſtimonies of no very conſiderable Men: *The reſt, he ſaith, for brevity's ſake he omits*; which is not very probable, conſidering how long he inſiſts upon the Story *of the miraculous Incorruption of his Body after his Deceaſe.* Which *Bellarmine* likewiſe magnifies, *viz. That his Body being caſt into Lime, was preſerved fifteen Months entire and free from Corruption.* What will not theſe Men make Miracles of, when they have a mind to it? When *Maffeius* ſaith, *That the Relicks of St.* Thomas *at* Meliapor, *were mixed with Lime and Sand*, which no doubt were deſigned to preſerve them from Corruption. And *Paulus Zacchias*, a learned Roman Phyſician, hath declared, *That the Incorruption of Bodies, by Salt, Nitre, or Lime, is ſo far from being a Miracle, that it hath nothing of wonder in it.* And yet this muſt be cry'd up as a ſtrange Miracle in *Xaverius* his Body, which would have paſſed for a common Accident in any one elſe, it being ſo well known to be an ordinary Effect of Nature, to preſerve Bodies a long time from Corruption, by the uſe of Things which are of ſo drying a nature as thoſe are. But as to all theſe Miracles, whoſe Relation we have from the *Jeſuits* in the *Eaſt-Indies*, we are to conſider what Credit their Teſtimony deſerves with us; for if they are Men who think it lawful to Lie for a good Cauſe (as no doubt the Honour of their Society is ſuch with them) how can we with any tolerable Diſcretion relie upon their Words? And what will thoſe Men ſtick at, who have had the Impudence to inſert fabulous Miracles and Stories into the very Hiſtory of the Goſpel? For which we are to underſtand, that *Acabar*, Emperor of the *Mogols*, having given liberty to the *Jeſuits*, to live in

the

Epiſtol. Japan 3. *p.* 30.

Epiſtol. Japan 8. *p.* 92.

Bellarm. de notis Eccl. li 4. *c.* 14.

Maffei Hiſt. Indic. l. 8.

Paul. Zacchia Quæſt. Medico legales l. 4. *tit.* 1. *q.* 10. *n.* 24.

Kirchman. de funeribus Rom. l. 1. *c.* 8.

Korman. de miraculis Mortuorum, p. 3. *c.* 6.

the City of *Agra*, deſired of *Hierome Xavier*, the Chief of them (a Kinſman of the former *Francis Xavier*, and *a Man of ſuch an Apoſtolical Spirit*, ſaith *Alegambe*) an Account of the Life and Miracles of Chriſt. The ſubtle *Jeſuit* very well underſtanding their own Doctrine about *the obſcurity and inſufficiency of Scripture*, durſt not put into his Hands the *four Evangeliſts*, but framed an excellent *Goſpel* of his own, *A.D.* 1602. which he declares at the end of it, *to have taken out of the Holy Goſpel, and the Books of the Prophets*: And we may judge of his ſincerity by theſe paſſages. In the beginning of it, he relates the Story of the *Virgin Mary*, not as it is in the *Evangeliſts*, but as he had taken it out of a ſilly Book *de Nativitate S. Mariæ*, attributed to St. *Hierom*, but rejected not only by *Eraſmus*, but by *Baronius*, *Canus*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, and others; and the true Author is ſuppoſed by ſome to be *Seleucus* the *Manichee*; whether it were he or no, *Baronius* ſaith, *he was ſo ignrant as not to avoid manifeſt Lyes*: however this new Evangeliſt thought him a fit Author for him to make a new Goſpel out of, the better to pleaſe the *Great Mogol*. He tells him out of that Book that "*Joachim* and *Anna* "the Parents of the Bleſſed Virgin, being very Rich and Childleſs, had "made a Vow to God, if they had a Son, to devote him to his Service; "one time *Joachim* went up to the Temple to offer up his Sacrifice "there, and *Iſſachar* the High Prieſt rejected him (a notorious Lye, ſaith *Baronius*; for no ſuch Man as *Iſſachar* could be High Prieſt then,) "upon which he and his Wife went away diſcontented; at laſt God ſent "an Angel to comfort *Joachim*, and told him he ſhould have a Daughter, and ſhould call her Name *Mary*, who ſhould be filled with the "Holy Ghoſt from her Conception; and charged them to perform their "Vow about her Education in the Temple; *he is ſo punctual as to ſet down* "the very Day of her Conception and Birth, and relates the occaſion of "keeping the Feaſt of her Nativity among Chriſtians, *viz.* a Revelation "made to an Eremite that ſhe was born the eighth of *September*, when "the Eremite heard ſtrange Melody in the Heavens upon that Day; upon "which *Innocent* the Fourth appointed the Feaſt to be kept. What *Goſpel* and *Prophets* had this *Jeſuit* met with to take theſe excellent Stories from? But it muſt be from one of the *Prophets* indeed, ſince *Innocent* the fourth lived 1250 Years ſince the Birth of Chriſt. *The Virgin*, as *Xavier*'s Goſpel goes on, at three Years old, upon *Friday* the twenty "firſt of *November*, was carried up to the Temple, and there ſhut up "in a Holy Place to be educated (moſt of the Commentators on this new Goſpel, tell us it was the *Holy of Holies*, which it ſeems was then turned into a *Nunnery*, *and for eleven Years together*, they ſay, *ſhe never went out of that place*; if any only ſhould boldly aſk what conveniencies ſhe could have there? They readily anſwer, "that ſhe needed none, being fed by Angels all that time with ſpiritual Food. So *Caniſius*, *Poza*, and others in *Theophilus Raynaudus*; and *Benedictus Gononus* adds, that *Zachary*, Father to St. *John Baptiſt*, ſaw the Angel that carried her Meat to her; for which he quotes *Pantaleon* in *Netaphraſtes*; (no doubt an excellent Author) but *Xavier* ſaith, *That for the moſt part ſhe had her Food from Heaven.* I omit *her Vow of Virginity*, *the manner of her Eſpouſals with* Joſeph, *and the reaſon of them*, viz. *to cheat the Devil*; *the bloſſoming of* Joſeph's *Rod*; the particular Deſcription of the *Virgin* Mary's *Countenance* with *great blewiſh Eyes, and golden Locks*, &c. all which he ſets off with as many Circumſtances, as if they had made a conſiderable part in our Goſpels: But one of the greateſt Miracles of her Beauty,

Hiſtoria Chriſti p. 17.

Xaver. p. 22.

Ryanaud. Diſtych. Marian. n. 10.

*Bened. Gonon Chronicon. Deip. p.*6.

Xaver. p. 25. *p.* 26, *&c. p.* 30.

was, *that a wicked Man by looking upon her was converted.* It was a great *ibid.*
pity then ſhe went no oftner abroad, that ſhe might have reformed the
World by her Countenance. Afterwards he deſcribes the manner of
the *Angels Salutation of the Bleſſed Virgin*, ſo exactly that it plainly appears, p. 34.
he deſpiſed the rudeneſs of the Evangeliſts in their manner of expreſſing
it. “ The Bleſſed Virgin, *ſaith he*, was then ſitting in her Parlour
“ muſing upon that ſaying of *Eſaias*, A Virgin ſhall conceive, &c.
“ and ſhe mightily deſired to ſee that Virgin, and wiſhed ſhe might be
“ her Hand-maid, while ſhe was in theſe thoughts, an Angel comes in
“ like a beautiful young Man with great ſplendour, and falls upon his
“ Knees, and fixed his Eyes on the Ground, and with great Devotion,
“ ſaid *Ave Maria*, &c. She was not ſurprized, *ſaith he*, at the ſight of
“ the Angel; for ſhe had often converſed with Angels before; but at his
“ humble poſture, and the Honour he gave to her. Who can doubt
now the lawfulneſs of praying to the *Bleſſed Virigin*, when the *Angel*
Gabriel, ſaid the *Ave Maria*, upon his bended Knees to her? “ After
“ the Angel had delivered his Meſſage, ſhe made him wait, *ſaith*
“ *Xavier*, till, Midnight, before ſhe gave any Anſwer; then, ſaith he, p. 3.
“ in the very point of Midnight, ſhe fell upon her Knees, and with
“ her Head downward, and Eyes full of Tears, and her Arms a croſs, p. 41.
“ ſhe ſaid, *Ecce ancilla Domini*, &c. Much in the ſame way he deſcribes p. 62.
the manner of her delivery, only that her Eyes were then lifted up towards
Heaven. I paſs by the fabulous Miracles he relates concerning
the Birth of our Saviour, of which there is not one word in Scripture, or p. 74.
any good Hiſtorian: The Story of the wiſe Men with their Names *Melchior*,
Caſpar, and *Balthaſar*; of their Kingdoms, and how their Bodies p. 89.
came to be carried to *Cologn*, which was much for the *Great Mogol's* edification
to know; the Miracle of the Letter *Vau*, blotted out by old *Simeon*;
which he found in the word afterwards; the check the Angel p. 94.
gave him, and how thereby he came to own the Meſſias, the care *Anna*
had over the young Virgins in the Temple, and the manner of obſerving
her Feaſt with Wax Candles; the Miracles wrought in *Ægypt* at p. 98.
Chriſts being there; the Miracle of the *Pool* of *Bethſeda, being cauſed* p. 101.
by the Wood of the Croſs, being hid there by King Solomon, *which floated* p. 198.
in our Saviours time, and when they took it out for the Crucifying Chriſt,
then the Pool loſt its vertue: And abundance of other Interpolations, and
Corruptions of the Story of the Goſpel; but by theſe few, we may gueſs
what ſincerity we are to expect from ſuch Men, in the relating the Miracles
of their own Order, who cannot keep their Hands off from Forgery
and Impoſture, in relating the Story of the Goſpel. And after the
ſame manner *Xavier* hath Publiſhed the *Hiſtory* of St. *Peter*. But leſt
any ſhould imagine that theſe Books were framed, and ſet forth by ſome
Enemies to the *Jeſuits*, to the diſgrace of their Order, *Alegambe* confeſſes
they were both Written in the *Perſian Language* by *Hierome Xavier*,
and faithfully Tranſlated into *Latin*, by *Lud. de Dieu*; ſome very few
faults he takes notice of, but they are ſo ſlight, that they confirm his
Authority in all the reſt: Let now any Impartial Man judge whether
ſuch Perſons deſerve any Faith in relating other Miracles, that dare ſo
horribly to Adulterate and Corrupt the very Story of the Bible? But
they little thought theſe abominable Frauds, would ever have come to
Light in theſe Parts, to make us underſtand what kind of Goſpel it is,
which they propagated in the *Indies*; and how unlikely it is that God

ſhould give the atteſtation of Miracles to ſuch lewd Foegeries. And thus much may ſuffice for comparing the Credibility of the Teſtimony, on which Miracles are received in the *Roman* Church; with that upon which we believe the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Enough one would think not only to ſtop the Mouth of *E. W.* for the future, but even of Impudence it ſelf.

Of the Impoſtures and Forgeries of Miracles in the *Rom*an Church.

Sect. 11. 3. I now come to ſhew the notorious Frauds and Impoſtures, which have been diſcovered in the *Roman* Church, in this point of Miracles. It was an eaſie matter in an Age of Credulity and Ignorance, to ſet up for a Power of Miracles; for few Men were inquiſitive into the nature and Circumſtances of things, and thoſe who underſtood, generally the beſt in thoſe times, were either Contrivers or Friends; yet it ſo fell out, that ſome notorious Impoſtures have been diſcovered, which have differed in nothing from thoſe which have paſſed for true Miracles among them, but only in the Fortune of being diſcovered. *Glaber Rodulphus*, in his Hiſtory, tells a Story of his own knowledge of a certain Perſon, that went up and down pretending to great Wonders; after the great Feats he had done in *France*, he goes into the *Alps*: and there pretends to have found the Relicks of St. *Juſtus* the *Martyr*; the Country People flocked in to him, and they who came whole and ſound were ſorry they had no Diſeaſe or Lameneſs to be cured. But certain it is, ſaith the Hiſtorian, ſtrange Cures were wrought there; the Biſhops in whoſe Dioceſſes theſe things were done, inſtead of making ſtrict Enquiries, demanded Money to give Licence to deceive the People. At laſt, one *Manfred*, a Great Man in thoſe Parts, cauſed the Body which wrought theſe Miracles to be taken away, and placed it in a Monaſtery of his own Erecting, and this *Relick-Finder*, grew into great requeſt with him, promiſing to diſcover more precious Relicks than theſe, and he told him the Names of the Martyrs, and manners of ſuffering very exactly. Some Perſons, among whom the Hiſtorian himſelf was one, asked him how he knew theſe things; he told them, that an Angel appeared in the Night, and told him all the things he deſired to know; and lifted him out of his Bed; and after many Diſcourſes, they parted very lovingly. Although, ſome of thm ſuſpected the Impoſture, yet the Biſhops Conſecrated the Church with great Pomp, and applauſe; of the People, who were innumerable, ſolemnized the Tranſlation of theſe Relicks. And although afterwards the wiſer ſort found out the cheat, and that the Body was taken at a venture in the Night out of a Grave, yet the Work of Miracles, went on as well as if the Martyr had been there, and the People ſtill continued in the belief of it. This the Hiſtorian ſaith, he purpoſely inſerted to diſcover the Impoſture of thoſe pretended Miracles. *Gulielmus Neubrigenſis*, gives an Account of a ſeditious Perſon in *London*, in the time of *Richard the firſt*, called *William Longbeard*, who ſtiled himſelf the *Saviour of the Poor*, and had gotten ſo great an intereſt among the People, that he had two and fifty thouſand Men at his command: At laſt he was ſeized on, and Executed; but after his Death the People cryed him up for a *Martyr*, and a Prieſt got one of his Chains, and gave out that he cured one Sick of a Fever by it; the People being encouraged by this, took away the very Gallows where he hung in the Night, and all the Earth about it, where any of his Blood was ſuppoſed to be ſpilt, and they digged ſo far as to make a

Glabri Rodulpi Hiſt. l. 4. *c.* 3.

Pit with carrying away the Earth for the Cure of Diſeaſes. By theſe Inſtances we ſee what a Diſpoſition the People were in, to be deluded under a pretence of Relicks and Miracles.

But it may be ſaid, *That ſuch Impoſtors may be in any Religion; and this reflects no more diſhonour on the* Roman *Church, than* Simon Magus *did upon the Apoſtles:* I proceed therefore to ſhew, that Perſons who have been countenanced and encouraged in that Church, have been found guilty of Impoſture. At the latter end of the twelfth Century, appeared one *Fulco*, a Man very famous for the great Miracles wrought by him, and his extraordinary way of Preaching. He was, ſaith *Jacobus de Vitriaco*, a plain Country-Prieſt, very ſimple and illiterate, who had been a looſe and diſſolute Man; but, being now reform'd, to the Univerſity of *Paris* he goes, to get ſome Authorities and Moral Documents in his Note Books; which, ſaith he, he furniſh'd himſelf with, as ſo many ſmooth Stones to deſtroy *Goliah*. Being thus far armed, he pretends a Commiſſion from Heaven to go abroad to Preach in all Places, and gave out that the *Bleſſed Virgin* appeared to him, and had fitted him for that Work, and bad him go preach Repentance in all places; and that ſhe had beſtow'd the Gift of Healing upon him, as *Otto de Sancto Blaſio* tells us. Upon this, he preaches at *Paris*, to the great Admiration of his Hearers, who looked on him as a Perſon inſpired, ſaith *Jacob. de Vitriaco*, and as *another St.* Paul; which Preaching was ſo effectual with many of the People, as to make them take off their Garments and Shoes, and carrying Whips in their Hands, to caſt themſelves at his Feet to receive Penance. After this way he went over all *France*, and a great part of the *Empire*, and came over into *England*, as our Hiſtorians tell us, and preached before *Richard* the Firſt; by the ſame Token he call'd him *Hypocrite*, to the great regret of ſome of our Hiſtorians; but it ſeems he ſtaid not long here, but away he went for *France* again. *Hoveden* tells us, that the Clergy of *Liſieux*, in *Normandy*, caſt him into Priſon; but he made a ſhift to get from thence quickly, and went to *Caen*, where he was again impriſon'd by the Governour of the Caſtle; and eſcaping thence, he caſt off the Duſt of his Feet againſt them: But, although the King of *England* had ſo mean an Opinion of him, the People in *France* thought they could not ſufficiently adore him. For *Jac. de Vitriaco* ſaith, That they thought themſelves happy who could get any piece of his Garments; in ſo much that he was fain almoſt every Day to put on a new Habit: Which one Day the People tore ſo unreaſonably, that he deſired them that they would not tear his Garments which were not bleſſed, but he would bleſs the Habit of one that ſtood by him; which he had no ſooner done, but the People did tear it in a thouſand Pieces, and preſerved them for Relicks: They preſſed ſo much upon him, ſaith the ſame Grave Author, that he was forced to beat them off with a Staff in his Hand; and altho' he wounded ſome with his Blows, yet they were ſo far from being diſpleaſed at it, that they kiſſed the Blood which came from them, as being ſanctify'd by his Strokes: (for his Hair Shirt and Penance made him very *Cholerick*.) Never any Man had greater Reputation for Miracles, than this; for where ever he came, it was given out that he cured all Diſeaſes; as all the Hiſtorians that mention him agree: But *Otto* gives the moſt particular Account of them, which he ſaid he had from one *Bertoldus de Oſinberc*, who ſaw him. When any dumb were brought unto him, he opened their Mouths, and breathed into them, and commanded

Jacob. de Vitriaco Hiſtor. Occidental. c. 0.

Otto de Sancto Blaſio append. ad Otton. Friſing. c. 47.

Jac. de Vitr. c. 8.

Matth. Weſtmonaſt. A.D. 1197.

Knighton l. 2. p. 2412. apud 10. Scriptores.

Hoveden. Annal. p. poſt. p. 448.

Jac. de Vitriaco c. 8.

manded them to ſpeak; which if they did not preſently, he gave them a good blow on the Cheeks, and then they ſpake. He made a very infirm Boy leap off his Horſe, and run before him, with holding up his Staff, as one ready to ſtrike him. But never was poor Man ſo ſerv'd, as the rich Uſurer was by him; (for we muſt know, his great Zeal was againſt Uſury) he ſeeing *in the Spirit*, ſaith *Bertoldus*, that this Man was prædeſtinated to Life, took an occeſion to Dine with him; and, as ſoon as he was gone into his Houſe, he ask'd what he had to Dinner? The Man told him he need not trouble himſelf about that, he would provide as well for him as the City would afford; he was not ſatisfy'd with this, but would needs go into the Kitchin, and have all ſet before him; which was no ſooner done, but he (very ſpightfully, ſo near Dinner-time) turns all into Frogs and Serpents; upon which the poor Uſurer fell upon his Knees, and begged Pardon for all his Faults. But *Fulco* told him, both he and all his Proviſions were Unclean; and there was no way for him to eſcape, but to give away all that he had; which the Uſurer, in a little time after, told him he had done; but it ſeems he had forgotten a quantity of Wheat, which was yet left. *Fulco* hearing of it, takes the Uſurer with him, and goes to the place where it lay, and found it full of Toads and Serpents; then he tells him, if he would be perfect, and certain of God's Mercy, he ſhould go naked into that *Granary*, then he promiſed him Eternal Life; which command he preſently obey'd, and then *Fulco* ſhut up and ſealed down the Cover of it, and commanded all not to come near it till next Morning; then great Multitudes flocked to ſee what was become of the Man, and they found nothing but a Man's Bones whiter than Snow; which he took out, and declared them to be holy Relicks, and cauſed them to be laid up accordingly. By this one Miracle, atteſted by one who ſaith, he ſaw his Miracles, we may judge of the Man and his Miracles. However, this Man was thought a fit Inſtrument to be imploy'd by the Pope to preach up a *Croiſado*; (for their Holineſſes have thought fit to make uſe of ſuch falſe Pretenders to Inſpiration and Miracles, as the fitteſt Men to manage their Deſigns; as *Peter* the *Eremit*, by *Urban* the Second; and this Man, by *Innocent* the Third) For *Otto* ſaith expreſly, that he preached by the Pope's Authority: And the *Chronicon Andrenſe*, lately publiſh'd by *D'achery*, affirms the ſame: *Raynaldus* mentions the Letters which were ſent him from *Innocent* the Third; and *Jacobus de Vitriaco* ſaith, that at laſt he carried the Croſs upon his Shoulders, and perſuaded Princes and others to an Expedition to the *Holy Land*; and by this means he heaped up abundance of Wealth together; and from that time, ſaith the ſame Author, his Authority and Reputation began to decline; and not long after he dy'd of a Fever at *Neulli*, in his own Pariſh Church, where he began his Work. *Otto* hath no mind at all to ſpeak of his End, but only ſaith, that Men cannot tell what became of him, after the Stories of his Miracles, nor what end he made; at which, he ſaith, the wiſer Men were exceedingly ſcandaliz'd; but he thinks he might be honeſtly defended. But *Rigordus*, who lived in the ſame time with him, intimates his mind ſufficiently about him; when, after mentioning his Miracles and Preaching, he ſaith, "But if a Man deſires to know with what "Intention a Man preaches, he muſt look to his End; becauſe the End "doth moſt clearly diſcover the Intention of the Heart. By which it is

D'acherii Spicileg. Tom. 9. *p.* 520. *Raynald. ad A. D.* 1198. *n.* 38.

Rigord. de Geſtis Philippi A.D. 1198.

is eaſie to underſtand what kind of Perſon he thought this *Fulco* to be. One of the greateſt Companions of this *Fulco*, was one *Petrus de Ruſciaco*, or *de Ruſciâ*, who had likewiſe gained a great Reputation for preaching Poverty, till he made himſelf exceſſively Rich; and by that means, ſaith *Jacobus de Vitriaco*, he not only made his own Doctrine contemptible, but brought a great Scandal upon all the Diſciples of *Fulco*. And *Robertus Antiſſiodorenſis*, an Author of that time, acknowledges, that the Devotion of the People, occaſion'd by theſe Preachers, ſpeedily declined; and many that ſeem'd reform'd of their Vices, return'd to the practice of them. But *Jacobus de Vitriaco* adds afterwards, that many falſe Prophets and Deceivers went abroad under the ſame Pretence of extraordinary Preaching; and, which is more, that they were ſent by the Biſhops of ſeveral Churches, to get Money from the People for the Repair of their Churches; and *Antiſſiodorenſis* expreſly ſaith, that *Fulco* went abroad to preach in his itinerant manner, by the Inſpiration of God, and the Licenſe of his Biſhop.

Jac. de Vitriaco c. 8. Hiſt. Occid.
Rob. Antiſſiod. Chron. ad A D 1198.
Jac. de Vitriaco c. 10.

Within leſs than forty Years after this *Fulco*, appeared another famous Impoſtor, pretending to work great Miracles, call'd *Johannes de Vincentia*, or *Vincenca* in *Italy*, of the *Dominican Order*, ſay the moſt Hiſtorians, although *Vignier* makes him a *Cordelier*. This Man was imploy'd by Pope *Gregory* the Ninth, in the time of his Troubles with *Frederick* the Second, to the City of *Bononia*, and prevailed ſo much upon them, ſaith *Sigonius*, by the Reputation of his Learning and Sanctity, that in a little time he had gotten the whole Power of the City in his Hands. But that which chiefly gain'd him ſo great Authority, was the Opinion of his great Miracles; for *Guido Bonatus*, who liv'd in that time, and ſaith he ſaw him, affirms that he had made the People believe, *he had Revelations from God, and that by his Command the Dead were raiſed*: *Spondanus*, out of *Thomas Cantipratenſis*, mentions Seven, *Vignier* Eighteen, that had been raiſed by him from the Dead; and adds, that his Companions gave out, that he cured all Diſeaſes, caſt out Devils, and did many other Miracles: But, after a while, he ſaith, his Impoſture was diſcovered, but not before he had gotten Twenty Thouſand Marks of Silver to his Convent: And *Guido Bonatus* ſaith of himſelf, that he was thought an Heretick for ſuſpecting his Impoſture from the beginning. *Matthew Paris* ſaith of him, that he loſt all his Eſteem through his Pride and bad Company. *Spondanus* knows not what to ſay to this judgment of *Matthew Paris*, finding him on one ſide ſo highly commended by Pope *Gregory* the Ninth, in his Letters to him, and on the other, ſuch evident Teſtimonies, that in a little time he loſt all the Authority he had in *Bononia*. But it is plain by the Letters of Pope *Gregory*, extant in *Raynaldus*, that he looked on him as one inſpired, and that had a Gift of Miracles; for he ſolemnly *gives Thanks to Jeſus Chriſt, for the great Miracles wrought by him*, which he parallels with thoſe wrought by *Moſes*, in the Preſence of *Pharaoh*, for the Redemption of the People of *Iſrael*; and it is as evident, that ſome of the learned'ſt Men in the *Roman* Church look on him as a meer Impoſtor. For the famous Jeſuit, who writ the *Diatribæ* againſt the *Dominicans*, under the Name of *Petrus de Valle clauſâ*, reckons up this Man among the notorious Cheats of that Order: And he who writ in Vindication of the Order, hath very little to ſay for him, but only that the Pope had a better Opinion of him: Which, it ſeems, the Jeſuit, who knew the

Sigon. de Regno Italia l. 17.
Fulgoſ. l. 1. tit. de Relig. cultu c. 1.
Spondan. Annal. Eccl. A.D. 1233. n. 10.
Vignier Hiſtor. de l'Egliſe A.D 1264.
Mat. Paris in Hen. 3. A.D. 1238.
Odoric. Raynald. A.D 1233. n. 35, 37, 38.
Petri de Valle-clauſâ diatrib. adverſ. Cyriacos Sect. 11.

Joh. Caſalas Candor Lilii Vindicatus p. 431. *Bzov. Annales A. D.* 1232. *n.* 2.

the Pope's Correſpondence with him well enough, did not think ſufficient to excuſe him from Impoſture. And yet after all this *Bzovius*, for the Honour of his Order, attributes to him wonderful Sanctity and Miracles, and makes him to have cur'd abundance of Diſeaſes with the Sign of the Croſs, to have rais'd up Ten Men from the Dead; adding, that once when he was praying there appear'd a Croſs in his Forehead, another time over his Head, and that a bright Star was ſeen over him, and an Angel whiſpering in his Ear. Judge now, Reader, what Credit theſe Reporters of Miracles in the *Roman* Church do deſerve from us, when ſuch Perſons who are by their own Order cry'd up for the Workers of Miracles, are by others of their own Church condemn'd for meer Impoſtors.

De 4. Hæreſiarchis Ordinis Prædicatorum, &c. apud Suitenſes in Civitate Bernenſi combuſtis A. D. 1509.

But one of the moſt notorious Impoſtures which ever came to light, was that of the *Dominicans* at *Bern*; the Subſtance of which I ſhall give from the authentick Relation it ſelf as it was publiſh'd *A. D.* 1509. very ſoon after the thing was done. It ſeems the Controverſy about the immaculate Conception of the Bleſſed Virgin had caus'd great Heats in *Germany*, and all ſorts did favour the Defenders of it, which extremely diſcontented the *Dominicans*, who found that the *Franciſcans* gain'd Ground of them chiefly upon the Authority of ſome Revelations and Miracles. The *Dominicans* therefore conſider'd how they might vie with their Adverſaries in theſe things, and reſolv'd to have Revelations from the Bleſſed Virgin againſt the immaculate Conception, and to have as good Marks of Chriſt's Wounds in their Order as St. *Francis* had; but ſuch a Deſign requir'd a good Theatre to act it on, where it might not be diſcover'd, and yet be ſufficiently known; at firſt they thought of *Francfort*, then of *Norimberg*; but at laſt they pitch'd upon *Bern*, as moſt convenient, by reaſon of the Simplicity and Ignorance of the People. Four Perſons were employ'd as the chief Actors in it, altho' with the Conſent and Knowledge of the Provincial; the firſt was *Johannes Vetter* the *Prior* of the *Convent*, the ſecond *Stephanus Bolſhort* their Preacher, the third *Franciſcus Ulſchi* the *Sub prior*, the fourth *Henricus Steinſcer* the *Procurator* of the *Convent*. Not long after an Occaſion happen'd for them to begin their Deſign, a plain ſimple Taylor call'd *Johannes Jetſer* happen'd to deſire to be admitted a *Lay-brother*, at firſt they ſcorn'd him, but finding he had Money they conſented to his Admiſſion; after they had try'd him, they found him a fit Perſon to practiſe upon. Accordingly the *Sub-prior* in the Night threw Stones into his Room, and made dreadful Noiſes to affright him with the Apprehenſion of Spirits diſturbing him; the next Day they gave him Wax Lights and Holy Water and ſome Sacred Relicks to arm him, ſo that he might have the Courage to talk with the Spirit, and they inform'd him what he was to ſay to it. The next Night the Spirit, *viz.* the *Sub-prior*, comes again, and puts the poor Taylor into a miſerable Fright, ſo that he durſt not anſwer as he was inſtructed; then the Spirit comes and ſeizes upon his Throat, as tho' he were going to choak him, at which he cry'd out, and deſir'd to know how he might help him, for he was told it was the Soul of one in Purgatory that came for Relief; then the Spirit told him he muſt diſcipline himſelf for Eight Days, till the Blood came, and cauſe Eight Maſſes to be ſaid for him, and to ſay himſelf Fifty *Pater-Noſters*, and as many *Ave-Maria's* for him, and at every one to kiſs the Ground, in remembrance of *Judas* his Kiſs to Chriſt, and then he ſhould be deliver'd; all this he promis'd to diſcover to his Superiors; the Spirit bid him not be affrighted, for he was to come again Six Days after, and to bring others with him: Immediately theſe things were publickly perform'd, and mighty flocking of the People there was upon the Noiſe of it, and the *Dominicans* were cry'd up, to the great Diſgrace of the *Franciſcans*. Againſt the next time, (when *Stephen*, whom they appointed his *Confeſſor*, had found him, not miſtruſting in the leaſt any Trick in it) they told him they would certainly try whether he was a good or evil Spirit, by Two Pieces of the *Bleſſed Sacrament*, which they would have ready againſt the Time the Spirit was to appear again. The Spirit comes at the Time appointed with Two more, but the honeſt Taylor having now gotten heart by the Preſence of the Hoſt, adjures the Spirit to anſwer him, and to tell him his Buſineſs; then the Spirit reveal'd to him, that the other Two were his Tormentors, which immediately vaniſh'd away; that he had been in Purgatory One Hundred and Sixty Years; that the *Dominican* Order was the beſt in the World; that ſome were in Purgatory for contradicting St. *Thomas* his Opinion about the maculate Conception; that the City of *Bern* ſhould be deſtroy'd, unleſs the *Franciſcans* were expell'd out of it; that *Scotus* was in Purgatory for aſſerting the immaculate Conception, with many other Particulars concerning himſelf which they had learnt from him in Confeſſion. After this the Spirit appear'd in the Form of St. *Barbara*, and told him the other Spirit would now return no more, but that the *Bleſſed Virgin* would appear ſuddenly to him, which accordingly happen'd, and then reveal'd to him, that the Pope would ſhortly determine againſt the immaculate Conception; and, in favour to him, told him, that ſhe gave him ſome of the Swadling-Clouts *Jeſus* was wrapt in, and a Vial full of her Son's Blood, (ſuch another I ſuppoſe as that at St. *Maximin's* in *France*) with ſeveral other Particulars too large to be mention'd. The moſt remarkable thing after this was the next Appearance of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, who expreſs'd a great Kindneſs to him, and a Favour ſhe would confer upon him in Token of her maculate Conception; then ſhe deſir'd him to put out his Hand, at firſt he was unwilling, but durſt not refuſe; then the Spirit drove a great Nail into his Hand, and made a Wound in it, and bad him keep it open with *Aqua-fortis*, and other Corroſives; the next Night ſhe brings him Clouts to lay to it, ſuch as St. *Francis* had, but fearing he ſhould not hold out with the other four Wounds a Water was given him, which depriv'd him of all Senſe, and then were the reſt made; which, when he came to himſelf, he wonder'd at, and was ready to believe indeed that they came from Heaven, and wonder'd at himſelf how like St. *Francis* he was: Then they taught him to imitate Chriſt's Sufferings in his Carriages, by ſtretching out his Arms and hanging down his Head in publick, which drew a ſtrange Concourſe of People to ſee him, and when they gave him the Water then the *Prior* told them that he expir'd with Devotion; after this they perſuaded him to great Mortification and Abſtinence, that it might be thought he had deſerv'd theſe Revelations and Wounds by his great Merits. At laſt the poor Man diſcover'd his Confeſſor's Voice in the Habit of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, and cry'd out he was cheated; then another came with the Hoſt all bloody in his Hands, as they had colour'd it, and aſſur'd him he was the *Bleſſed Virgin*, whom he doubted of before; but his Suſpicions ſtill increas'd by their Endeavours to take them away.

Then he reſolves to leave the Convent, which they perceiving at laſt drew him to conſent to the carrying on the Deſign, which, when he had done, they began to ſhew new Tricks to the People, making the Image of the *Bleſſed Virgin* to weep, by the Help of one *Lazarus* a Painter, and *Jetzer*, to embrace it ſo faſt in a Poſture of Devotion, that he could not be ſtirr'd from it till the bloody *Euchariſt* was brought. But *Jetzer* was at length tir'd out with the Severities they us'd towards him, and afraid of being poyſon'd to prevent the Diſcovery, and ſo eſcap'd out of the Convent, and then declar'd all this Impoſture to the Magiſtrates; upon which they were all ſeiz'd upon, and after many Delays us'd in the Proſecution of them at the Court of *Rome*, they were at laſt burn'd, and their Aſhes caſt into the River, leſt they ſhould be preſerv'd for Relicks, as the Author of the Relation confeſſes they were accounted Martyrs by ſome, and thought to be very unjuſtly condemned and executed. And no doubt the violent Proſecution of them was due to their inveterate Enemies the *Franciſcans*, otherwiſe they might have eſcap'd, as other Impoſtors had done before them. But the pretending to the Wounds of St. *Francis* was an unpardonable Fault with them, and to be expiated with nothing leſs than Death.

Trithem. Chronicon Sponheim. A.D. 1509 *Petr. Mart Ep.* 341, 402. *Baſel addit. ad Naucler. Suri. Comment. rerum geſt. Del Rio diſquiſit. Magic. l.* 4. *c.* 1. *q.* 3. *ſect.* 4. *Spondan. Ann. A.D.* 1508. *n.* 5. *Petrus à Valle clauſà ſect.* 99. *Candor Lilii Vindicat. p.* 421.

This Story is not only thus related in this Book publiſh'd on purpoſe, (which I have by me) but the Truth of it is confeſs'd by *Trithemius*, by *Peter Martyr Anglerius*, by *Baſelius*, by *Surius*, by *Del Rio*, by *Spondanus*, and by *Petrus à Valle clauſâ*, all of them far enough from being ſuſpected of any Enmity to the *Roman* Church. *Bzovius* thought it the beſt way to take no notice at all of it, and ſo did *Genebrard* and *Gaultier*, conſidering what a Diſhonour it reflects on them, by the Occaſion it gives to ſuſpect other Frauds and Impoſtures which have been manag'd by better Hands. But the late *Dominican* Apologiſt *John Caſalas* would needs have it all to be a meer Contrivance of *Reuchlin*, out of his Hatred to the Monks, which is ſo ridiculous and abſurd an Evaſion, that it appears by it he had never ſeen the authentick Relation of it. But he tells us that *Antonius Senenſis* in his *Bibliotheca Ordinis Prædicatorum*, juſtifies the Men that ſuffer'd, ſaying, that they ſuffer'd innocently, being oppreſs'd by their Enemies; ſo impoſſible is it for the greateſt Frauds and Impoſtures as to Revelations and Miracles, to want Friends in the *Roman* Church.

Sleidan. Comment. l. 9. *A.* 1534.

But we muſt not think this ſort of Impoſtures was confin'd only to the *Dominican* Order; for the *Franciſcans* at *Orleans* were found out in the counterfeiting a mute Spirit, repreſenting the Soul of a Woman deceas'd that made Signs ſhe was damn'd for being a *Lutheran*, which was found to be nothing elſe but a Novice of their Order appointed by them to act that part; but after full Diſcovery of the Matter of Fact they were preſerv'd from Puniſhment for the Reputation of their Order, in a Time when the Deſign was to perſecute the *Lutherans*. This Story I confeſs is related by *Sleidan*, but I do not find it contradicted by any of their own Authors.

Ribadineira de vit. Ignatii l. 5. *c.* 10. *Del-Rio diſquiſ. Mag. l.* 2. *q.* 18, 25. *Benzo Hiſt. Novi orbis l.* 3. *c.* 16.

Of the ſame Seraphical Order, and not long after that Time, appear'd in *Spain* a notorious Impoſtor call'd *Magdalena de la Cruz*, and confeſs'd to be ſuch by *Ribadineira*, *Del-Rio*, *Benzo*, and others; ſhe was Abbeſs of the *Franciſcan* Nuns in *Corduba*, and theſe Miracles are reported of her, That being invocated in a Storm at Sea ſhe appear'd to the Mariners and the Storm ceas'd; that ſhe was frequently lifted up in Trances into the Air; that once being ſo lifted up ſhe receiv'd the Hoſt, which came out of the Hands of the Prieſt thro' the Air and enter'd into her Mouth; that when ſhe was in the Garden, and the Sacrament by chance paſs'd by in the Street, the Wall of the Garden open'd that ſhe might worſhip the Hoſt; that for many Days ſhe liv'd only upon the Bleſſed Sacrament; her Reputation by means of theſe Miracles was ſo great, that the great Ladies of *Spain* being at the point of Child-birth ſent to her their Child-Bed-Linnen to be bleſſed by her, nay, the Empreſs herſelf ſent hers from *Valladolid* to *Corduba*, and the Emperor undertook no great Expedition without conſulting her and deſiring her Prayers; and yet after all theſe things the *Dominican* Inquiſitors, being jealous of the growing Reputation by her means of the *Franciſcan* Order, found a Pretence to ſeize upon her, and upon Examination condemn'd her for a notorious Impoſtor.

Such another was *Maria de la Viſitacion*, Prioreſs *de la Annuntiada* in *Lisbon*, (of whom I have ſpoken elſewhere on another Occaſion) but ſhe was of the *Dominican* Order, (for theſe Two Orders of *Mendicants* ſtill did ſtrive to out-match each other in theſe pretended Saints and Miracles, and by their mutual Jealouſies and Animoſities theſe Impoſtures came to be diſcover'd, without which they had paſſed among the People as current as thoſe of the Founders of the Two Orders.) About her a Book was publiſh'd in *French* by *Stephen de Luſignan*, a *Dominican* Fryer, printed at *Paris* by *John Beſſant*, *A. D.* 1586. with this Title, *The great Miracles and moſt holy Wounds which this preſent Year* 1586. *have happen'd to the Right Reverend Mother, now Prioreſs of the Monaſtery* de la Annuntiada *in* Lisbon, *of the Order of Preaching Friers, approv'd by the Reverend Father Frier* Lewis *of* Granada, *and other Perſons worthy of Credit.* In his Dedication to the Queen of *France* he ſaith, That he had publiſh'd the greateſt Miracles that ever Almighty God in our Times hath wrought in the Perſon of a moſt noble, moſt vertuous, and moſt religious Virgin, moſt devoted to the Holy Sacrament, and St. *Thomas* of *Aquine*, by whoſe Merits and Interceſſions ſhe hath deſerv'd to have viſibly for her Husband Jeſus Chriſt crucify'd, his five moſt holy Wounds, by means whereof the Divine Majeſty doth continually divers Miracles. In the Letter of the Provincial *F. Antonio de la Gerda* ſent to *Rome* to be ſhew'd to the Pope, and afterwasds printed by Order, are theſe Paſſages concerning her. Mother *Mary de la Viſitacion* at Eleven Years of Age entred into the Monaſtery *de la Annuntiada*, and at Sixteen Years made Profeſſion, in which Time our Lord Jeſus Chriſt appeared to this Religious, to recompence her Merits, and took her to his Spouſe, ſaying to her the Words of the Prophet *Jeremy*, *I have loved thee with an everlaſting Love*, &c. And from that Time forward he ſtill appeared to her, granting her many particular Favours, ſpeaking and converſing familiarly with her, as one Friend doth with another, as God talked and diſcourſed with *Moſes*; and oft-times he appeared to her accompany'd with Saints of both Sexes, as with *Mary Magdalen*, St. *Dominick*, St. *Thomas* of *Aquine*, St. *Katharine* of *Siena*, and ſometimes alone, and was very familiar with her, helping her to ſay the Canonical Hours, and at the end of every Pſalm ſhe would ſay, *Gloria* Patri, *& tibi, & Spiritui Sancto.* He tells ſtrange Stories of her Raptures and Extaſies, of her miraculous Cures of Diſeaſes, and how the Hoſt came of its own Accord to her Mouth out of the place where it was kept; of her miraculous Wounds in Imitation of St. *Francis*, made by Chriſt himſelf, with Beams of Fire iſſuing from him in her Side, Hands and Feet, which opened on *Fridays*; and how ſhe was often ſeen, with a Glory about her, lifted up into the Air. To theſe *Lewis* of *Granada* adds, that for ſeven Years, every *Thurſday*, at the *Ave Mary* Hour, ſhe felt in her Head all the Pains of the Crown of Thorns; and ſhe had ſome marks of thoſe Thorns in her Head, and the Pains endured till *Friday*, the ſame Hour. Many more particular Miracles the Provincial relates of her; as, the curing of a Cancer, by applying one of the Clouts to it which was taken from the Wound in her Side; and that Inſtruments were made of the truth of this by a publick Notary; and of other Diſeaſes, by pieces of the Croſs given by her; from which *Luſignan*, among other Concluſions, draws this, that Miracles have ever continu'd in the Catholick, Apoſtolick and *Roman* Church. Such kind of Miracles I grant, have, but I think not much to the Credit of it. *Sixtus* 5. was over joy'd at the News of theſe glorious Miracles, as he expreſſed in his Letter to that purpoſe, to Cardinal *Albertus* of *Auſtria*, dated at *Rome*, *Septemb.* 10. 1584. ſubſcrib'd *Antonio Prucha Badulini*. And ſo great was her Reputation in *Spain*, that ſhe was choſen to bleſs the Standard Royal in the *Spaniſh Armada*, 1588. which was perform'd with a mighty Solemnity. After all which, in the beginning of 1589. ſhe was condemn'd for an Impoſtor, and a Book publiſh'd, ſhewing the manner how ſhe deceived the People, in this pretence of Miracles.

Ribadineir. vit. Igno. Loyolæ l. 5. 10.

Ribadineira mentions ſuch another Impoſtor, *viz.* a Nun at *Bononia*, which imitated the Pains of our Saviour on the Croſs, and ſaith, that ſhe had the Wounds in her Hands and Side, and the Pains of the Crown of Thorns on her Head, which dropt Blood from them; but ſhe had, at laſt, a very bad End: The Obſervation of which Impoſtures, made, ſaith he, *Ignatius Loyola*, in his old Age, vehemently to ſuſpect thoſe frequent Extaſies, Viſions and Revelations, which himſelf had pretended to, as much as any, in his younger Days. And afterwards he excuſeth *Ignatius Loyola* for not having his Sanctity ſo atteſted, with Miracles, as ſome expected; and ſaith, that Miracles are not neceſſary in our times. This he writ *A. D.* 1572. But although he knew *Ignatius* as well then, as ever he did afterwards; yet, when the deſign of Canonizing *Ignatius* began to be manag'd by the *Society*, then *Ribadineira* chang'd his Story; and in the leſſer Account of his Life, publiſhed afterwards, pretends to abundance of Miracles that were wrought by him. By which we may eaſily gueſs of what Credit thoſe Miracles are, which ſo intimate a Friend of *Ignatius* knew nothing of, till it was thought to be much for the Honour of their Society, that he ſhould be canoniz'd. And it is obſervable, that the Miracles mention'd by *Ribadineira*, were ſuch only which are moſt liable to Fraud and Impoſture, *viz.* caſting out of Devils, in their way, of which there are ſo many notorious Inſtances in the *Roman* Church.

Haſen Muler. Hiſtor. Jeſuitici Ordinis c. 8.

Haſenmullerus who had been himſelf a Jeſuit, relates that his Brethren, at *Rome* told him, that a Woman poſſeſſed with a Devil follow'd *Ignatius*, and cry'd, *Thou only art able to deliver me*; then *Ignatius* turning about, repeated this Verſe of *Virgil*,

Speluncam Dido, Dux & Trojanus eandem.

At which (for there is an unknown Quality in theſe Words, for caſting out Devils) the Devil threw the Woman down, and going out of her, cryd, *O thou Son of* Loyola, *like a Lyon thou ſendeſt me to Hell; but, I beſeech thee, ſend me any where elſe:* Then *Ignatius* taking pity on the poor Devil, bid him go whither he would, ſo he poſſeſſed no Body after: At which the Woman was delivered: And, as the Jeſuit, *Turrian*,

rian, ſaid, ſhe was a devout Servant of *Ignatius* all her Days. Another time, a Servant of Cardinal *Farneſe* was poſſeſſed with a ſullen Devil, that was reſolv'd not to be caſt out, but only by *Ignatius*; he was then called by the People; and he told them, *He knew that Devil well enough; he thinks to laugh at you and me too, but he ſhall be deceiv'd.* Therefore he gives a Brother, of his Order, one of the *Beads* of his *Roſary*, which was conſecrated by *Pius* the Fifth, and bid him come behind the poſſeſſed Perſon (was that fair Dealing, to come behind the Devil?) and to touch him, and ſay ſoftly, *I adjure thee, in the Name of the Virgin* Mary, *and by command of my Father* Loyola, *and by the Virtue of this bleſſed Bead, to be gone.* Immediately the Devil cry'd out, that *Loyola* tormented him; but no Perſons ſaw him there abouts: The Devil then explained himſelf, ſaying, that his Bead was of more force than all their Exorciſms; and ſo left him.

The ſame Author tells us, of his own knowledge, that at *Landſperg*, in *Germany*, there was a Carter that went to his Pariſh Prieſt, and told him, that the Devil did often Drive him to his doors, but would not go in himſelf, nor let him go in; not long after, this Fellow was taken and condemn'd for Thievery; but he pretended to be poſſeſſed with a Devil: The *Jeſuits* hearing of it, came to him, and made uſe of all their Exorciſms, but to no purpoſe. At laſt, the Rector remembring *Ignatius* his cunning way of coming behind the Devil, follows his Method, and with an *Agnus Dei* commands the Devil, in the Name of the Virgin *Mary*, to be gone; but the obſtinate Devil told him plainly, he would not be gone, unleſs the Man were ſaved from Hanging. Forthwith the *Jeſuits* got his Pardon, and the Devil was preſently gone, and the Man went away, and laughed in his Sleeve, and told others afterwards, he counterfeited being poſſeſſed, only to eſcape Hanging. But however, the *Jeſuits* boaſted of this as a great Miracle, and commended the uſe of *Agnus Dei*'s very highly for this, and ſold abundance of them (as Mountebanks do their Medicines) to the People, that were willing to be cheated. And one of the Fathers of the Society, call'd *Lutz*, made a Sermon to the People on the occaſion of this Miracle, in commendation of *Agnus Dei*'s. Many other ſuch Stories he relates of the *Jeſuits Miracles*.

But we are not to imagine, that theſe ſubtle *Jeſuits* only caſt out Devils thus in other Countries, for we have ſufficient Evidence of this Faculty of theirs here at Home: For which we are to underſtand, That in the Years 1585, and 1586, the *Jeſuits* in *England*, finding it neceſſary to animate their Party towards a Deſign then in hand, thought nothing would tend ſo much to it, as pretending to ſome great Miracles. And nothing being more eaſie to be manag'd, for the deceiving the People, than the caſting out of Devils, where they never were, this they reſolve upon. To this end they gave out, that the Places where they intended to act this Scene, were mightily haunted with Spirits; then they made choice of fit Perſons to ſhew their Tricks upon, which were hypochondriacal and diſtemper'd Men, and ſome hyſterical and fearful Women, who had all of them their Dependance on ſuch as were faſt Friends to the Deſign: Twelve Exorciſts were imploy'd to act their Parts in this Scene, under *Weſton* or *Edmonds* the *Jeſuit*, who was the chief Contriver and Manager of it. It happened that three of the Maid-Servants had been Proteſtants; theſe they told, that the Proteſtants were poſſeſſed with Devils, and that no good could be done to them, till their Baptiſm was ſet right. Then to work they go with them, as to their Baptiſm, with their Latin Charms, their Salt, Spittle, Oyl, *&c.* and gave them new Names. This being done, they took all occaſions to tell them ſtrange Stories of Exorciſms in foreign Countries, the manner of the Fits of poſſeſſed Perſons, and the Words they ſpake, and the Sights they ſaw; how they roared at the approach of any Sacred Relicks; how they could not abide the ſight of the Sacrament, or the Prieſts; how they would greatly commend Hereticks, and complain that they were burnt, if the Prieſts did but touch them. By this they very well underſtood their Parts, and they were ſoon put upon ſhewing their Skill in acting them; for at the firſt Maſs that ever one of the Maids ſaw, ſhe was put into the *Holy Chair*, and they bound her with Towels; then one of the Prieſts read in his *Book* of *Exorciſing*; but finding no alteration in her, but only from her Fear, they made her drink about a Pint of Sack and Sallet-Oyl, being hallowed and mingled with Rue and ſome kind of Spices, which they call'd the *Holy Potion.* The Maid loathed the taſte of it, which they told her came from the Devil, who hated nothing more than that Holy Drink; but ſhe was forced, by degrees, to drink it up Then ſhe grew very ſick and giddy, and fell into a cold Sweat, which made her begin to believe her ſelf poſſeſſed. After this, they burn'd Brimſtone, with other things, and made her hold down her Face over the Smoke of it: Which they did, till they made her look black in the Face. By this horrible Uſage, the Wench fell firſt into a Rage, and ſpake ſhe knew not what; then it intoxicated and benumm'd her Senſes; and, at laſt, ſhe fell into a Swoon: And, when ſhe came to her ſelf, told them they had almoſt kill'd her: And ſome of them, after this uſage (which was common to all whom they would have believed to be poſſeſſed) were reſolved rather to make away themſelves, than endure it again. They had invented pretty Names for the Devils which poſſeſſed them, *Frateretto*, *Fliberdegibbet*, *Hoberdidance*, *Tocobatto*, *Kellico*, *Porterichio*, *Motubizanto*, *Maho*, *Modu*, &c. When ever they cry'd out with Pain and Ill-uſage, they ſtill ſaid, it was the Devil in them; ſo that, at laſt, they were forced to comply with them, and to ſay juſt as they would have them, for their own Eaſe. Then the Work went on well, and the Devil commended the Queen and the Proteſtants, but declared a great hatred of Holy Water and Relicks; eſpecially of *Campian's* Thumb and *Brian's* Bones, when they apply'd them to them. All the Dreams they had in the Night, paſſed for Viſions; and as often as the Exorciſts pleaſed, what ever they ſaid, or did, was not by themſelves, but by the Devils in them. But, at laſt, when ſome of their own Party diſlik'd their Doings, and they were in great Fears of having their horrible Impoſture diſcovered, they ſoon diſpoſſeſſed all the Devils out of them. Then their care was to prevent diſcovery by theſe Perſons, whom they diſpoſed in ſeveral places, and fed with Money and Promiſes, and kept from their Friends; and ſometimes threatning them, that if they confeſſed any thing, the Devil would poſſeſs them worſe than before: And withal told them, that without an Oath they might ſay any thing to excuſe themſelves; but *Harrington*, a Prieſt, that had taken to himſelf one of the Wenches afterwards, under pretence of marrying her, told *Friſwood Williams*, which was her right Name, that if ſhe were examin'd upon Oath, the Church did diſpenſe with her, ſo as ſhe might anſwer what ſhe thought fit notwithſtanding; becauſe an Oath did not bind her to confeſs any thing that might tend to the diſhonour of their Prieſthood, or of the Catholick Church.

Before this Impoſture was diſcovered, it did the Prieſts very great Service, for *Anthony Tyrrell* one of the *Prieſts* in his Examination confeſſed, that in the compaſs of half a Year, they had gained five hundred Perſons to their Church; and ſome ſaid three or four thouſand. And the Prieſts had written ſeveral Books concerning the Miracles wrought by them, full of moſt notorious Forgeries, as appeared by the particular Examination of the Perſons pretended to be diſpoſſeſſed by them. *Tyrrell* ſaid that *Weſton* the Provincial of the *Jeſuits* had written a Quire of Paper of the *Viſions* of *Mainey*, one of the Perſons out of whom he ſaid he had caſt out Devils; and another Book to prove the Continuance of this Power in their Church, and to ſhew the Virtue of holy Relicks, eſpecially of their late Tyburn Saints, *Campian*, *Sherwin*, *Brian* and *Coltam*. This Buſineſs making ſo much noiſe put the Perſons in Authority upon enquiring more ſtrictly into it; and having at laſt ſeized upon ſome of the Perſons concerned in it; in their ſeveral Examinations upon Oath they confeſſed the whole Cheat, as I have delivered it from them. Their Examinations were entred upon Record in the *Court* of *High-commiſſion*, and afterwards publiſhed *A. D.* 1604. with a particular Declaration of the whole Impoſture. In which any Perſon may ſatisfy himſelf of the truth of what I have reported, and abundance of Circumſtances which I have omitted. *Tyrrell* the Prieſt upon his Oath *June* 15. 1602. declared in his Confeſſion written with his own hand, that having peruſed the Examinations of *Sarah Williams* and *Friſwood* her Siſter, of *Anne Smith* and of *Richard Mainey*, he was fully perſwaded that they have depoſed the truth in ſuch points whereof they were examined belonging to their pretended Poſſeſſion or Diſpoſſeſſion. The effect whereof, ſaith he, is, *that they were drawn by our cunning Carriage of Matters, to ſeem, as though they had been poſſeſſed, when as in truth they were not, neither were any of the Prieſts ignorant in my Conſcience of their Diſſimulation, nor the Parties themſelves, (as now it appeareth) of our diſſembled Proceeding with them.* And afterwards adds a very material thing, *viz. For although both my ſelf, (and ſo I think of the reſt) did know that all was but counterfeit, yet for as much as we perceived that thereby great Credit did grow to the Catholick Cauſe, and great Diſcredit to the Proteſtants, we held it lawful to do as we did. For the general Conceit,* ſaith he, *among all the Prieſts of that Order is, that they may deny any thing, which being confeſſed doth turn to the Diſhonour of the Catholick Church of* Rome; and concludes his Confeſſion with ſaying, *that they do not account it evil, (as I verily think) to calumniate the Proteſtants by any Device whatſoever, that may carry any Probability with it, nor make any Conſcience at all to tell and publiſh any Untruths, which they think, being believed, may advance and promote ſuch Points and Matters as they take upon them to defend for the Honour of the Church of* Rome *and Dignity of their Prieſthood.* Judge now Reader, whether ſuch Perſons do not deſerve the higheſt Credit in all their Stories of Miracles, who think it lawful both to cheat and lie for the ſake of their Church.

Not Twenty Years after the Diſcovery of this Impoſture we find them at the ſame work again, when they writ *the faithful Narration of the Proceedings of the Catholick Gentlemen with the Boy of* Bilſon; with this Sentence at the beginning and end of it. *Non nobis Domine, non nobis; ſed Nomini tuo da Gloriam.* Whereas the Hiſtory of this Impoſture is ſo particularly laid open by the Confeſſion of the Boy himſelf, that it would make any others (but ſuch as have the Impudence to compare their Frauds and Impoſtures with the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles) be aſhamed ever to mention or own it.

Thuan. hiſt. l. 123. Such another Impoſture *Thuanus* at large relates concerning *Martha Broſſier, A. D.* 1599. which gave great Diſturbance in *France*, happening ſo ſoon after the Edict of *Nants*. One *James Broſſier* being weary of his poor Employment at home, wanders from Place to Place with his three Daughters, and this *Martha* pretended to be poſſeſſed with an evil Spirit, and although the Cheat was diſcovered in other Places, yet at *Paris* they hoped to meet with ſome who would be ready to make uſe of ſuch a counterfeit Poſſeſſion for their own ends; accordingly there the *Capuchins* preſently lay hold upon her, and perſwade the People ſhe was really poſſeſſed; the *Archbiſhop* of *Paris* diſliking the *Capuchins* Proceedings appointed ſome of the ableſt Phyſicians in *Paris* to watch and examine her, who preſently ſuſpected the Impoſture, but deſired further time and advice. In the mean while *Fr. Seraphin* very ſolemnly falls to his *Exorciſms*, and ſhe acted her Part ſo artificially with writhing her Body, rolling her Eyes, and trembling of all her Joints as cauſed great Aſtoniſhment in the Spectators; but at theſe Words *Homo factus eſt*, ſhe moved her whole body in ſo ſtrange a manner from the Altar to the doors of the Chappel, that *Fr. Seraphin* cried out; *if there be any Infidel yet among you let him come and try his Strength with this Spirit.* At which *Mareſcot* the *Phyſician* ſaid he would do it; then the cunning Gypſie cried that the Spirit had left her; wherein ſhe was ſeconded by the Exorciſt. While the Phyſicians were by, ſhe lay very ſtill, but ſhe no ſooner thought them gone, but ſhe was at her old tricks. Then theſe Phyſicians were ſhut out and others brought in, who would be more favourable to the deſign, and by theſe a Certificate was drawn up atteſted by themſelves that ſhe was really poſſeſſed; and an Abbot affirmed that when ſhe was held by ſix Men ſhe got above their Heads four Foot into the Air and there ſtood. When this account of her was publiſhed, *Mareſcot* confuted it anſwering all their Arguments and giving an account of all the ſtrange Symptoms which were ſeen in her. But ſo much were the People moved by this, that there was great danger of a Tumult, the King therefore gave order to the Parliament to prevent riotous Meetings, and to commit the protended poſſeſſed Perſon to the Care of Phyſicians, who returned this Anſwer, that they could find nothing preternatural in her; then great Clamors were made by the People and ſeditious Preachers that the Priviledges of the Church were infringed, and that all this was done in favour of the *Hugonots*; to take away from the Catholick Church the Glory of her Miracles; after ſevere Animadverſion on theſe factious Preachers and Friers; *Martha* was ſent whom with her Father and Siſters, and confined thither. But the *Biſhop* of *Clermont* and his Brother carried her away to *Avignon*, and refuſed to obey the Summons ſent them by the Parliament; and the King ſent to Cardinal *Oſſat* his Ambaſſador at *Rome* to acquaint the Pope with the whole Matter, before they came thither: It happened that *Sirmondus* was then with Cardinal *Oſſat*, him he imploys to the General of the *Order* of *Jeſuits* (who were ſuſpected to be Friends to the Brothers who had been bred up in their Society) that if they medled in this Matter, it would be their greateſt hindrance to their Reſtitution in *France*, which they had then good hopes of. Upon this, the *Jeſuits* forſook them, and they were forced to ſubmit to the King; and ſo poor *Martha* was quite diſpoſſeſſed. Thus we ſee what Intrigues and Deſigns were carried on by ſuch Impoſtures in the Roman Church; that when ſuch things eſcape Examination they paſs for Miracles, but when they are throughly ſearched into, they appear to be meer Cheats and Impoſtures.

I ſhall conclude this Diſcourſe of Impoſtures with theſe Paſſages out of the *Lord Herbet*'s Hiſtory of *Henry* VIII.

Herbert's *Hiſt. of* Hen. *VIII.* A.D. 1538. p. 431.

“ The King having Iſſue Male, proceeded more confidently in his
“ Deſigns; and becauſe he knew that the pretended and falſe Miracles
“ of Prieſts had ſeduced many ignorant People to a ſuperſtitious
“ Obedience to the *Romiſh See* and Reverence of *Monaſteries*,
“ he reſolved to detect them, at leaſt as many as he could;
“ for divers were ſo cunningly repreſented, as they had kept their
“ Credit for ſome Ages; the manner of theſe times being, if a Man
“ were reſtored to his Health upon a Pilgrimage, or obtained any
“ thing he deſired upon a Vow to ſome Saint, never to ſtudy
“ other cauſe. And here out of our Records I ſhall mention ſome
“ of the Images and Relicks to which the Pilgrimages of thoſe times
“ brought Devotion and Offerings; as our Lady's Girdle, ſhewed
“ in eleven ſeveral Places, and her Milk in eight, the Bell of
“ St. *Gutblac*, and the Felt of St. *Thomas* of *Lancaſter*, both Remedies
“ for the Head-ach; the Pen-knife and Boots of St. *Thomas*
“ of *Canterbury*, and a piece of his Shirt much reverenced
“ by great-belly'd Women; the Coals that roaſted St. *Laurence*;
“ two or three Heads of St. *Urſula*, *Malcus*'s Ear, and the pairing
“ of St. *Edmond*'s Nails; the Image of an Angel with one
“ Wing which brought hither the Spears Head that pierced Chriſt's
“ ſide; an Image of our Lady with a Taper in her hand, which
“ burned nine Years together without waſting, till one forſwearing
“ himſelf thereon, it went out; and was now found to be but
“ a piece of Wood: Our Lady of *Worceſter*, from which certain
“ Veils and Dreſſings being taken, there appeared the Statue of a
“ Biſhop ten foot high; theſe and others were now brought forth
“ and with great Oſtentation ſhewed to the People. Among which
“ were two notable Trumperies I cannot omit: One was the *Rood*
“ of *Grace* at *Boxley* in *Kent*; which being made with divers

“ vices to turn the eyes and move the lips was ſhewed publickly at St. *Paul's Croſs* by *John Biſhop of Rocheſter* and there broken and pulled in pieces. The other was at *Hales* in *Glouceſterſhire*, where the Blood of Chriſt brought from *Jeruſalem* being kept [as was affirmed for divers Ages, had drawn many great Offerings to it from remote Places: and it was ſaid to have this Property, that if a Man were in mortal Sin, and not abſolved he could not ſee it; otherwiſe very well: Therefore every Man that came to behold this Miracle confeſt himſelf firſt to a Prieſt there, and then offering ſomething to the Altar, was directed to a Chappel where the Relick was ſhewed; the Prieſt who confeſt him (in the mean while) retiring himſelf to the back Part of the ſaid Chappel, and putting forth a Cabinet or Tabernacle of Chryſtal, which being thick on the one ſide that nothing could be ſeen through it, but on the other ſide thin and tranſparent they uſed diverſely: For if a Rich and Devout Man entred, they would ſhew the thick ſide, till he had paid for as many Maſſes, and given as large Alms as they thought fit: After which (to his great joy) they permitted him to ſee the thin ſide and the Blood. Which yet (as my Author a Clerk of the Council to *Edward* the ſixth, and living in thoſe times affirms) was proved to be the Blood of a Duck every week renewed by the Prieſts, who kept the ſecret betwixt them. Beſides which, the Images of our *Lady* of *Walſingham*, of *Ipſwich*, of *Fenriſe*, of *Iſlington*, and St. *John* of *Oſulſton* (called otherwiſe Mr. *John Shorn*) who was ſaid to ſhut up the Devil in a Boot, and divers others were publickly burnt.

“ And by this means the Monaſteries grew infamous where moſt of theſe Images were kept, and divers were undeceived who before held a Reverend Opinion of theſe pretended Relicks and Miracles.

P. 437. 438.

“ After which, he relates, how the King diſcovered the Forgery of the Miracles pretended to be wrought at *Thomas Beckets* Shrine, and that the Skull which the People did ſo much venerate, was not his own, that being found together with his Body in the Tomb.

I leave it now to the Judgment of the Reader, what Credit ſuch Miracles deſerve, which are reported by Perſons who think it lawful to lie in theſe matters, and which, where ſtrict Examination hath been made, have been diſcovered ſo often to be notorious Impoſtures? And this may abundantly ſuffice for the firſt particular, which was the comparing the Miracles of the Roman Church with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles in point of Credibility.

Their Miracles being granted do not prove their Churches Infallibility.

§. 12. 2. I come to compare them as to the Teſtimony given by them to Infallibility, *i. e.* whether the Miracles ſuppoſed to be wrought in the Roman Church do equally prove that Church infallible as thoſe wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles did prove them infallible.

For clearing of this I ſhall premiſe theſe particulars.

1. That it is agreed on both ſides, that the Miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, did ſufficiently prove that they were Teachers ſent from God. For we are aſſured by the univerſal Teſtimony of all Chriſtians (not contradicted by their greateſt Adverſaries) that the firſt Preachers of the Chriſtian Religion did work ſo many, ſo publick, ſo great Miracles, that all impartial Perſons could not but look upon them as Perſons immediately ſent by God. And Chriſt himſelf declared *that this was* the end for which he did thoſe miraculous Works, *that Men might believe* Mat. 11. 5. *by them that God hath ſent him*, that without theſe *Men might* John 5. *have had an excuſe for their Infidelity*, that *his Works did bear* 36. 15. 24. *witneſs of him*; And his Evangeliſt declares, *that this was the end for which theſe Miracles are recorded, that Men might believe* 20. 30, 31. *that Jeſus was the Son of God.* Afterwards, when he was riſen from the dead, and he ſent abroad his Diſciples to preach the Goſpel, he told them that *God would bear them witneſs by divers* Mark. 16. *Signs and Miracles and Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt*, of which we 17, 18. have a full account in the Books of the New Teſtament. As to Heb. 2. 4. all which Miracles we have not the leaſt ground of Suſpicion of any Fraud or Impoſture, being publickly done in the preſence of Enemies, and written in a time when the Teſtimony of Writers might be eaſily contradicted, and when all imaginable Ways were uſed to make the firſt Witneſſes of theſe things to recant their Teſtimonies, by the greateſt Severities and Perſecutions: inſtead of which they perſiſted with great Reſolution, and laid down their Lives rather than weaken the Teſtimony which they had given. Thus we ſee ſuch great and extraordinary Effects of divine Power which we ought to call Miracles, were wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles on purpoſe to confirm their own Authority that they were Perſons ſent from God, and therefore could not deceive the World in the Doctrine delivered by them.

2. The Authority and Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles being thus confirmed by the Miracles wrought by them, there cannot be any ſuch Neceſſity in ſucceeding Ages to confirm the ſame Doctrine by Miracles. For if it were once fully proved by thoſe Miracles then wrought, there can want nothing further to eſtabliſh the Faith of ſucceeding Ages than a certain conveyance of thoſe Miracles to them. Thoſe Miracles being wrought for the benefit of ſucceeding Ages, as well as of that preſent Age: And if thoſe Miracles would not ſerve for the Ages following as well as that preſent time, it might with as much reaſon be ſaid that then they did ſerve only for thoſe who ſaw them. For on the ſame ground that Perſons then, in regard of diſtance of Place, were bound to believe although they did not ſee them wrought; ſo likewiſe are others in regard of diſtance of time, only ſuppoſing the certainty of conveyance to be equal. But it is with much advantage to us, by the concurrent Teſtimony of ſo many Ages, and the Effects of the Doctrine confirmed by thoſe Miracles upon ſo many Nations of the World, notwithſtanding all the Power and Subtilty which were uſed againſt it.

The leſs the neceſſity and the greater the pretence to Miracles, ſo much more reaſon there is to ſuſpect them. Becauſe God, we are certain, doth not imploy his Power in going beyond the common effects of Nature to little or no purpoſe. When we ſee, that in all the Writings of Scripture Miracles were very ſparingly wrought, unleſs it were for the Confirmation of a new Religion, as that of *Moſes* and *Chriſt*; if afterwards we find ſuch abundance of Miracles pretended to, that no Age or Country of one ſort of Men, but give out that Multitudes of theſe are done among them, what, muſt we think that God hath changed the Method of his Providence? and not rather, that God is true, but ſuch Men are Liars, or through Ignorance and Credulity take thoſe for Miracles which are not ſo.

4. Thoſe cannot be true Miracles which are pretended to be wrought to confirm a Doctrine contrary to what is already confirmed by Miracles. For God will never imploy his Power to contradict himſelf; he may in the eſtabliſhing of one Religion foretel the coming of another afterwards in its Room by his own Appointment as in the Goſpel ſucceeding the Law; but the latter Miracles in this caſe do not contradict, but rather confirm the Doctrine of the former; but when he hath declared that no other Religion ſhall come into the World after that which is confirmed by Miracles, as it is with the Chriſtian Religion, then to ſuppoſe Miracles wrought to confirm any Doctrine contrary to that, is to ſuppoſe that God by Miracles ſhould contradict himſelf. Therefore although in the beginning of a Religion, the Doctrine is to be proved by Miracles, yet that being once ſuppoſed, Miracles afterwards are to be tryed by the Doctrine. And then though an Angel from Heaven ſhould preach, or offer to confirm any other Doctrine by Miracles than that which was firſt confirmed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, we are bound to reject that Doctrine and to ſuſpect thoſe Miracles not to be from God.

5. Where falſe and lying Miracles are foretold by a Doctrine confirmed by true Miracles; there can be no reaſon to believe upon ſuch Miracles till they are evidently diſtinguiſhed from ſuch as are deceitful. Now this is plainly the Caſe in the Chriſtian Religion, Chriſt himſelf hath foretold that *Men ſhall ariſe doing ſuch great Wonders in imitation of him as ſhould deceive if it were poſſible the very elect*; and his Apoſtles: *that his greateſt Enemies ſhould appear with all Power and Signs and lying Wonders.* Can any thing be now more reaſonable than after ſuch Forewarnings for us to examin all Pretences of Miracles, by trying whether they can be evidently diſtinguiſhed from all deceitful Appearances of Miracles; which may be wrought by a Power leſs than divine? For in this caſe the Evidence muſt be ſuch, as the Perſons concerned are to judge by; to tell them any Diſtinctions which they cannot proceed by in the Judgment of Miracles, is to ſpeak impertinently, where Rules of Judgment are required.

Matth. 24. 24. 2 Theſſ. 2. 9.

6. If the continuance of the Power of Miracles be aſſerted to prove the Churches Infallibility in every Age, there muſt not only evident Proof be given that ſuch Miracles are wrought, but that they are wrought for this very end. For if God may work Miracles for another end, either to ſhew his Providence in general, or particular Regard to ſome Men, then the meer proving Miracles cannot be ſufficient, but it muſt be ſhewed that theſe Miracles

cles could be wrought for no other end, but to prove the Church infallible.

Theſe things being premiſed I now come to ſhew.

1. That in the Roman Church, they cannot give any evident diſtinction between the Miracles they pretend to, and ſuch which we are bid to beware of.

2. That they can never prove that the Miracles wrought in their Church could be wrought for no other end, than to prove the Infallibility of their Church.

1. That in the Roman Church they cannot give any evident Diſtinction between their Miracles and ſuch as we are bid to beware of. For which we are to conſider, that ſcarce any Religion or Superſtition hath obtained in the World, but it hath pretended to be confirmed by ſome kind of Miracles; which in it ſelf is no more a Prejudice to true Miracles than ſophiſtical Arguments are to true reaſoning. But thoſe who pretend to Miracles in a Church which is founded on a Doctrine confirmed by undoubted Miracles muſt give ſuch evidence of the Truth of them, as may apparently diſtinguiſh them from all falſe Pretences.

For if they give no other Anſwers to ſuch pretences of Miracles as they condemn in others, but what will deſtroy the Authority of the Miracles aſſerted by themſelves, then they can prove no more the Churches Infallibility by their Miracles, than either Philoſophers, Heathens, or Hereticks could do by theirs. If the bare pretence of Miracles would ſerve, for all that I know *Pythagoras* might deſerve at leaſt as much Eſteem as St. *Francis*, or St. *Dominick*; for the Scholars of the one delivered as unanimouſly the Report of his Miracles, as the Diſciples of the other could do. *Pythagoras* his taming the *Daunian Bear*, (reported ſaith *Porphyrie* in his Life by antient Writers of good Credit) and charging him never after to hurt any living Creature, was to my Underſtanding as great a Miracle as St. *Francis* his taming the Wolf. And his whiſpering the *Tarentine Bull* in the ear, and perſwading him to eat no more beans, (who for his great abſtinence afterwards was called *the ſacred Bull*) was altogether as good an Argument of the reſtoring the State of Innocency to him, as the Command over brute Creatures was to St. *Francis*, or any other Legendary Saints. The Rivers ſaluting him (whether it were called *Caucaſus* as *Porphyrie* hath it, or *Neſſus* as *Laertius*, and *Jamblichus*, or *Coſas* as *Ælian*, or whatever were the true Name of it) was as great an Argument of his Sanctity, as the Trees in *Turſellinus*, bowing to the Chappel of *Loreto* were of the miraculous Sanctity of it. Why ſhould not his being ſeen at the ſame time at *Metapont* in *Italy*, and *Tauromenium* in *Sicily*, be as great a Wonder, as the being ſeen in ſeveral places at once has been reported of ſeveral of the Romiſh Saints? Why ſhould not his *golden thigh* be as miraculous, as the reſtored Leg at *Zaragoſa*? unleſs the *Prieſt Abaris* be proved a falſer Witneſs, than *Hieronimus Brizids*; or the People of *Zaragoſa* leſs ſuſpected of Partiality, than the *Greeks*, at the *Olympick* games: at which ſome Authors tells us, *Pythagoras* ſhewed his *Golden Thigh*. Why ſhould St. *Francis* his *Aſs* that ſtood ſtill to hear him preach, be more miraculous, than the *Aſs*, which *Suidas* reports, heard *Ammo-*

Porphyr. vit. Pythag.

nianus Lectures? Why ſhould the ſpeaking of Images in the Roman Church prove the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, more than it did in old Heathen *Rome?* For as the Roman Breviary ſaith *that an Image ſpake to Aquinas, and commended his Writings*, ſo the old Roman Writers ſay, *that the Image of Fortune ſpake not once but twice to the Matrons and commended their Dedication of her*; and ſo did the Image of *Juno Moneta* at *Veij* to the Souldier that aſked her whether ſhe would go to *Rome?* To whom ſhe anſwered, *ſhe would.* Why may not *Æſculapius*'s Cure of the Woman in his Temple at *Epidaurus* mentioned by *Ælian* be thought as ſtrange as *Xaverius*'s appearing to *Fr.* Marcellus *Maſtrilli* at *Naples*, and curing him upon his Promiſe to go to the *Indies?* Which is another of the Miracles ſo much magnifyed by *E. W.* If there be any Difference, that of *Æſculapius* ſeems the greater Miracle? Why ſhould not the Miracles attributed to the Emperors *Veſpaſian*, *Adrian*, and *Aurelian*, related by *Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, *Spartianus*, and *Vopiſcus*, have as much Credit at leaſt as thoſe of the Legendary Saints? Since the Writers of them are looked on as Men of more Sincerity and Integrity, by thoſe of their own Church, than the Authors of the Lives of the Saints are.

Suid. v. Ammonian.

Val. Max. l. 1. c. 8. n. 3, 4.

Ælian. de animal. l. 9. c. 33.

Tacit. Hiſt. 4. Sueton. Veſp. c. 7. Spartian. in Adrian. Vopiſcus in Aurel.

But to come yet nearer, how can their pretended Miracles prove the Church they are wrought in to be the true Church and infallible; ſince by their own Confeſſion, Miracles to all appearance as great have been wrought among *Hereticks* and in a *falſe Church?* And by the Anſwers they give to theſe we ſhall eaſily judge, how far they can give evidence of the Truth of their own Miracles.

The Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians report ſeveral Miracles that have been wrought by *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*; *Philoſtorgius* attributes the Power of Miracles to the *Arian Biſhops*, to *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Nicomedia*, to *Agapetus* Biſhop of *Synada*, of whom he ſaith *that he raiſed the dead and healed all ſorts of Diſeaſes*, to *Theophilus*, to *Aëtius*, *Eunomius*, *Leontius*, *Candidus*, *Evagrius*, *Arrianus*, and *Florentius*. *Socrates* attributes the ſame Power to the *Novatians*; as to *Paulus* the Biſhop of that Party when he was to baptize the Jewiſh Impoſtor, and the Water miraculouſly diſappeared; and *Sozomen* to *Eutychianus* of the ſame Party; and the *Donatiſts*, to *Pontius* and *Donatus* as we have already ſeen from St. *Auguſtin*. Now if the tryal of the Church in thoſe days had been by Miracles, I would fain know on which ſide the Advantage had been? St. *Chryſoſtom* diſowns any ſuch thing as a continuance of the Power of Miracles in the Biſhops of the Catholick Church, as beſides the Places already produced to that purpoſe, may be ſeen in ſeveral others, wherein he ſuppoſes, *that there is not ſo much as a Footſtep of that Power of Miracles left in the Church which was in the Apoſtles*; he aſſerts, *that God hath put a ſtop to Miracles, that he doth not give it to the moſt worthy Perſons, that they were intended only for Unbelievers, and that there is no need of them where the Chriſtian Faith is ſettled.* What now ſhould be ſaid in this Caſe? For it is juſt the ſame as between us and the Church of *Rome*, the Catholick Biſhops pretended no more to a Power of Miracles than the Proteſtant Biſhops do now; but the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, *Novatians* and *Donatiſts* all challenged this power of Miracles to themſelves, therefore it is a plain caſe, if the Church of

Philoſtorg apud Phot. Cod. 40. & apud Nicetam. Choniat. l. 5. c. 7. Philoſtorg. l. 2. Tom. 8 l. 3. Tom. 4. l. 4. n. 7. l. 9. n. 1. Socrat. l. 7. c. 17. Sozom. l. 1. c. 14.

εἰ δὲ τῆς μὲν δυνάμεως ἐκείνης οὐδὲ ἴχνος ὑπολέλειπται &c. Chryſ. de ſacerd. l. 4. p. 35. τὰ σημεῖα ἔπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς in Matth. hom. 33. νῦν δὲ οὐδὲ ἀξίοις δίδωσι. Tom. 5. p. 277. Tom. 6. p. 148.

of *Rome* be now in the right, then ſo were theſe Heretical and Schiſmatical Parties, if the Proteſtants be miſtaken, ſo were St. *Chryſoſtom* and the Biſhops of the Catholick Church.

But what Anſwer now do theſe Men give to theſe Inſtances? Even ſuch as very eaſily returns upon themſelves, and upon the very ſame grounds we may overthrow the Authority of their Miracles.

1. They ſay, *the Teſtimony of the Writers ought to be ſuſpected of Partiality to their own ſide.* So *Malderus* anſwers the Teſtimony of *Socrates*; ſaying, *that he either feigned, or related theſe Miracles to the Honour of his own Party*; but this Anſwer is both falſe and deſtructive to themſelves. It is falſe, becauſe notwithſtanding what *Baronius*, *La-bè*, and others have ſaid, *Socrates* was no *Novatian*, as *Henri Valeſius*, hath well provided in his Preface to his Hiſtory. But ſuppoſe he were, muſt the Authority of all Perſons be taken away that relate things to the Honour of their own Church? What then becomes of all the Miracles of the *Roman* Church? Are they atteſted by any but ſuch who are well-wiſhers to the truth of them? And that may go a great way in the Belief of them. Were not *Gabriel de Aldama* the Vicar General and *Hieronimus Brizids* and the reſt of the Subſcribers as great Friends to the Church of *Rome*, and as much concerned for the honour of it, as *Socrates* could be for the *Novatians*? Why then ſhould their Teſtimony for the reſtored Legate *Zaragoſa* be more creditable than *Socrates* his, for *Paulus* the *Novatian* Biſhop? So that, if Intereſt takes away all Authority in theſe Matters, then we cannot ſafely believe the Teſtimony of any in the Church of *Rome*, for the Miracles wrought in it; if notwithſtanding that, the Authority of Witneſſes ſtands good, then Miracles may be wrought in heretical or ſchiſmatical Churches, and conſequently can prove nothing as to the Truth, or Infallibility of the Church. But neither the *Novatians*, nor *Arians*, nor *Donatiſts* were convicted of ſo many Forgeries in this Matter of Miracles as thoſe of the Church of *Rome* have been; they never thought it lawful, that we can find, to tell lies for the honour of their Church; both which we have already proved concerning the reporters of Miracles in the *Roman* Church; and therefore their Teſtimony ought more to be ſuſpected in this Matter, than that of honeſt Heathens or Hereticks.

Malder. in Thom. 2 2. q. 1. ar. 5. ſect. 6.

2. They anſwer, *that notwithſtanding all the outward Appearance of Miracles, the things done by them might be no true Miracles.* So *Malderus* goes on ſaying, *that the pretended* Miracle *of* Paulus *the Novatian Biſhop, was not ſuch as did exceed the Power of the Devil.* And *Bellarmin* grants *that there can be no infallible Certainty of the truth of a Miracle before the Approbation of the Church*; the reaſon he gives is this, *becauſe though the Devil can do no true Miracles, yet he can do the greateſt to appearance.* Now I would fain underſtand this, how Miracles can prove the Truth and Infallibility of the Church, if the Truth of Miracles depends upon the Churches Approbation? *i. e.* Whether I muſt not firſt believe the Church to be true, before I can poſſibly be certain whether a Miracle be true or not? I know, *Bellarmin* ſaith, *that the Church is proved by* Miracles *not as to infallible Certainty*;

Bellarm. de notis Eccl. l. 4. c. 14.

but as to the Evidence of Credibility. But what Evidence of Credibility can there be from Miracles, where no one can be certain whether they be Miracles or not? For the making Faith credible by Miracles doth ſuppoſe thoſe Miracles to be firſt certainly known to be ſuch; but in this caſe, if the Power of the Devil can extend ſo far, as that no certain Difference can be aſſigned between true and apparent Miracles, but from the Churches Approbation, how is it poſſible the Church ſhould be certainly known by Miracles, if the Miracles cannot be certainly known but by the Church? So that for us to diſtinguiſh the Miracles done by Hereticks and thoſe in the Catholick Church, we muſt appeal to the Judgment of the Catholick Church; and yet our way to know, which is the Catholick Church ſaith *E. W.* and his Brethren muſt be by Miracles; *i. e.* we muſt know a Man by ſuch Marks which we cannot know to be the Marks of ſuch a Man till we firſt know the Man. But it may be others ſpeak more conſiſtently and reaſonably in this Matter: And therefore,

3. They anſwer, *that although Hereticks may do real Miracles yet not for the Confirmation of their Hereſy; but of ſome common Truth.* So the ſame *Malderus* ſaith, *that the Novatian Miracle being granted to be true, doth not confirm the Error of the Novatians, but the truth of the Sacrament, for the Jew was baptized before by the* Arians *and* Macedonians. So *Michael Medina* ſalves the Miracles wrought among the *Pagans, that they did give Teſtimony to Divine Providence and not to their particular Superſtitions. Fevardentius* confeſſes the Church hath never determined that Hereticks cannot work true Miracles, and that thoſe who hold the affirmative have plain Teſtimonies of Fathers for them; which he there mentions. If this be true, then Miracles now can prove nothing as to the Truth or Infallibility of the Church, when the Communions of Chriſtians are different from each other; for the Miracle wrought may only be for the Atteſtation of ſome common Truths received among all Chriſtians, or to manifeſt the Providence of God to the World.

Mich. Medina de recta in Deum fide l. 2. c. 7. p. 53.

Fevardent. not. in Iren. l. 2. c. 56.

Among their late Writers none hath conſidered this Difficulty with more Care and Diligence than Father *Lingendes* hath done, both with a reſpect to the Miracles of Heathens and Hereticks. “To which he thus anſwers. 1. That for the moſt part, they were falſe and counterfeit, at leaſt they were not true Miracles, if the name of Miracle be taken ſtrictly and properly; for, ſaith he, either they were meer Illuſions of the Senſes, or they did not exceed any created Power, either in the ſubſtance or the manner of them, and therefore the Devils might eaſily effect them. 2. That ſome Circumſtances did diſcover the Impoſture, when true Miracles were wrought in oppoſition to them, as in *Pharaohs Magicians* and *Simon Magus:* Otherwiſe God would not permit evil Men to work Miracles. 3. That God hath given a moſt certain Rule for the Tryal of Miracles, *viz. God is faithful and cannot deny himſelf:* And therefore he cannot be the Author of Miracles whereby things contrary to each other are confirmed. Wherefore ſaith he, if a Faith once eſtabliſhed by Miracles be impugned by other Miracles, we are to believe the latter Miracles to be meer Impoſture. For the Apoſtle tells us, *that Jeſus Chriſt is not yea and nay, but a Yea and Amen;* and *although we or an Angel from Heaven preach another Goſpel; let him be Anathema.* See the Wiſ-

Lingendes Concion. in Quadrag. Tom. 2. Conc. 2.

2 Cor. 1. 19, 20.

Gal. 1. 8.

“dom of the Apoſtle: He brings us back to the firſt preaching, which was not lightly eſtabliſhed but with innumerable Miracles, which were moſt certain and moſt manifeſt: From whence he concludes that all others that are brought to confirm any Doctrine contrary to this ought to be rejected. But of what ſort? Even though an Angel or an Apoſtle ſhould preach another Doctrine; for, ſaith he, among things impoſſible, that is the moſt impoſſible that God ſhould lie; which is far more impoſſible than that an Angel ſhould; and conſequently what God hath once atteſted by Miracles, can be leſs falſe than when an Angel hath atteſted; or the Apoſtle ſpake this, that by this means we may diſcover the Devil, when he transforms himſelf into an Angel of Light. 4. If any true Miracles were wrought among Heathens and Infidels, as it may be ſome were; yet none were ever wrought to confirm any Falſhood or Error, but for ſome truth, or ſome Benefit to Mankind, among which he reckons the Miracles of *Claudia* the *Roman Lady* and of the *veſtal Virgin* to give teſtimony to their Innocency. After this he deſcends to a more particular Examination of the Miracles of Hereticks and falſe Chriſtians; and as to theſe he lays down theſe Propoſitions. 1. That Miracles are of two kinds, ſome ſtrictly and properly ſo called, which are Effects exceeding all created Powers, either as to the ſubſtance or the manner of them; as the curing a Man born blind, the raiſing the Dead, *&c.* others, are ſuch as exceed the common Power of Nature, although there be ſome ſecret and hidden Cauſes of them that may lye within the Compaſs of Nature. The firſt ſort he ſaith, are the only undoubted Teſtimonies of Truth; but the other may be wrought by the Devil's Power, either by local Motion, or the Application of the Power of natural Agents. Of this ſort, ſaith he, are the Miracles done by falſe Chriſts and falſe Prophets and by Antichriſts; and among theſe he reckons all manner of Cures, when the Diſeaſes are not wholly incurable. 2. He ſaith that Miracles of this later ſort are equivocal Signs and may be referred to different Cauſes, and therefore nothing can be determined by them conſidered in themſelves; becauſe they may be done by a different Power and for a different End. When they are done for Oſtentation, or Delight, or Curioſity, they cannot have God for their Author; much leſs when they are wrought to confirm a falſe Doctrine, or for an evil end; therefore when ſuch Miracles are wrought for Confirmation of an Error they have not God but the Devil for their Cauſe. For although they be equivocal of themſelves, yet the determining of them to an evil end ſuch as the Confirmation of an Error is, takes away all equivocalneſs in them. 3. He aſſerts that true and proper Miracles in the firſt Senſe, although moſt commonly wrought by good Men as Gods Inſtruments, yet may ſometimes be done, by wicked Men, and Hereticks and Infidels. For which he inſtances in *Balaam*, and thoſe our Saviour mentions, who ſhould boaſt of the Miracles they had wrought in his Name, which Chriſt doth not deny, but only rejects them for being workers of Iniquity; and in *Judas*, who wrought Miracles with the other Apoſtles, altho' we do not read that the *Bleſſed Virgin*, or *Joſeph*, or *John* the Baptiſt ever wrought any. He obſerves from St. *Auſtin* that God gives this Power of Miracles to evil Men when he denies it to good. 1. Leſt the Power ſhould be attributed to the Inſtrument; or ſeem to take its

" Virtue from thence. 2. Becauſe Miracles are not wrought for the
" good of the efficient, but for the good of others. 3. Leſt Men ſhou'd
" ſet a higher value upon Miracles than upon true Goodneſs and Vir-
" tue. For, ſaith he, this is a falſe Conſequence, ſuch a Man does
" Miracles, therefore he is approved or his Doctrine; ſuch a place Mi-
" racles are wrought in, therefore ſuch a place is approved; for, by
" this conſequence, wicked Men, Hereticks and Inſidels would be ap-
" proved, of whom it is certain that they have wrought Miracles.
" 4. Such kind of Miracles though they may be done by Hereticks can
" never be wrought for the Confirmation of Error; for that were to
" charge God himſelf with Falſhood; but Miracles of the other ſort
" he grants may be wrought for the Confirmation of Errors, becauſe
" they are ſuch as do not exceed the Devils Power; and in this caſe
" to know whether they come from God or the Devil, muſt be taken
" from the end for which they are wrought; as he ſhews from St. *Auſtin.*
From which Diſcourſe of *Lingendes* it follows, that ſince the Confirmation of Chriſtian Religion by Miracles, the only certain way of diſtinguiſhing true and deceitful Miracles is from the end for which they were wrought: For he grants that to all outward appearance, Hereticks and falſe Chriſtians may do as great as any; nay God himſelf may uſe them as his Inſtruments to confirm Truth by; but we are ſure God cannot employ his Power to confirm a Falſhood. Since therefore we are forewarned that Men ſhall appear with ſuch Signs and lying Wonders, *as would if it were poſſible deceive the very Elect*; ſince no Diſtinction can be made from the things themſelves between the Effects of a created inviſible Power, and of a divine in moſt things which paſs for Miracles; ſince Hereticks may be Gods Inſtruments in the moſt divine Miracles for a good end, it neceſſarily follows that the pretence of Miracles is far from proving the Truth and Infallibility of the Church wherein they are wrought, till it be made appear, that they are truly divine Miracles, that they are wrought for this end to prove this Churches Infallibility, and that the Churches Infallibility doth not contradict any part of that Doctrine which hath been already confirmed by the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

2. They can never prove that the Miracles wrought in the Roman Church, were wrought for no other end but to prove the Infallibility of their Church. When Chriſt and his Apoſtles wrought Miracles to prove their Infallibility, they wrought the Miracles themſelves, and declared that this was the end for which they were Wrought, that Men might believe *that they were teachers ſent from God*; but there is nothing like this in the Miracles of the Roman Church: They are generally pretended to be done at ſome Shrine or Monument, or by a Viſion of ſome Saint, and among the moſt credulous People, but by no means for the Satisfaction of Infidels or Hereticks, whoſe very Preſence is enough to ſpoil a well contrived Miracle; but ſuppoſing the things true which are reported, what doth a reſtored Leg to a poor Boy at *Zaragoſa* in *Spain* ſignify to the Proof of the Roman Churches Infallibility? Or *Father* Marcellus's Cure at *Naples* by a Viſion of *Xaverius* to the Proof of *Pius* IVth's Creed? If they will prove any thing by this way of Miracles, let their Miſſionaries here among us, whom they account Infidels and Hereticks, do the ſame things that Chriſt and his Apoſtles did for the Converſion of Jews and Gentiles. Let them heal all manner of Diſeaſes as publickly, as commonly, as perfectly, as ſud-

denly as they did; and with no more Art or Ceremony; let us ſee them raiſe the dead, and not think we will be put off with *painted Straws*, or *counterfeit Trances*; which we hope they are aſhamed of themſelves; ſuch things, I aſſure them, tend not to the Credit of their Power of Miracles among us, and do not much help our Faith in the Belief of things done at a great diſtance and in ſuch Places were Credulity and Superſtition reign. If you do Miracles in earneſt do them before Enemies, as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did, give us leave to ſtand by, that we may be ſatisfyed from the Circumſtances of them that they are true Miracles, and wrought to teſtify that your teachers are ſent from God. But you do not pretend to work Miracles to confirm the Authority of your teachers, for then of all Perſons your Popes ſhould work the greateſt Miracles, and the Biſhops who ſit in General Councils, among whom this Infallibility is lodged, therefore there is no parallel between the Miracles done in the Church of *Rome*, and thoſe which were wrought by Chriſt or his Apoſtles. If all that had been pleaded in the Apoſtles times for their divine Commiſſion had been only that *a poor Boy had his Leg cut off and ſtrangely reſtored*, or that *ſome Perſons were ſuddenly cured of a dangerous Diſeaſe by the Viſion of an Apoſtle*, would this have ever ſatisfyed the World, that the Apoſtles were Perſons ſent from God and aſſiſted by an infallible Spirit? Suppoſing the Matters of Fact were true, it might be reaſonably demanded, why God might not do ſuch extraordinary Cures in ſome rare Caſes, without making that Company of Men infallible among whom they are done? For we ſee their own Writers acknowledge, that God may do real Miracles even among Pagans and Infidels, to give Teſtimony to his univerſal Providence. And *Suarez* particularly diſtinguiſheth in this caſe of Miracles, ſaying *that a Miracle may be wrought two ways.* 1. *Without reſpect to any truth at all to be confirmed by it, but only for the Benefit of him that receives it, as in caſe of a miraculous Cure or ſuch like.* 2. *When it is wrought purpoſely to confirm the truth of a Doctrine.* Suarez de Fide diſp. 4. Sect. 3. n. 10. Now I ſay, ſuppoſing I ſhould grant all that *E. W.* contends for, as to the Truth of the two Miracles he inſiſts ſo much upon, *viz. the cure of F.* Marcellus, *and the reſtoring Leg at* Zaragoſa, what can this prove as to their Churches Infallibility, if according to *Suarez* ſuch Miracles may be wrought only for the Benefit of thoſe who receive them? *Del-Rio* ſaith *this is no good Conſequence, ſuch a one wrought Miracles therefore his Faith is true, becauſe God may work* Miracles *by Infidels, but this Conſequence*, he ſaith, *is good, ſuch a one wrought* Miracles *to confirm the Faith which he profeſſed, therefore his Faith is true, becauſe God cannot work* Miracles *purpoſely to confirm a Falſhood.* Del. Rio diſquiſ. Magic. l. 2. c. 7. But withal, he ſaith, elſewhere, *that the Faith being now eſtabliſhed, there is little or no neceſſity of* Miracles *to confirm it.* L. 4. c. 4. quæſt. 5. ſect. 2. Suppoſing then ſome true Miracles to be wrought in the Roman Church, what Conſequence can be thence drawn for that Churches Infallibility in Doctrine, if thoſe Miracles are not wrought for that End? as *E. W.* never undertook to prove that they were. And if the Conſequence will not hold as to a particular Perſon for the Truth of his Faith, from the bare working of Miracles, neither can it for the Truth or Infallibility of a Church, for the ſame reaſon; for if God may work Miracles by Infidels, he may likewiſe in a falſe or corrupt Church. *Maldonat*, another Jeſuit confeſſeth *that ſince the Chriſtian Religion hath been confirmed by* Miracles *in the Churches beginning, there is no ne-* Maldonat. in Marc. 16, 17.

ceſſity of Miracles *for that end, and quotes* Gregory *and* Bede *for it; who compare the Power of* Miracles *to the watering of a Plant which* is *only needful at firſt and is given over when it hath taken root.* So that whatever Miracles they ſuppoſe to remain in the Church, they do not look on them as wrought for the Confirmation of any neceſſary part of Chriſtian Faith, ſuch as the Churches Infallibility is aſſerted to be by *E. W.*

Andrad. defenſ. fid. Trid. l. 2.

Andradius ſaith, *that Miracles are oftentimes falſe, but always weak Proofs of a true Church.*

Fer. in Math. 24. v. 23, 24.

Ferus, *that the Doctrine of a Church is not to be proved by Miracles, but Miracles by the Doctrine, viz.* becauſe Chriſt hath forewarned us of falſe Prophets doing ſo many Signs and Wonders.

Acoſta de temp. noviſſ. l. 2 c. 9.

So that *Acoſta* ſaith, *that in the time of Antichriſt it will be a hard matter to diſcern true and falſe Signs, when theſe later ſhall be many and great, and very like the true*; and he quotes it from *Hippolytus whom he calls an antient Writer*, that Antichriſt ſhall do far greater Miracles than the Cure of *Marcellus*, or the reſtored Leg at *Zaragoſa*, viz. *that he ſhall raiſe the dead as well as cure the diſeaſed, and have command over all the Elements.*

c. 18.

And I would underſtand from *E. W.* whether Antichriſt's Church will not then be proved as infallible in this way as the Church of *Rome?*

Cajet. de concept. virginis c. 1.

Cajetan determines that the Church hath no ground to determine any matter of Doctrine now on the account of Miracles; *becauſe the Devil may do ſuch things which we cannot diſtinguiſh from true Miracles, as in great Cures,* &c. *And becauſe Signs were given for Unbelievers, but the Church now hath the Revelation of Prophets and Apoſtles to proceed by: and becauſe Miracles prove only a perſonal Faith,* i. e. *of one that ſaith he is ſent from God; and becauſe the Doctrine of the Scripture is delivered to us with ſo much Certainty, that if an Angel from Heaven ſhould deliver any thing contrary to it we are not to believe him; and laſtly, becauſe the moſt authentick Teſtimonies of* Miracles *among them,* viz. *in the Canonization of Saints, are not altogether certain, becauſe it is written every* Man *is a Lyer:* and he ſuppoſes *that Faith muſt ſtand on a more infallible Certainty than that of their* Miracles. And many of their moſt learned Writers do aſſert, that there can be no Certainty of the Truth of any Miracles among them, but from the Churches Approbation; which is in effect to ſay, they do not believe the Church infallible becauſe of their Miracles, but they believe their Miracles to be true, becauſe they believe their Church to be infallible.

Paul Zacchiæ Quæſt. Medico. Legalis l. 4. tit. 1. q. 1. n. 5. 6, 10. q. 4. n. 3.

For which *Paulus Zacchias* gives this reaſon, *becauſe wicked* Men *and Devils may not only do* Miracles *in appearance, but ſuch as are really ſo, as the Inſtruments of divine Power; and becauſe credulous People are very apt to be deceived with falſe* Miracles *inſtead of true.* And after he hath laid down the Conditions of a true Miracle he hath a Chapter on purpoſe to enquire, *why ſince Miracles very rarely happen, yet ſo many are ſtill pretended to in the Roman Church?* One cauſe he aſſigns of it is the monſtrous Credulity of their People in this matter of Miracles, who make ſo many, that he ſaith, *if they were to be believed,* Miracles *would be almoſt as common as the ordinary Effects of Nature; for no odd or unuſual accident happens, but among them paſſes for a Miracle; no Man eſcapes out of a dangerous Diſeaſe* (eſpecially if by the diſturbance of his fancy, he imagins he had a Viſion of ſome Saint as *Xaverius* or the like) *but he gives out he obtained his Recovery by a Miracle; no Man avoids any great danger or trouble* (if he chanced to think of the bleſſed Virgin in it, or made any Addreſſes to ſome Saint, for I do not find that praying to God or Chriſt is ſo effectual for Miracles as praying to the Saints is) *but this is cryed up for a Miracle. Riolanus* gives the Relation of a Man that was hanged and his Body delivered to the Phyſicians to be diſſected, Riolan. Anthropograph. l. 1. c. 15. who found there was ſome Life in him, and by letting blood and other means they recovered him, who afterwards returning to his own Country *Oetingen*, where there was a celebrated Image of the Bleſſed Virgin, this very Recovery was there painted for a ſubſtantial Miracle. But to return to *Zacchius*: *Miracles*, ſaith he, *are made ſo common among us, as though God had nothing elſe to do with his Power but to pervert the courſe of Nature by it at the beck of any idle Fellow; as if God did not manage his Power, as he does all things elſe, with infinite Wiſdom; as if God employed his extraordinary Power without great and moſt urgent Cauſes. For when it was neceſſary to ſhew his Power for the Confirmation of the Chriſtian Religion and the Satisfaction of Unbelievers, then all Perſons might ſee the wonderful Works of God*; but now, ſaith he, *when the Truth of Chriſtianity is known it would be to no purpoſe for God to ſhew ſo many Miracles. But whence then comes it, that ſo many Miracles are ſtill talked of? This ariſes*, ſaith he, *from the Devotion of ſome who attribute ordinary effects of Nature to a miraculous Power; and from the ſuperſtitious Folly and Fraud of others who will not endure any thing cryed up for a Miracle ſhould be ever queſtioned by any; but ſay, it is profane, atheiſtical*, and which is ſomewhat worſe, *heretical to do it. Whereas poor Wretches, they do not think what Injury they do the Catholick Cauſe, while they go about to ſtrengthen it with Lies and Forgeries; when the Chriſtian Doctrine is already fully confirmed by the moſt true and undoubted Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. What need they then to feign any new Miracles? Doth God need your Lies, will ye talk deceitfully for him?* as *I may juſtly uſe the Words of* Job, *ſaith he, of theſe Men.* n. 7. Another cauſe of ſo much Talk of Miracles in the Roman Church he ſaith, is *Ignorance; whereby any extraordinary Accident, though ſuch as might happen, where Chriſtianity was never known, is extolled for a Miracle.*

Quorum Operum cauſas nulla ratione videre
Poſſunt, hæc fieri divino numine rentur.

n. 9. From hence he proceeds to particulars, and ſhews, that moſt of thoſe who are accounted poſſeſſed among them are *Melancholy* and *Hypochondriacal Men and Hyſterical Women:* Quæſt. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. and then examines the pretence to *Inſpiration* and *Prophecy*, to *Raptures and Extaſies*, to *miraculous Cures*, to *prodigious Faſtings*, to *Incorruption of Bodies*, to *raiſing from the dead* and ſhews under every one of theſe Heads, how very often the meer effects of Nature paſs for Miracles in the *Roman* Church; to whoſe Learned Diſcourſes I refer the Reader: and we may eaſily underſtand the meaning of ſuch a Perſon, when he tells us after all this, *that the Church will not ſuffer* Men *to be deceived about Miracles, but ſuch as the Church approves are to be approved.* Now let any one judge whether ſuch Perſons who receive no other Miracles, but ſuch which the Church commands them to believe, could ever imagin that the Infallibility of their Church was proved by ſuch Miracles, which they would not believe to be true, unleſs they firſt believed the Church which approved them to be infallible. *Fortunatus Scacchus*, a

Fortun. Scacch de notis & ſignis ſanctitatis ſect. 8. c. 1.

Man of great Authority in *Rome* grants *that it is a very eaſy matter to take falſe* Miracles *for true*; *and that no certain Argument can be taken from Tables which are hung up at Images or Shrines*; *that wicked* Men *may do real* Miracles, *which he proves from Scripture and Hiſtory, and the continued Practice in their Church*, from whence he concludes, *that no Argument can be drawn for the Sanctity of any Perſon, but only from ſuch* Miracles *as are approved by the* Roman *Church*. *For*, ſaith he, *it belongs only to the Authority of the* Roman *See, and the Biſhop of* Rome *to determine which are true* Miracles? *becauſe the Promiſe of Infallibility is only made to the* Roman *Church and the Head of it.* From whence he concludes, *that no other Biſhop hath any* Power *to approve* Miracles, *eſpecially if they be ſuppoſed to be wrought by an uncanonized Saint.*

Aquin. 2. 2 quæſt. 178 art. 2.

Proceſſus Canoniz. B. Andreæ Corſini part. 2. ſect. 3.

Contelor. de Canoniz. Sanctorum. c. 17. n. 7.

For we are to underſtand, that the great Uſe of Miracles in the *Roman* Church, hath not been pretended to be for proving the Faith or Infallibility of the Church, but for an Argument of Saintſhip of thoſe who are to be beatified or *canonized*. So *Aquinas* determines, *that Miracles are either wrought to confirm the Truth of a Doctrine preached*; *or for the Demonſtration of the Sanctity of a Perſon*; and therfore in the Proceſs of *Canonization*, one main Enquiry is, about the Miracles wrought by the Perſon who ſtands for the Preferment of *Canonization*. In the Proceſs about the *Canonization* of *Andreas Corſinus* preſented to *Paul V.* the *Auditors* of the *Rota*, ſay, *that to the Being canonized, it is concluded by all to be neceſſary that the Perſon have wrought Miracles: And there they agree that it is not neceſſary to a Miracle to be wrought for the Confirmation of Faith, ſeeing Miracles may be done for another End* viz. *for the Proof of the Sanctity of the Perſon. And ſuch Miracles* ſay they, *are thoſe which are done among Catholicks, for whoſe ſake Miracles would be neceſſary on no other account: becauſe Miracles are a Sign* not to *Believers but to Unbelievers*; *whence*, as they well obſerve from *Iſidore* St. Paul *cured the Father of Publius by a Miracle, but preſcribed to Timothy a natural Remedy.* And *Contelorius* cites many other Proceſſes of *Canonization* to the ſame purpoſe, *viz.* to prove *that it is not neceſſary to a Miracle that it be done for the Confirmation of any Part of Chriſtian Faith.* Since therefore the far greateſt Number of the Miracles in the *Roman* Church, are ſuch as are wrought for another end how can they from them prove the Infallibility of their Church? unleſs they can make it appear that where ever there are true Saints, the Church is infallible. From which it appears, that the Miracles of the *Roman* Church ought no more to be compared with thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles as to the Teſtimony by them given to Infallibility, than in Point of Credibility; and that in both reſpects they are, ſo infinitely ſhort of them, that nothing but the heighth of Impudence could make any Man, pretending to be Chriſtian, to aſſert, that as great (nay greater) Miracles have been done by the *Roman* Church, as ever were done by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, in which Subject I have taken the more pains, not meerly to detect the Frauds and Impoſtures of the *Roman* Church; but to preſerve and vindicate the Honour of Chriſtianity, leſt that ſhould ſuffer by the intolerable Rudeneſs of theſe Compariſons.

A DEFENCE OF THE DISCOURSE CONCERNING THE IDOLATRY Practiſed in the Church of Rome,

In Anſwer to a BOOK Entituled,

Catholicks no Idolaters.

53.1.D.

The First Part.

TO THE

Right Reverend Father in GOD, HENRY *Lord Biſhop of* LONDON, *One of the Lords of His Majeſties Moſt Honourable Privy Council.*

My Lord,

I Have heard that in ſome famous *Prophetick Pictures* pretending to repreſent the *Fate* of *England*, the chief thing obſervable (in ſeveral of them) was a *Mole*; a Creature blind and buſy, ſmooth and deceitful, continually working under Ground, but now and then to be diſcerned by the diſturbance it makes in the Surface of the Earth: Which is ſo natural a Deſcription of a reſtleſs Party among us, that we need no *Judge of Controverſies* to interpret the meaning of it. Our *Foreſathers* had ſufficient *Teſtimony* of their *working under Ground*; but in our *Age* they act more viſibly, and with that indefatigable Induſtry, that they threaten (without great Care to prevent them) the undermining of our *Church*, and the Ruin of our eſtabliſhed *Religion*. Which ſince they

they cannot hope ſo eaſily to compaſs alone, they endeavour to draw in to their Aſſiſtance, all ſuch diſcontented Parties, who are ſo weak, (if any can be ſo) to be prevailed on to be Inſtruments to ſerve them, in pulling down a *Church*, which can never fall, but they muſt be *ſtifled* in its *Ruins*. One would think, it were hardly poſſible, for any to run into a Snare, which lies ſo open to their view; or to flatter themſelves with the vain Hopes of eſcaping better than the *Church* they deſign to deſtroy. But ſuch is the admirable *Wiſdom* of *Divine Providence* to order things ſo above all *humane Diſcretion*, that when the *Sins* of a *Nation* have provoked *God* to forſake it, he ſuffers thoſe to concurr in the moſt pernicious *Councils* for *enſlaving Conſcience*, who pretend to the greateſt *Zeal* for the *Liberty* of it. So that our *Church* of *England* in its preſent Condition, ſeems to ſtand as the *Church* of *Corinth* did of old, between Two unquiet and boiſterous Seas; and there are ſome very buſy in cutting through the *Iſthmus* between them, to let in both at once upon it, ſuppoſing that no Strength will be able to withſtand the Force of ſo terrible an Inundation. It is a Conſideration that might diſhearten thoſe who are engaged in the *Defence* of our *Religion* againſt the common *Adverſaries*, to ſee that they promiſe themſelves as much from the *Folly* of ſome of their moſt *ſeeming Enemies*, as from the *Intereſt* and 2 Cor. 7. 5. *Power* of their *Friends*: Thus like S. *Paul* in *Macedonia*, *we are troubled on every ſide, without are Fightings, and within are Fears.* If Men did but once underſtand *the things which belong to our Peace*, we might yet hope to weather out the *Storms* that threaten us, and to live, as the *Church* hath frequently done, in a *toſſing Condition*, with Waves beating on every ſide. But if through *Weakneſs* or *Wilfulneſs*, *thoſe things ſhould be hid from our Eyes*, the Proſpect of our future Condition is much more dreadful and amazing than the preſent can be.

If it were reaſonable to hope, that all Men would lay aſide Prejudice and Paſſion, and have greater Regard to the *common Good*, than to the *Intereſts* of their ſeveral *Parties*, they could not but ſee where our main *Strength* lies, by what our Enemies are moſt concerned to deſtroy; and that no Men of common Underſtanding would make uſe of *diſunited Parties* to deſtroy one *Great Body*, unleſs they were ſure to maſter them, when they had done with them; and therefore the beſt way for their own Security were to unite themſelves with the *Church* of *England*. That were a *Bleſſing* too great for ſuch a *People* to expect, whoſe Sins have made our *Breaches* ſo wide, that we have too great reaſon to fear the common Enemy may enter through them; if there be not ſome way found out to *repair thoſe Breaches*, and to build up the Places which are broken down.

For my own part, I cannot ſee, how thoſe who could have joyned in *Communion* with the *Chriſtian Church*, in the time of *Theodoſius* the *Great*, can juſtly refuſe to do it in ours. For that is the *Age* of the *Church*, which our *Church* of *England* ſince the *Reformation*, comes the neareſt to; *Idolatry* being then ſuppreſſed by the *Imperial Edicts*, the *Churches* ſettled by *Law* under the *Government* of *Biſhops*, *Publick Liturgies* appointed, *Antiquity* reverenced, *Schiſm* diſcountenanced, *Learning* encouraged, and ſome few *Cermonies* uſed, but without any of thoſe corrupt Mixtures which afterwards prevailed in the *Roman Church*. And what ever Men of ill Minds may ſuggeſt to the Diſparagement of thoſe times, it is really an *Honour* to our *Church*, to ſuffer together with that *Age*, when the *Chriſtian Church* began to be firmly ſettled by the *Countenance* of the *civil Power*, and did enjoy its Primitive *Purity* without the *Poverty* and *Hardſhips* it endured before. And the *Biſhops* of that time were Men of that exemplary *Piety*, of thoſe great *Abilities*, of that excellent *Conduct* and *Magnanimity*, as ſet them above the *Contempt* or Reproach of any but *Infidels* and *Apoſtates*. For then lived the *Gregories*, the *Baſils*, the *Chryſoſtoms* in the *Eaſtern Church*; the *Ambroſes*, and *Auguſtins* in the *Weſtern*; and they who can ſuſpect theſe to have been *Enemies* to the *Power of Godlineſs*, did never underſtand what it meant.

It were, no doubt, the moſt deſirable thing in our State and Condition to ſee the *Piety*, the *Zeal*, the *Courage*, the *Wiſdom* of thoſe *holy Biſhops* revived among us in ſuch an *Age* which needs the Conjunction of all theſe together. For ſuch is the Inſolency and Number of the open Contemners of our *Church* and *Religion*, ſuch is the Activity of thoſe who oppoſe it, and the Subtilty of thoſe who undermine it, as requires all the *Devotion* and *Abilities* of thoſe great *Perſons* to defend it. And I hope that *divine Spirit* which inflamed and acted them hath not forſaken that *ſacred Order* among us: but that it will daily raiſe up more who ſhall be able to convince *Diſſenters*, that there may be true and hearty *Zeal* for *Religion* among our *Prelates*; and thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, that *good Works* are moſt agreeable to the *Principles* of the *Reformation*. Nay, even in this Age, as bad as it is there may be as great *Inſtances* produced of *real Charity*, and of *Works* of *publick* and *pious Uſes*, as when Men thought to get *Souls* out of *Purgatory*, or *themſelves* into *Heaven* by what they did. And if it were poſſible exactly to compare all *Acts* of this *Nature* which have been done ever ſince the *Reformation*, with what there was done of the ſame kind for a much longer time immediately before it, if the *Proteſtant Charity* ſhould ſeem to fall ſhort in outward *Pomp* and *Magnificence*, it would be found much more to exceed it, in *Number* and *Uſefulneſs*.

Which makes me ſo much the more wonder to hear and ſee, the ill effects of the *Reformation* in this kind, ſo much inſiſted on of late, to diſprove the *Goodneſs* of it. If *ſome great Men had ſiniſter ends in it*, when was there any great *Action* of that *Nature*, wherein ſome *Perſons* did not aim at their own advantage by it? Who can excuſe all the *Courtiers* in the time of *Conſtantine*, or all the *Actions* of that *Great Emperour* himſelf? Muſt *Chriſtianity* therefore be thought the worſe, becauſe it did prevail in his time, and very much by his means? And there were ſome partial *Hiſtorians* in thoſe days, that impute the demoliſhing of *Heathen Temples* and the ſuppreſſing of *Idolatry* to the *Rapine* and *Sacrilege* of the Times. For even thoſe *Heathen Temples* were *richly endowed*; and it is not to be ſuppoſed, that when ſuch a *Tree* was ſhaking, there would be no *ſcrambling* for the *Fruit* of it.

However, we are not concerned to juſtify the *Actions* or *Deſigns* of any particular *Perſons* how *great ſoever*: but that which we plead for, is, that the *Reformation* it ſelf was a *juſt*, *pious*, *prudent*, and *neceſſary* thing; and had both ſufficient *Authority* to warrant it, and ſufficient *Reaſon* to juſtifie it.

We read in the *Spaniſh Hiſtory* a remarkable *Precedent*, which vindicates the Proceeding of our *Reformation* in *England.* The *Gothick Nation* had been infected with *Arianiſm* two hundred and thirteen years, when by the means of *Leander Biſhop* of *Sevil*, the *King Reccaredus* being duly informed in the *Orthodox Faith*, called a *Council* at *Toledo*, wherein *Arianiſm* was renounced by the *Declaration* and *Subſcription* of the *King*, himſelf, being preſent in *Council*; and afterwards by the *Biſhops* who joyned with him, and the *Great Men*; which being done, the *Council* proceeded to make new *Canons* and *Conſtitutions*, which the *King confirmed* by his *Edict*, declaring, *that if any Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon refuſed to obſerve them, he was ſentenced by the Council to Excommunication; if any of the higher rank of the Laity, the Penalty was paying half their Eſtates to the Exchequer, if others, Confiſcation and Baniſhment.* All which is extant in the *Records* of that *Council.* The *Arian Biſhops*, as *Mariana* relates, ſuch as *Athalocus* and *Sunna* with others, having the old *Queen Goſwinda* and ſeveral of the *Nobility* to joyn with them, made all the diſturbance they could, to hinder the *Reformation.* But, God not only carried it through, but wonderfully preſerved the *Life* of the *King*, notwithſtanding many Conſpiracies againſt him; after whoſe Death, the *Arian faction* was very buſie, and made ſeveral *Attempts* by *Treaſon* and *Rebellion* to be reſtored again; and they once thought themſelves ſure, when they had gotten *Wittericus* of their Party to the *Throne*, but his ſhort *Reign* put an end to all their *Hopes.* I find ſome of the latter *Spaniſh Hiſtorians* much troubled to ſee all done in this *Reformation*, by the *King*, and the *Biſhops* and *great Men*, without the leaſt mention of the *Popes Authority. Lucas Tudenſis* therefore ſaith, *that* Leander *was the Popes Legat*, but *Mariana* confeſſes, *that the very Acts of the Council contradict it.* He would have it believed, *that they ſent Legats to the Pope afterwards to have the Council confirmed by him*; but he acknowledgeth, *that nothing appears in Hiſtory to that purpoſe:* and if any ſuch thing had been, it would not have been omitted in the *Epiſtles* of *Gregory*, who writ to *Leander* a *Letter* of *Congratulation* for the *Converſion* of *Reccaredus.* But then *National Churches* were ſuppoſed to have *Power* enough to *reform* themſelves, provided, that they proceeded according to the *Decrees* of the *Four General Councils.*

Concil. Tolet. 3. A. D. 589.

Marian. de rebus Hiſp. l. 5. c. 14. 15.

Marian. l. 6. c. 1.

Greg. Regiſtr. l. 1. ep. 41.

And this is that we maintain in behalf of the *Church* of *England*, that it receives all the *Creeds* which were then received, and hath reformed thoſe *Abuſes* only which have crept into the *Church* ſince that *Time.*

This, My Lord, is the *Cauſe*, which by *Command* of my *Superiors*, I was firſt engaged to defend; among whom *your Lordſhips Predeceſſor* (whoſe conſtant *Friendſhip* and *Kindneſs* I muſt never forget) was one of the *chief.* Since that time, I have had but little reſpite from theſe (not ſo pleaſing to me, as ſometimes neceſſary) *Polemical Exerciſes*; and notwithſtanding all the *Rage* and *Malice* of the *Adverſaries* of our *Church* againſt me, I ſit down with that Contentment, that I have defended a *Righteous Cauſe*, and with an *honeſt Mind*; and therefore I little regard their bittereſt Cenſures and Reproaches.

In the midſt of ſuch a *Croud* of *Adverſaries*, it was no unpleaſant Entertainment to me to ſee the various Methods, with which they have attacked me; ſome with piteous Moans and Outcries, others grinning and only ſhewing their Teeth, others ranting and hectoring, others ſcolding and reviling; but I muſt needs ſay, the *Adverſary* I now anſwer, hath ſhewed more *Art* and *Cunning* than all the reſt put together; and hath ſaid as much in *Defence* of their Cauſe, as *Wit* and *Subtilty* could invent (I wiſh I could ſpeak as freely of his fair dealing, and *Ingenuity*.) Him therefore I reſerved to be anſwered by himſelf after I had ſhaken off the leſſer and more *barking* Creatures.

What I have now done, I humbly preſent to your *Lordſhips* hands; and I am very glad of this Opportunity to declare what Satisfaction the *Members* of your own *Church*, and the *Clergy* of this great *City* have to ſee a *Perſon* of ſo *noble Birth*, ſo much *Temper* and *Prudence*, ſo firm an *Aſſertor* of the *Proteſtant Religion* and *Church* of *England*, appointed by his *Majeſty* to have the *Conduct* and *Government* of them. That *God Almighty* would aſſiſt and direct your *Lordſhip* in thoſe things which tend to the *Peace* and *Welfare* of this *Church*, is the hearty *Prayer* of

My LORD,

Your Lordſhips *moſt dutiful*
and obedient Servant,

May 30. 1676.

ED. STILLINGFLEET.

To the READER.

I*T hath been long expected that I ſhould have publiſhed an* Anſwer *to* T. G. *as the moſt conſiderable* Adverſary *that appeared againſt me; but it is very well known, that before his* Book *came out, I had undertaken the* Anſwer *of* ſeveral others; *which when I had ſet forth, a* Perſon *of* Honour, *who had been pleaſed to defend me againſt one of my keeneſt Antagoniſts, was aſſaulted by him; whom I was in the firſt Place obliged in* Gratitude, *to eaſe of any farther Trouble. Since that time I have applyed my ſelf to the Conſideration of* T. G's. *Book, as much as* Health, *and* other Buſineſs *would permit.*

And finding ſuch Confuſion in moſt Diſcourſes *about* Idolatry, *and that till the* Nature *of it were fully and clearly* ſtated, *Men would ſtill diſpute in the* dark *about theſe matters, in my laſt* Summers *Retirement,*

ment, I ſet my ſelf to the ſtrict Examination of it, by ſearching with my utmoſt Diligence into the Idolatries *practiſed in all* Parts *of the World, by the Help of the beſt* Authors, *I could meet with, either* antient *or* modern; *when I had done this, I compared thoſe* Obſervations *I had made with the* Senſe *of the* Scriptures, *and of the* Fathers *of the ſeveral* Ages *of the* Chriſtian Church, *who had managed the* Charge *of* Idolatry *againſt* Heathens, *or* Hereticks. *From hence I framed the* Firſt Part *of the following* Book, *wherein I have not only examined and confuted* T. G's *falſe* Notion *of it, but endeavoured to ſettle the* true *one in its Place.*

Which being diſpatched, and the main Principles *of his whole* Book *thereby* weakned *and* overthrown; *I betook my ſelf to the particular* Defence *of the* Charge *of* Idolatry *practiſed in the* Roman Church *in the* Worſhip *of* Images; *and I apprehended nothing of greater Conſequence in this* Debate, *than to give a true* Account *of the* ſtate *of the* Controverſie *between us; which* T. G. *endeavoured with all his Art to blind and confound. After which, I have given a diſtinct* Anſwer *to every thing* material *or* plauſible *in that* Part *of his* Book. *Which ſwelling this* Diſcourſe *beyond my Expectation, I muſt reſpite the other* Part *to a farther Opportunity; which I may the better do, becauſe the* Remainder *of* T. G's Book *hath already received a ſufficient* Anſwer *from a learned and worthy Perſon.*

PART

PART I.

A General Diſcourſe concerning the Nature *of* Idolatry.

CHAP. I.

T. Goddens *Notion of* Idolatry *examined and confuted.*

TO make good the *Charge* of *Idolatry* againſt the *Roman Church*, which is my preſent buſineſs, there are two things neceſſary to be done,

1. To lay down the right *Notion* of *Idolatry*.
2. To examine what *T. Godden* and others have ſaid, to juſtify themſelves, from the *particulars* of this *Charge*.

I begin with the Conſideration of the *Nature* of *Idolatry*, not only
becauſe my Adverſary calls me to it in theſe Words, *Here the Ax is* T. G. 203.
laid to the Root, and if ever the Dr. *will ſpeak home to the purpoſe,*
it muſt be upon this point. He muſt ſpeak to the Nature of the thing,
&c. But becauſe the Weight of the whole matter in debate depends upon it, and whoſoever reads through *T. G's* anſwer to me, will find the only Strength of it to lie in a very different *Notion* of *Idolatry* which he ſets up, which if it prove true, the main of my Charge muſt fall to the ground; although however by his way of writing he can hardly anſwer the Character I had given him, either of a *Learned* or *ingenuous Adverſary*.

The *Notion* of *Idolatry* which T. G. lays down may be gathered
from theſe Aſſertions of his, That, *God being the only ſupreme and* P. 64.
ſuper-excellent Being, above all and over all, to him therefore Sovereign
Honour is only to be given, and to none beſide him; That *as no Com-*
mand of God can make that to be not Idolatry which is ſo in the Na-
ture of the thing; *ſo no Prohibition (if there were any) could make*
that to be Idolatry, which hath not in it the true and real Nature of
Idolatry; That, *the Worſhip of Images forbidden in the Commandment,* P. 203.
is the worſhipping Images inſtead of God; *and the Reaſon of the Law* P. 39.
was to keep the People in their Duty of giving Sovereign worſhip to
God alone, by reſtraining them from Idolatry. That *this Law was* P. 63.
made particularly to forbid Sovereign worſhip to be given (*as* he ſaith,
it was at that time given by the Heathen) *to graven Images*, i. e. *re-* P 67.
preſentations of imaginary Beings; *or to any Similitude*, i. e. *the Like-*
neſs of any thing, which although it had a real being, yet was not
God: That, *the Image-worſhip condemned by St.* Paul, *was the worſhipping* P. 99.
Images for Gods, or as the Images of falſe Gods: That, *evil Spirits or falſe* P. 103. P. 349.
Gods did reſide in their Images by magical Incantation: That, *the ſupreme*
God of the Heathens was not the true God but a Devil, and that the Poets P. 348.
who call him the Father of Gods and Men, were thoſe whom Horace
confeſſeth, that they took the Privilege to dare to feign and ſay any
thing.

thing. From theſe Aſſertions, it is no hard matter to form *T. G's* Notion of Idolatry, *viz.* That it is, the giving the Sovereign Worſhip of God to a Creature, and among the Heathens to the Devil. And now who dares charge the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry? I do not wonder that he calls this ſo *foul*, ſo *extravagant*, ſo *unjuſt a Charge*; and parallels me with no meaner a Perſon than *Julian the Apoſtate*, ſaying, *That ſurely a more injurious Calumny ſcarce ever dropt* P. 350. *from the Pen of the greateſt Enemy of Chriſtianity, except that of* Julian *the Apoſtate.* But I am ſo uſed to their hard Words, that I can eaſily paſs them over, and immediately apply my ſelf to the debate of theſe things, which will tend very much to the clearing the true *Notion* of *Idolatry.*

1. Whether *Idolatry* be not conſiſtent with the *Acknowledgment* of one *ſupreme Being*?

2. Wherein the *Nature* of that *Divine Worſhip* lies, which being given to a *Creature* makes it *Idolatry*?

For if thoſe who acknowledge one *ſupreme Being*, the *Creator* and *Governor* of the World, were notwithſtanding this, guilty of *Idola*- P. 27. *try*, and that *Idolatry* be, as *T. G.* confeſſeth, *the giving the Worſhip due to God to a Creature*; then if we can prove, that the *Church* of *Rome* doth give any Part of that *Worſhip* which is due to *God* to any thing beſides him, we may ſtill juſtly charge them with *Idolatry*, although they believe one *ſupreme God*, and reſerve ſome *worſhip* which he calls *Sovereign* to him.

§2.1. 1. Whether *Idolatry* be not conſiſtent with the *Acknowledgment* of one *ſupreme Being*, *Creator*, and *Governor* of the World? Whom I ſuppoſe *T. G.* will not deny to be the *true God*. It is agreed by him, that the whole *Heathen* World was guilty of *Idolatry*, without excepting the *more intelligent and wiſer Perſons* among them; therefore our only buſineſs as to them is to enquire, whether they did acknowledge this *ſupreme Being*; and it is without diſpute, that all Chriſtians do acknowledge the true God; if I can then prove, that ſuch have notwithſtanding been charged with *Idolatry*, by thoſe whoſe Judgment *T. G.* dares not refuſe, I hope theſe two things being made out, will be ſufficient to prove, that thoſe may be guilty of *Idolatry*, who acknowledge one *ſupreme God*.

1. As to the *Heathens*, who are confeſſed to be *Idolaters*. I have ſuch Plenty and choice of evidence in this matter, that it is not eaſie to know which to leave out; for, if either the *Teſtimony* of the *Heathens* themſelves may be taken; or the *Teſtimony* of the *Writers* of the *Roman Church* concerning them; or the *Teſtimony* of the *Scriptures*; or of thoſe *Fathers* who diſputed againſt their *Idolatry*, or of the *Roman Church* it ſelf, I do not doubt, to make it evident, that thoſe *Heathens* who are charged with *Idolatry*, did acknowledge one *ſupream God*. In ſo great ſtore I have reaſon to conſider the temper of the Perſon I have to deal with; For, if it produce the *Teſtimony* of the *Heathen Writers* themſelves, it may be he may ſuſpect, that the *Devil* dwelt in their *Books* as well as in their *Images*; and being a very cunning Sophiſter that he might perſwade their *Philoſophers* to write for one *God*, that he might have the *worſhip* belonging to him: as O. C's Inſtruments were for a ſingle Perſon, that the *Government* might be put into his hands, But, I have a better Reaſon than this, *viz.* that *this Work* is already undertaken, by a very learned *Perſon* of our *Church*.

The *Teſtimony* of *Scripture* is plain enough in this matter to any unbyaſſed Mind; as appears by St. *Pauls* ſaying to the Men of *Athens*, when he ſaw the *Altar to the unknown God*; *Whom ye ignorantly worſhip, him I declare unto you*; Did St. *Paul* mean the *Devil* by this? Did he in good earneſt go abroad to preach the *Devil* to the World? yet he preached him whom they ignorantly worſhipped, *i. e. the Devil*, ſaith *T. G.* Although St. *Paul* immediately ſaith, *it was the God that made the World, and all Things in it*: and afterwards quotes one of their *Poets* for ſaying τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν, *For we are his Off-ſpring*; and it is obſervable that the Words immediately going before in *Aratus* are Πάντη δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες, and he uſeth Διὸς twice more in the Verſes before, Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεθα—— μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαὶ, which is the very *Word* that *T. G.* ſaith doth ſignifie an *Arch-Devil.* Doth St. *Paul* then ſay, we are all the *Devils Off-ſpring*? and not an ordinary one neither, but the very *Arch-devils*? Was this his way of perſwading the *Athenians* to leave the worſhip of *Devils*, to tell them, that *they were all the Devils Off-ſpring*? No, it was far enough from him, for he infers from that ſaying of *Aratus*, that *they were the Off-ſpring of God*, Γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ Θεοῦ. So that if St. *Paul* may be credited rather than *T. G.* their *Jupiter* was ſo far from being the *Arch-Devil*, that *he was the true* God, *bleſſed for evermore.* And it is obſervable, that St. *Paul* quotes one of their *Poets* for this ſaying; notwithſtanding *T. G's* ſharp cenſure of them out of *Horace*; with which, the force of St. *Pauls* Teſtimony is overthrown. But he was not alone in making this to be the *Poets* Senſe, for *Ariſtobulus* the *Jewiſh Philoſopher* produces it to the ſame purpoſe, and adds, that *although he uſed the name of* Jove, *yet his Deſign was to expreſs the true* God. *Minucius Felix* ſaith wiſely in this caſe, *They who make* Jove *the chief* God, *are only deceived in the name, but agree in the Power*; ſo far was he from thinking their *Jupiter Father of* Gods *and Men*, (which he applauds the *Poets* for ſaying) to have been the *Arch-devil.*

Act. 7. 23

v. 24.

v. 28.

P. 348. 349. 352.

v. 20.

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 13. c. 12.

Minuc. Felix in Octav. p. 19.

But *T. G.* quotes *Origen* for ſaying, that *the Chriſtians would undergo any Torments rather than confeſs* Jupiter *to be* God; *for they did not believe* Jupiter *and Sabaoth to be the ſame, neither indeed to be any* God *at all, but a Devil, who is delighted with the name of* Jupiter, *an Enemy to Men and* God. I grant, *Origen* doth ſay ſo; but ſuppoſe St. *Paul* and *Origen* contradict one another, I deſire to know whom we are to follow? Yet if *T. G.* had conſidered *Origen* as he ought to have done, he would have ſeen how little had been gained by this ſaying of his. For when *Celſus* had ſaid, *it was no great matter whether they called the ſupreme God* Jupiter, *or* Adonai, *or* Sabaoth, *or* Ammon *as the Ægyptians did, or* Pappai *as the* Scythians. *Origen* anſwers. 1. That he had ſpoken already upon this Subject, *which he deſires may be remembred*; now in that Place he ſaith, *that by reaſon of the abundance of filthy and obſcene Fables which went of their* Jupiter, *the Chriſtians would by no means endure to have the true* God *called by his Name*; *having learnt from* Plato *to be ſcrupulous about the very names of their Gods.* 2. *Origen* hath a particular conceit about the Power of the *Hebrew* Names; and hath a very odd Diſcourſe, unbecoming a Philoſopher and a *Chriſtian*,

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5.

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 4. p. 196. ed. Cant.

about the *Power* of *Words* in *Enchantments*, and that the ſame Words
had great force in their *Originals*, which they loſt being tranſlated
Orig. c. into other Languages ; *and if it be thus*, ſaith he, *in other names, how*
Celſ. l. 1. p. *much more ought we to think it ſo in the names of* God? And therefore
19. &c. he would by no means have thoſe powerful Names of *Adonai*
and *Sabaoth* to be changed for any other. By which for all that
I can ſee, Origen would as much have ſcrupled calling the divine
Being, *God*, as *Jove*, If *Voſſius* his Conjecture be true, that *God* is
Voſſ. de the ſame with the old *German Gode*, or *Godan*, and according to
Idolol. l. the common Permutation of thoſe Letters, *Wodan*, who was the
1. c. 37. chief *God* among the *Germans*. 3. He ſaith, *that it was no Fault at*
all for any Perſons to call the ſupreme God *by the names uſed in their*
own Language ; as the *Ægyptians* might call him *Ammon*, and the
Scythians Pappai : and then why not the *Greeks* Δία or Ζῆνα? and
I do not ſee he finds much Fault with them for it ; but he would
not have thoſe Names brought into the *Chriſtian Religion*, which had
been defiled by ſuch impure Stories and Repreſentations among the
Heathens : which is the beſt thing that he ſaith to this purpoſe:
But we ſee that *Origen* himſelf doth not deny that either the *Greeks*,
or *Ægyptians*, or *Scythians* did own a *ſupreme God*, or that they had
proper names to expreſs him by: but he would not have the *Chriſtians*
bring thoſe Names into their *Religion* ; and that *Origen* grants
that the *Heathens* did acknowledge the ſupreme God, will be proved
afterwards. But whatever his Opinion was, we are ſure St. *Paul*
by the God that was known among the *Heathens*, did not mean
the *Devil* : For was the believing the *Devil* to be the *ſupreme God*,
Rom. 1. 18. that *holding the Truth in Unrighteouſneſs*, which St. *Paul* charges the
v. 19. *Heathens* with? Was this indeed that Τὸ γνωϛὸν τȣ̃ Θεȣ̃ *That which*
is known of God, which he ſaith, not only *was manifeſt in them*, but,
that God *himſelf had revealed it to them?* Was this *that Eternal*
v. 20. *Power and God-head which was to be ſeen by the things that were*
made, ſo as to leave them without Excuſe? Was this *their knowing*
v. 21. *of* God, and *that incorruptible God whoſe Glory they turned into the*
Image of a corruptible Man, &c? Was all this, nothing but *Jupiter*
v. 23. of *Crete*, and the *Arch-devil* under his Name? But what will not
Men ſay, rather than confeſs themſelves *Idolaters?*

§ 3. Although theſe Teſtimonies of Scripture, be never ſo evident ; yet
I am not ſure but *T.* G. may be the *Polus* mentioned in *Eraſmus* now,
P. 37. 203. (whom he mentions for my ſake, more than once) and may eſpy a
red fiery Dragon, even the old *Serpent* there, where I can ſee nothing
but the diſcovery of the true God. Therefore ſuppoſing that
the *Teſtimony* of *Heathens*, or the *Scriptures* may not weigh much
with him, methinks he might have conſidered what the *Learned*
Th. A- Men of their own Church have ſaid to this purpoſe. *Th. Aquinas*
quin. c. confeſſeth, *that the moſt of the Gentiles did acknowledge one ſupreme*
Gent. God, *from whom they ſaid all thoſe others whom they called Gods did*
c. 42. in *receive their Being* ; *and that they aſcribed the name of Divinity to*
fin. *all Immortal Subſtances, chiefly by reaſon of their Wiſdom, Happineſs,*
and Government Which Cuſtom of ſpeaking, ſaith he, *is likewiſe found*
in Scripture, where either the holy Angels, or Men, and Judges are
called God ; *I have ſaid ye are Gods, and many other Places. Franciſcus*
Ferrarienſis in his *Commentaries* on that Place ſaith, that *Aquinas*
his meaning was, that the Scripture only agreed with the Hea-

thens as to the name, but that they called their Gods properly ſo, whereas the Scripture ſpeaks of them only by way of Participation. And did *Aquinas,* mean any otherwiſe of the Heathens, when he ſaith, *that all their Inferior Gods derived their very being from the Supreme?* The ſame *Aquinas,* in his *Book* purpoſely written againſt the Gentiles, gives this account of their Principles of Religion; *that ſome of them held one God the firſt and univerſal Principle of all things; but withal they gave divine Worſhip* (Latriam) *next to the Supreme God to intellectual Subſtances of a Heavenly Nature, which they call Gods, whether they were Subſtances ſeparated from Bodies, or the Souls of the Heavenly Orbs and Stars: In the next Place to intellectual Subſtances united to aerial Bodies, which they called* Dæmons, *whom they made Gods in reſpect of Men, and thought they deſerved divine Worſhip from Men as being Mediators between the Gods and them; and in the laſt place to the Souls of good Men, as being raiſed to a higher State than that of this preſent Life. Others of them ſuppoſing God to be the Soul of the World, did believe, that divine Worſhip was to be given to the whole World, and the ſeveral parts of it, not for the ſake of the Body but the Soul, which they ſaid was God: as a Wiſe Man hath Honour given him not for the ſake of his body, but of his mind.* Others again *aſſerted, that Things below Men as Images, might have divine worſhip given to them, in as much as they did participate of a Superior Nature, either from the influence of Heavenly Bodies, or the preſence of ſome Spirits, which Images they called Gods, and from thence they were called Idolaters.* And ſo he proves, *that they were, who acknowledging one firſt Principle did give divine worſhip to any other being: becauſe it weakens the notion and eſteem we ought to have of the Supreme Being to give divine worſhip to any other beſides him; as it would leſſen the Honour of a King, for any other Perſon to have the ſame kind of reſpect ſhewed to him, which we expreſs to the King: and becauſe this divine worſhip is due to God on the account of Creation, which is proper only to him, and becauſe he is properly Lord over us and none elſe beſides him: and he is our great and laſt end;* which are all of them great and weighty Reaſons, why divine worſhip ſhould be appropriated to God alone. *But,* ſaith he, *although this Opinion which makes God a ſeparate Being and the firſt Cauſe of all intellectual Beings, be true: yet that which makes God the Soul of the World, though it be farther from Truth, gives a better account of giving divine worſhip to created Beings. For then they give that divine worſhip to God himſelf: For according to this Principle, the ſeveral Parts of the World in reſpect of God, are but as the ſeveral Members of a Mans Body in reſpect of his Soul. But the moſt unreaſonable Opinion,* he ſaith, *is that of animated Images, becauſe thoſe cannot deſerve more worſhip, than either the Spirits that animate them, or the Makers of them, which ought not to have divine worſhip given them; beſides, that by lying Oracles and wicked Counſels, theſe appear to have been evil Spirits, and therefore deſerve no worſhip of us. From hence,* he ſaith, *it appears, that becauſe divine worſhip is proper only to God, as the firſt Principle; and none but an ill diſpoſed rational Being can excite Men to the doing ſuch unlawful things, as giving the worſhip proper to God to any other Being, that Men were drawn to Idolatry by the inſtigation of evil Spirits, which coveted divine honours to themſelves: and therefore the Scripture ſaith, they worſhipped* Devils *and not God.* From which

Id l. 3 *c.* 120.

which remarkable Teſtimony we may take notice of theſe things. 1. That he confeſſeth many of the *Gentiles* whom he charges with *Idolatry*, did believe and worſhip the *Supreme God* as *Creator and Governor of the World.* 2. That *divine worſhip* is ſo proper to the true God, that whoſoever gives it to any created Being, though in it ſelf of real Excellency, and conſidered as deriving that Excellency from God, is yet guilty of *Idolatry*.

3. That *Relative Latria* being given to a Creature, is *Idolatry*; for ſo he makes it to be, in thoſe who ſuppoſed *God* to be the *Soul of the World.* And I deſire *T. G.* or any other cunning *Sophiſter* among them to ſhew me why a Man may not as lawfully worſhip any part of the World with a *Relative Latria*, ſuppoſing *God* to be the *Soul* of the *World*, as any *Image*, or *Crucifix* whatſoever? For if *Union*, *Contact*, or *Relation*, be a ſufficient ground for *Relative Latria*, in one caſe, it will be in the other alſo, and I cannot but wonder ſo great a Judgment as *Aquinas* had, ſhould not either have made him juſtify the *Heathens* on this *Suppoſition*, or condemn the *Chriſtians* in giving *Latria* i. e. *proper divine worſhip* to the *Croſs*. For there is not any ſhadow of reaſon produced by him for the one, which would not have held much more for the other. For, *if the Honour of the Image is carried to the Prototype*; is not the honour of the Members of the *Body* to the Mind that animates them? If *the Image deſerve the ſame worſhip with the Perſon repreſented by it*; is not much more any Part of the Body capable of receiving the *Honour* due to the *Perſon*? as the *Popes Toe* is of the Worſhip that is given to him. Why ſhould it be more unlawful to worſhip God, by worſhipping *Fire*, or *Water*, or the *Earth*, or any inferior Creature, ſuppoſing *God* to be the *Soul* of the *World*, than it is to ſhew *Reverence* to the *Pope* by kiſſing his *Toe*? which I ſuppoſe, can be upon no other reaſon, but becauſe it is a Part of his Body, which is *animated* by the ſame *Soul* in all the Members of it. 4. That *Aquinas* doth not therefore ſay, that the *Heathens worſhipped* Devils *becauſe the ſupreme God whom they worſhipped was an Arch-devil*, as T. G. ſaith, but becauſe none but evil *Spirits* would draw Men, to give *divine worſhip* to any thing but *God* himſelf; and then, that evil Spirits did appear to heighten and encourage this devotion, by acting and ſpeaking in *Images*. The Conſequence of which I deſire *T. G.* to conſider. And this Teſtimony of *Aquinas* is the more conſiderable, not only for his great Authority in the *Roman Church*; and becauſe *Pius* V. in the Approbation of his *Works A. D.* 1567. very gravely mentions *Chriſts* ſpeaking to him from a *Crucifix*, when he was praying before it, *that he had written well concerning him* (it ſeems the *Crucifix* was *animated* too); but becauſe I find this *Book* ſo highly applauded by *Poſſevin*, and others for the beſt account of the *Chriſtian Religion* in oppoſition to *Heatheniſm*.

Aquin. Sum. p. 3. q. 25. art. 3.

Poſſev. Biblioth. l. 9. c. 25. Thom. à Jeſu de Converſ. gent. l. 11. c. 2.

Card. Cajetan in his *Commentaries* on *Aquinas* ſpeaking of the *Images* of God, he diſtinguiſhes them into three Sorts. 1. *Some that were to repreſent the Divinity*, which he utterly condemns. 2. *Some to ſet forth the appearances of God mentioned in Scripture.* 3. *Some by way of Analogy, that by ſenſible things we may be brought to the Veneration of inſenſible, as the Holy Ghoſt in the form of an old Man holding a Globe in his Hand*, &c; *which laſt way*, ſaith he, *comes near to the Cuſtom of the Heathens who repreſented God diverſly, as he is the Cauſe of divers effects, as under the form of* Minerva *by reaſon of his* Wiſdom, *and the like.* Would *Cajetan* ever

Cajet. in Th. p. 3. q. 25. art. 3.

have parallel'd the *Cuſtom* of the *Church* of *Rome*, with that of the *Heathens*, if he had thought they had only pictured the *Devil* under theſe Repreſentations? In another place he puts this Queſtion; *how it could be ſaid that all the Gods of the Heathens were Devils, ſince although they worſhipped many Gods, yet withal they worſhipped one Supreme God?* To which he anſwers. 1. *That the Devils were the cauſes of Idolatry, and ſo they were Devils cauſually though not eſſentially.* 2. *That although thoſe they worſhipped were not in themſelves Devils, as the Heavenly Intelligences; yet they were ſo as they were the Gods of the Heathens:* i. e. *as they had divine worſhip given to them. And the true God himſelf,* he ſaith, *was not worſhipped according to what he was, but according to what they conceived of him.* But he grants before that they conceived of him, *as the ſupreme God:* which was a *right Conception* of him; but if he means it was *imperfect*, is it not ſo in thoſe who worſhip him moſt truly?

In Aq 2.1. q.94.art.4.

Martinus Pereſius Ayala a Learned *Biſhop* in *Spain*, treating the *Queſtion* of the *Worſhip* of *Images*; ſaith expreſly, *That* St. *Auguſtin condemned all divine worſhip or Latria to be given to any kind of Images, not,* ſaith he, *in regard of their matter, for there was no need to give caution againſt that, but in regard of their Repreſentation,* and he calls them *Idolaters which give that worſhip to Images which is due to God* (with T. G's leave I tranſlate *Simulachra Images*, for ſo I am ſure *Pereſius* underſtands it) *Neither* ſaith he, *was* St. *Auguſtine ignorant, that there were few or none among the* Gentiles *who thought the matter of their Idols ſo faſhioned to be Gods or God:* (let T. G. mark that) *but on that account he ſeems to condemn them, that they gave divine Honour to their Images, as they repreſented God: for there were many Idols among them in which there was no Devil who gave Anſwers, but they only repreſented God as their Benefactor: neither did all the things which the* Gentiles *worſhipped ſignifie a falſe God. For there was an Altar at* Athens *to the unknown God. Joh. Ferus* ſaith, *that the Intention of the Heathens, was through their Idols to give worſhip to the true God.* Now T. G. knows that *humane Acts do certainly go whither they are intended*; ſo that according to *Ferus*, theſe Heathens did truly worſhip the true God. *Athan. Kircher lays it down as a certain Principle, that there never was in any Age, any People ſo rude and barbarous, which did not acknowledge and worſhip one ſupreme Deity, the firſt Principle and Governor of all things.* But ſaith he, *that they might teach the People that the ſupreme Being, whom we call God, was preſent in all Places, therefore they made abundance of Gods in all Places and over all Things.* So that as *Max. Tyrius* ſaith, *no Place was left without a* Deity. *Petavius* not only makes uſe of the Arguments produced by the Heathens to prove one ſupreme God, and thinks them conſiderable: but ſaith *that* St. *Paul demonſtrates* (mark that) *that the Gentile Philoſophers attained to the Knowledge of God by the Works of Creation:* and quotes the ſaying of *Max. Tyrius* with Approbation, *that however the ſeveral Nations of the World differed from each other in Cuſtoms and Languages and Modes of worſhip, yet they all agreed in this, that there was one God, Lord, and Father of all,* and ſaith, *that the Teſtimony of* Oroſius *is moſt true, that both the Philoſophers and common Heathens did believe one God the Author of all things, and*

Mart. Pereſ. de divin. trad. part. 3. p. 120.

Ferus in Act. 17.

Kirch. Oedip. Ægy. ſynt. 3. c. 1.

c. 2.

Petav. dogm. The. To. 1. c. 1. §. 9.

Max. Tyr. differt. 1.

Oroſ. l. 6. c. 1.

to whom all things are referred: But that under this God they did worſhip many inferiour and ſubſervient Gods: and he adds that Paſſage of St. *Auguſtin, that the Heathens ſuppoſed all their Gods to come at firſt out of one Subſtance:* But I wonder he omitted what is very obſervable in the ſame Chapter, *viz.* that *Fauſtus* the *Manichean* holding two firſt Principles, ſaith, *that the Chriſtians joyned with the Heathens in believing but one: And S.* Auguſtin confeſſeth, *that the greateſt part of the Heathens did believe the ſame with the Chriſtians in that point; but the difference,* he ſaith, *lay here, that they worſhipped more Gods than one: And therein the* Manichees *agreed with them, and the Chriſtians only with the* Jews, *but the* Manichees *in that were worſe than the Heathens, that theſe worſhipped thoſe things for Gods which were, but were not Gods; but they worſhipped thoſe things, which were ſo far from being Gods that they were not at all. Faber Faventinus,* in his Diſcourſe againſt *Atheiſts,* inſiſts upon this as an Argument of ſome Weight to prove a Deity, *becauſe all Mankind had ſo ſettled a Notion of one firſt Principle in their Minds from which all things come, and by which they were governed, and however they differed in other Conceptions about this firſt Principle, yet they all agreed in this, that it was Immortal, and not only good in it ſelf, but the Fountain of all Good.* Which ſurely was no Deſcription of an *Arch-Devil.* But what need I farther inſiſt on thoſe Authors of his own Church who have yielded this; when there are ſeveral who with Approbation, have undertaken the Proof of this in Books written purpoſely on this Subject: Such as *Raim. Breganius, Mutius Panſa, Livius Galantes, Paulus Benius Eugubinus,* but above all *Auguſtinus Steuchus Eugubinus,* who have made it their Buſineſs to prove, *that not only the Being of the Deity, but the Unity as a firſt Principle, the Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Power and* Providence *of God, were acknowledged not meerly by the* Philoſophers, *as* Plato *and* Ariſtotle *and their Followers, but by the Generality of Mankind.* But I am afraid theſe *Books* may be as hard for him to find as *Trigautius* was, and it were well, if his *Principles* were as hard to find too, if they diſcover no more Learning or Judgment than this, *that the Supreme God of the Heathens was an Arch-Devil.*

Petav. l. 1. c. 3. § 3.
Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 10.
c. 9.
Ph. Faber Faven. adverſ. Atheos diſp. 1. c. 2. n. 27.
Raim. Bregan. Theolog. Gentil.
Mutius Panſa de Oſculo Ethnicæ & Chriſtianæ Philoſo.
Liv. Galant. Chriſtianæ philoſoph. cum Platon. comparat.
Paul. Benii Eugub. Platon. & Ariſtot. Theolog.
Aug. Steuc. Eugub. de perenni Philo.

§ 4.
T. G. p. 350.

But *T. G.* ſaith, *that the Father of Gods and Men among the Heathens, was according to the Fathers an Arch-Devil.* Is it not poſſible for you to entertain wild and abſurd Opinions your ſelves, but upon all Occaſions you muſt lay them at the Doors of the *Fathers?* I have heard of a place where the People were hard put to it to provide *God-fathers* for their *Children*; at laſt, they reſolved to chooſe Two Men that were to ſtand as *God-fathers* for all the *Children* that were to be born in the *Pariſh*; juſt ſuch a uſe you make of the *Fathers,* they muſt *Chriſten* all your *Brats,* and how fooliſh ſoever an Opinion be, if it comes from you, it muſt preſently paſs under the Name of the *Fathers.* But I ſhall do my endeavour to break this bad Cuſtom of yours, and ſince *T. G.* thinks me a *ſcarce-revolted Preſbyterian,* I ſhall make the right *Father* ſtand for his own *Children.* And becauſe this is very material toward the true Underſtanding the *Nature* of *Idolatry,* I ſhall give a full account of the Senſe of the *Fathers* in this point; and not as *T. G.* hath done from one ſingle Paſſage of a learned (but by their own Church thought *heretical*) *Father, viz. Origen*, preſently cry out, *the Fathers, the Fathers.* Which is like a Country Fellow that came to a Gentleman, and told him he had found out a brave *Covie* of Partridges lying in ſuch a Field; the Gentleman was very much pleaſed with the News, and preſently asked him how many there were: What half a Score? No. Eight? No. Six? No. Four? No. But how many then are there? Sir, ſaith the Country Fellow, it is a *Covie* of one. I am afraid *T. G*'s *Covie* of *Fathers* will hardly come to one at laſt.

Juſtin Martyr is the eldeſt genuine Father extant, who undertook to reprove the *Gentils* for their *Idolatry*, and to defend the Chriſtian Worſhip. In his *Paræneſis* to the *Greeks* he takes notice, *how hardly the wiſer* Gentiles *thought themſelves dealt with, when all the Poetical Fables about their Gods were objected againſt them* (juſt as ſome of the *Church of Rome* do, when we tell them of the *Legends* of their *Saints*, which the more ingenuous confeſs to be made by Men, *who took a Priviledge of feigning and ſaying any thing, as well as the Heathen Poets*); *but they appealed for the Principles of their Religion to* Plato *and* Ariſtotle: Both whom he confeſſes, *to have aſſerted one Supreme God*; although they differed in their Opinions about the manner of the Formation of things by him. Afterwards he ſaith, *That the firſt Author of* Polytheiſm *among them*, viz. Orpheus, *did plainly aſſert one Supreme God, and the making of all things by him:* For which he produces many *Verſes* of his: And to the ſame purpoſe an excellent Teſtimony of *Sophocles, viz. that in Truth there is but one God, who made Heaven and Earth and Sea and Winds: But the Folly and Madneſs of Mankind brought in the Images of Gods, and when they had offered Sacrifices and kept Solemnities to theſe, they thought themſelves Religious.* He farther ſhews that *Pythagoras delivered to his Diſciples the Unity of God, and his being the Cauſe of all things, and the Fountain of all Good: that* Plato *being warned by* Socrates *his Death durſt not oppoſe the Gods commonly worſhipped, but one may gueſs by his Writings, that his Meaning as to the inferiour Deities was, that they who would have them might, and they who would not might let them alone: But that himſelf had a right Opinion concerning the true* God. *That,* Homer *by his Golden Chain did attribute to the Supreme* God *a Power over all the reſt*; and *that the reſt of the Deities were near as far diſtant from the Supreme as Men were: And that the Supreme was he whom* Homer *calls*, Θεὸς αὐτὸς *God himſelf*, which ſignifies, ſaith *Juſtin*, τὸν ὄντως ὄντα Θεὸν *the truly exiſtent Deity:* and *that in* Achilles *his Shield he makes* Vulcan *repreſent the Creation of the World.* From theſe Arguments he perſwades the *Greeks* to hearken to the *Revelation* which the *True and Supreme* God had made of himſelf to the World, and *to worſhip him according to his own Will.* In his *Apologies* to the *Roman Emperors, Antoninus Pius* and *Marcus Aurelius*, and the *Roman Senate and People* (for ſo *Baronius* ſhews, that which is now called the *firſt*, was truly the *ſecond*, and that not only written to the *Senate*, but to the *Emperor* too, who at that time was *Marcus Aurelius*, as *Euſebius* ſaith, and *Photius* after him) he gives this account of the *State* of the *Controverſy* then ſo warmly managed about *Idolatry: That it was not whether there*

Juſtin. Martyr. paræn. p. 4. ed. Pariſ.

p. 6.

p. 16.

p. 18.

p. 19.

p. 22.

p. 27.

Baron. A. 164. n. 14.

Euſeb. hiſt. l. 4. c. 17.

were one Supreme God or no: Or whether he ought to have divine Worſhip given to him: But whether thoſe whom the Gentils *called Gods were ſo or no; and whether they or dead Men did deſerve any Divine Honour to be given to them; and laſtly, that being ſuppoſed, whether this Honour ought to be given to Images or no?* For every one of theſe *Juſtin* ſpeaks diſtinctly to. *As to their Gods,* he denies *that they deſerved any Divine Worſhip, becauſe they deſired*
p. 44. *it and were delighted with it;* From whence, as well as from other Arguments, he proves, *that they could not be true Gods, but evil Dæmons:* That *thoſe who were Chriſtians, did only worſhip the true God the Father of all Virtue and Goodneſs; and his Son who hath inſtructed both Men and Angels,* (for it is ridiculous to think that in this Place *Juſtin* ſhould aſſert the *Worſhip of Angels* equal with the Father and Son, and before the Holy Ghoſt, as ſome great Men of the Church of Rome have done) and the *Prophetick Spirit, in Spirit and Truth.* In another place he
p. 68. ſaith, *that they had no other Crime to object againſt the Chriſtians but that they did not worſhip the ſame Gods with them; nor offer*
p. 66. *up Libations and the Smoak of Sacrifices to dead Men; nor crown and worſhip Images; that they agreed with* Menander, who ſaid, *we ought not to worſhip the* Work *of Mens Hands:* Not becauſe *Devils* dwelt in them, *but becauſe Men were the Makers of them.* And he wondered they could call them *Gods,* which *they knew*
p. 57. *to be without Soul, and dead, and to have no Likeneſs to God:* (It was not then upon the account of their being *animated* by *evil Spirits,* that the Chriſtians rejected this Worſhip, for then theſe reaſons would not have held.) *All the Reſemblance they had, was to thoſe evil Spirits that had appeared among Men;* for that was *Juſtins* Opinion of the Beginning of *Idolatry,* that *God had com-*
p. 44. *mitted the Government of all things under the Heavens to particular Angels, but theſe Angels prevaricating by the Love of Women, did upon them beget Dæmons, that theſe Dæmons were the great Corruptors of Mankind; and partly by frightful Apparitions, and by inſtructing Men in Idolatrous Rites, did by degrees draw Men to give them* Divine *Worſhip, the People not imagining them to be evil Spirits, and ſo were called by ſuch Names as they liked beſt themſelves, as* Neptune, Pluto, *&c.*

p. 55. *But the true God had no certain Name given to him, for* ſaith he, *Father, and God, and Creator, and Lord, and Maſter, are not Names, but Titles ariſing from his Works, and good Deeds: And*
p. 44. *God, is not a Name, but a Notion engrafted in human Nature of an unexpreſſible Being. But, that God alone, is to be worſhipped, appears by this, which is the great Command given to Chriſtians.*
p. 65. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy* God *and him only ſhalt thou ſerve, with all thy Heart and with all thy Strength, even the Lord God that made thee.* Where we ſee, the Force of the Argument uſed by *Juſtin* in behalf of the Chriſtians, lay in Gods peremptory Prohibition of giving Divine Worſhip to any thing but himſelf; and that founded upon Gods Right of Dominion over us by Virtue of Creation. In his *Book* of the Divine Monarchy, he ſhews, *that although the Heathens did make great Uſe of the Poets to juſtify their Polytheiſm, yet they did give clear Teſtimony of one Supreme* **Deity, who was the** Maker *and Governor of all things;* for which end

end he produces the ſayings of *Æſchylus*, *Sophocles*, *Orpheus*, *Pythagoras*, *Philemon*, *Menander* and *Euripides*; all very conſiderable to this purpoſe. In his Works there is extant *the Reſolution of ſeveral Queſtions by a Greek Philoſopher*, and the *Chriſtians Reply*, in which nothing can be more evident, than that it was agreed on both ſides *that there was one Supreme God infinitely good, powerful and wiſe.* Nay *the Greek Philoſopher* looks upon *the Ignorance of God as a thing impoſſible, becauſe all* Men *naturally agree in the Knowledge of God.* P. 160.

§ 5. But there are plain Evidences in that Book, that it is of later Date than *Juſtin*'s time; therefore inſtead of inſiſting any more on that, I ſhall give a farther Proof, that in his time it could be no part of the Diſpute between the *Chriſtians* and *Heathens*, whether there were *one Supreme God*, that ought to be worſhipped by Men; and that ſhall be from that very *Emperor* to whom *Euſebius* ſaith, *Juſtin* Martyr did make his ſecond Apology, *viz. M. Aurelius Antoninus.* It is particularly obſerved of him, by the *Roman Hiſtorians, that he had a great Zeal for preſerving the old* Roman *Religion:* And *Jul. Capitolinus* ſaith, *that he was ſo skilful in all the* Practices *of it, that he needed not, as it was common, for one to prompt him, becauſe he could ſay the* Prayers *by Heart*; and he was ſo confident of the *Protection of the Gods*, that he bids *Fauſtina* not puniſh thoſe who had conſpired againſt him, *for the Gods would defend him: His Zeal being pleaſing to them*; and therefore *Baronius* doth not wonder that *Juſtin* and other *Chriſtians* ſuffered Martyrdom under him. But in the *Books* which are left of his writing we may eaſily diſcover, that he firmly believed an *Eternal Wiſdom and Providence which managed the World*; and, *that the Gods*, whoſe Veneration he commends, were looked on by him *as the ſubſervient Miniſters of the Divine Wiſdom. Reverence the God*, ſaith he; *but withal*, he ſaith, *honour that which is moſt excellent in the World, that which diſpoſeth and governs all:* Which ſometimes he calls the *all-commanding Reaſon*, ſometimes, *the* Mind *and Soul of the World*, which he expreſly ſaith *is but one.* And in one place he ſaith, that *there is but one World, and one God, and one Subſtance, and one Law, and one common Reaſon of intelligent Beings, and one Truth.*

Jul. Capit. vit. Anton.
Baron. A. 164. n. 7, 8, 9.
Anton. l. 6 § 30. l. 2, 3. l. 5. 33. l. 5. 21. l. 6. 5. 42. l. 5. 32. l. 4. 40. l. 7. 9. l. 9. 4.

§ 6. But the great Objection againſt ſuch *Teſtimonies* of *Antoninus* and others lies in this, *that theſe only ſhew the particular Opinions of ſome few* Men *of Philoſophical* Minds; *but they do not reach to the publick and eſtabliſhed Religion among them, which ſeemed to make no difference between the Supreme God and other Deities*; *from whence it follows, that they did not give to him any ſuch Worſhip as belonged to him.* Which being the moſt conſiderable Objection againſt the Deſign of this preſent Diſcourſe, I ſhall here endeavour to remove it, before I produce any farther Teſtimonies of the *Fathers*.

For which we muſt conſider, wherein the *Romans* did ſuppoſe the ſolemn and outward Acts of their *Religion* to conſiſt, *viz. in the Worſhip appropriated to their Temples*, or in *occaſional Prayers* and *Vows*, or in ſome *parts of Divination*, whereby they ſuppoſed *God* did make known his Mind to them: If I can therefore prove, that the *Romans* did in an extraordinary manner make uſe of all theſe Acts of *Religious Worſhip* to the *Supreme God*, it will then neceſſarily follow, that the Controverſy between the *Fathers* and them about *Idolatry*, could not be about the Worſhip of one *Supreme God*, but about giving *Religious Worſhip* to any *elſe beſides him*.

1. The *Worſhip performed in their Temples*, was the moſt ſolemn and frequent among them; in ſo much that *Tully* ſaith, *therein the People of* Rome *exceeded all Nations in the World*; but the moſt ſolemn part of that *Worſhip* was that which was performed in the *Capitol* at *Rome*, and in the *Temple* of *Jupiter Latialis* in *Alba*; and both theſe, I ſhall prove were dedicated to the *Supreme God*. The firſt *Capitol* was built at *Rome* by *Numa Pompilius*, and called by *Varro* the *old Capitol*, which ſtood at a good diſtance from the place where the Foundations of the great *Temple* were laid by *Tarquinius Priſcus*, the one being about the *Cirque* of *Flora*, the other upon the *Tarpeian Mountain*. There is ſo little left of the Memory of the former, that for the deſign of it, we are to judge by the general Intention of *Numa* as to the Worſhip of the *Deity*: Of which Plutarch gives this account; *That he forbad the* Romans *making any Image of God, either like to Men or Beaſt; becauſe the Firſt Being is inviſible, and incorruptible, and can only be apprehended by our Minds. From hence*, ſaith he, *it was that the* Romans, *although they built Temples and holy* Places, *yet for* 160. *Years had no graven or painted Image of God; accounting it a prophane thing to repreſent the more excellent by what was below it; and becauſe we cannot come near to* God *any other way than by our Underſtanding*. I do not deny, that *Numa* did allow the Worſhip of inferiour *Deities*, as of *Juno*, *Minerva*, and of *Deified Men*, as of *Quirinus*, as *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* ſaith; but ſince it is plain from hence that he acknowledged a *Firſt*, *inviſible*, *incomprehenſible Being*, ſince he deduced the Reaſon of *Divine worſhip* from Conſiderations proper to him, ſince he appointed a *Flamen Dialis* as the chief of all the reſt, as *Livy* tells us, and erected a *Capitol* to *Jove*, it is incredible that he ſhould deſign it for any other than the *Supreme Deity*. What Force was there in *Numa*'s Reaſon againſt *Images*, if the *Firſt*, and *inviſible Being* were not *worſhipped* by him? To what end were Reaſons framed againſt a thing never intended? And which would not hold againſt the Worſhip of *Deified Men*, unleſs the Worſhip of them was ſuppoſed to be carried at laſt to the *Supreme God*? But not only *Plutarch* atteſted this, but *Varro* ſaith, *that for* 170 *Years the* Romans *worſhipped their Gods without Images*: *i. e.* till the *New Capitol* was erected: Which was vowed by *Tarquinius Priſcus* in the *Sabine* War; but he was only able to prepare the Place and lay the Foundations; *Servius Tullus* carried it on, *Tarquinius Superbus* was at vaſt Charge upon it, *deſigning*, ſaith Livy, *a Temple of ſuch a Capacity as might become the King of Gods and Men*; which was the common Phraſe whereby *Ennius*, Plautus and *Virgil* did ſet forth the *Supreme Deity*. This magnificent Temple which according to *Dionyſius*, ſtood upon 800 Foot of Ground, was not finiſhed till after the Expulſion of *Tarquin*, and was then dedicated with great Solemnity by *Horatius* Pulvillus being both *Conſul* and Pontifex. And from that time this was accounted *the great Seat of God and* Religion *among them*; it was *Sedes Jovis*, in *Livy*;

Jovis

De Aruſpic. Reſp. c. 9.

Euſeb. Chronic. p. 118.
Varro de Ling. Lat. l. 4.

Plutarch. in Numa.

Dionyſ. Halicarn. Antiq. Rom. l. 2.

Liv. hiſt. l. 1. c. 19.

Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 4. c. 31.

Dionyſ. l. 3.

Tacit. hiſt. l. 3. c. 72.
Liv. l. 1. c. 53.
Varro de Ling. lat. l. 5.
Plaut. capt. Act. 3. ſc. 4.
Liv. l. 2.
Sen. Con. ſol. ad Marciam.
Liv. l. 5. c. 50.

Jovis Summi Arx, in *Ovid*; *terreſtre Domicilium Jovis*, in *Cicero*; *Sedes Jovis Opt. Max.* in *Tacitus*; which are all as plain Teſtimonies that this *Temple* was deſigned for the *Supreme God* among them, as can be deſired; but if any thing more can be added, it is only what *Pliny* ſaith in his *Panegyrick, that God was as preſent there as he was in the Heavens.* To this *Temple* the greateſt Reſort was made eſpecially by the *Magiſtrates* on all *ſolemn Occaſions*: Hither the *Conſuls* came and made their *Vows* and *offered Sacrifices* before they went into their *Provinces*, on *the very day they entred upon their Office*, ſaith *Livy*, for it was one of the Charges againſt *Flaminius, that he went away without doing it*; hither thoſe that triumphed came and offered up their *Laurels* and laid them in the Lap of *Jupiter O. M.* here the great Souldiers conſecrated their *Arms*, and hung up the *Spoils* of their Enemies, by which means it came to incredible Riches; here, the great *Scipio* was obſerved to be very often converſant in the night *in cella Jovis*; and *Alexander Severus* never miſſed *attending the Service of the Capitol, if he were in the City, every ſeventh day*, as *Lampridius* ſaith in his Life; by which we ſee in what extraordinary Eſteem the Service of *Jupiter O. M.* in the *Capitol* was among the greateſt Perſons in Rome; from whence, *Lactantius* ſaith, it was *ſummum caput* Religionum *ſuarum publicarum*; the very top of their Religion; and *Iſidore* thinks that it was called *Capitolium*, becauſe it was *Romanæ Urbis & Religionis caput ſummum*; ſo that it was not only the Worſhip of the *Supreme*, but a *higher degree of Worſhip* than was uſed at any other *Temple* in Rome. If any worſhip can be ſuppoſed more *ſolemn* than this, it was that of *Jupiter Latialis* upon the *Mountain* of *Alba*, whither the *Roman Coſſ.* went upon the *Feriæ Latinæ*, and there met the Ambaſſadours ſent on purpoſe from the whole *Society* of the *Latins*; where they all joyned together in a common Sacrifice to the ſame *Jove*, as *Dionyſius*, *Strabo*, and *Livy* relate.

Ovid. Faſt. l. 2. Cic. in Verr. 4. c. 58. Tacit. hiſt. 3. 72. Plin. Panegyr.

Liv. l. 4. c. 32. l. 21. c. 63. Plin. hiſt. l. 15. 30. Sen. ad Helv. c. 10. A. Geld. l. 7. c. 1.

Lactant. l. 1. c. 11. Iſidor. Origin. l. 15. c. 2.

Dionyſ. hiſt. l. 4. Strabo. l. 5. Liv. l. 21. c. 63. 22. c. 1. 38. c. 44. 41. c. 16. 42. c. 35. 45. c. 3. 44. c. 19.

I can foreſee but two Objections againſt this evidence for the *worſhip* of the *ſupreme God* among the *Romans*. 1. *That* Jupiter *was not worſhipped alone in the Capitol, but* Juno *and* Minerva *too.* 2. *That this* Jupiter *was not the ſupreme* God, *but* Jupiter *of* Crete. To theſe I anſwer. 1. I confeſs that *Juno* and *Minerva* had their *Images* in the *Capitol*; but we are to conſider that it was a Rule in their Pontifical Law, that *a Temple could be conſecrated only to one* God; and therefore *M. Marcellus* could not dedicate the ſame *Temple* to *Honour* and *Vertue*, becauſe the Pontifices, ſaith *Livy*, told him, *unum Templum, duobus Numinibus non rectè dedicari.* But there might be *Images* or little *Cells*, of other *Gods* beſides; as *T. G.* knows, in a *Church* dedicated to *God* or the *B. Virgin*, there may be *Chappels* to *Saints*, which do not hinder the main deſign of the worſhip being to *God*: and ſo it was in this (and many other things among the old *Romans*;) as *Diana* and the *Muſes* were in the *Temple* of *Apollo*; and the *Graces* of *Phidias* in the Temple of *Jupiter Olympius*; but *Livy* particularly ſaith, as to this *Temple* of the *Capitol*, *that they cleared the ground as much as they could of all worſhips beſides*, ut area eſſet tota Jovis, *that it might wholly belong to Jove*.

Liv. l. 7.

Liv. l. 1. c. 55.

The only Queſtion then is, *whether by this* Jove *they meant the ſupreme God, or* Jupiter *of* Crete? For which we are to obſerve, 1. *That* 2.

That the Poetical Fables were rejected at Rome. 2. *That the Character given of* Jupiter *by the* Romans *can belong only to the ſupreme God.*

1. That the Poetical *Fables* were rejected at *Rome.* I do not mean only that they were rejected by their Wiſemen as *Varro*, *Seneca*, and others, but by their moſt antient Laws about *Religion. Marlianus* mentions a *Table* of the *Laws* of *Romulus* preſerved in the *Capitol*, among which this is one, *DEORUM FABULAS NE CREDUNTO.* And that this was no Invention of his own, appears by what *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus* at large diſcourſeth on this Subject: where he ſhews, *that although the Cuſtoms and Rites of Religion inſtituted by* Romulus *were agreeable to the beſt among the* Greeks; *yet he utterly rejected all their Fables concerning their* Gods *(which are indeed ſo many Blaſphemies and Reproaches of them) as wicked, unprofitable and indecent, and not becoming good Men, much leſs thoſe which were worſhiped for* Gods*: And that he diſpoſed the minds of men to ſpeak and think things worthy of that bleſſed Nature they ſuppoſed them to have.* And he particularly inſtances in the *Fables* of *Saturn* and *Jupiter*, and the *Myſteries* of *Ceres* and *Bacchus*, and the *Madneſſes* and *Wickedneſs* of the *Greeks* in *celebrating their religious Myſteries*; but, he ſaith, *all things that concerned Religion were ſaid and done among the* Romans, *with greater Gravity than among the* Greeks *or* Barbarians. *By this he would not have any think him ignorant that Some of the Greek Fables might be uſeful to ſome Perſons, either for natural or moral Philoſophy or other Purpoſes; but upon the whole matter he did much more approve the* Roman *Theology, becauſe the Benefit of thoſe Fables was very little to any, and thoſe very few; but the common People who are not verſed in Philoſophy, are apt to take theſe things in the worſt Senſe, either from thence to learn to contemn their Gods, or to follow their Examples.*

Marlian. Topogr. Romæ. l. 2 c. 8. Dionyſ. Halicarn. Antiq. Rom. l. 2. p. 90.

I do not undertake to defend all the *Roman Theology*, nor can it be ſaid that the *Romans* did in all things maintain τὸ ἐυ πρεπὲς that or decency of worſhip which Dionyſius magnifies them for, as appears by the many *Indecencies* which the *Fathers* charge the Practice of their Religion with; but as they were not to be excuſed in other things, ſo we ought not to charge them with more than they were guilty of; I mean when all the *Poetical Fables* of *Jupiter* are applyed to *Jupiter* O. M. that was worſhipped in the *Capitol* at Rome. But ſome *writers* are to be excuſed, who having been bred up in the *Schools* of *Rhetoricians*, and practiſing that Art ſo long before, when they came to be *Chriſtians*, they could not eaſily forbear giving a caſt of their former Employment. As when *Arnobius* had been proving the natural Notion of one *ſupreme God* in the Minds of Men, he brings in the Romans anſwering, that *if this were intended againſt them, it* was a meer Calumny, *for they believ'd him and called him* Jupiter O. M. *and built a moſt magnificent Temple to him in the Capitol*; which he endeavours to diſprove *becauſe God is eternal*, and *their* Jupiter *was born and had a Father and Mother and Uncles and Aunts, as other Mortals have.* Which indeed was an infallible Argument, that *Jupiter* of *Crete* could not be the *ſupreme God*; but for all that, might not the *Romans* call the *ſupreme God* by the name of *Jupiter O. M?* The Queſtion is not, whether they did wiſely to make uſe of a name ſo corrupted and abuſed by abominable Fables; but whether under

Anob. c. gent. l. 1. p. 19.

this Name they meant the *ſupreme Being* or no? and they thought it a ſufficient diſtinction of him from that infamous *Jupiter* of the *Poets*, that they called him *Optimus Maximus*: which *Lactantius* confeſſeth, were the Titles the *Romans* always gave him in their *Prayers*; *Quid horum omnium Pater Jupiter, qui in ſolenni precatione Opt. Max. nominatur*? Which not only ſhews the Title they gave him, but the *Supplications* they made to him, and the believing him to be the *Father of Gods and* Men: and yet after this, *Lactantius* rips up all the *Extravagancies* of the *Poets*; as though the *Romans* at the ſame time believed him to have done all thoſe things, and to have been the *Supreme Governor of the World*, as he confeſſes they did. *Regnare in cœlo Jovem vulgus exiſtimat, id & doctis pariter & indoctis perſuaſum eſt; quod & Religio ipſa & Precationes, & hymni & delubra & ſimulachra demonſtrant*; Which Words are a very plain Teſtimony, *that they not only believed him to be Governor of the World, but that they did intend to give ſolemn Worſhip to him by Prayers and Hymns and Sacrifices.* But when he immediately adds, *that they confeſs the ſame* Jupiter *to have been born of* Saturn *and* Rhea; he might have done well to have explained himſelf a little more, for not long after he acknowledges, *that many did reject the Poets in theſe matters, as guilty not only of lying but of Sacrilege*; and beſides theſe, the *Philoſophers* he ſaith, *did make two Joves, the one natural, the other fabulous*, *i. e.* in truth, they made but one, rejecting the other *as a Figment of the Poets*. But he ſaith, *they were to blame in calling him Jove*; and what then? this is only a Diſpute about the Name, whereas the Queſtion is, whom they underſtood by that Name; and ſome think it was the moſt proper Name they could have uſed, *Jove* being only a little varied from the name the *ſupreme God* was called by in the Scripture. And *Lactantius* himſelf confeſſes, *they had the Knowledge of the ſupreme God among them*, and what other Name had they to call him by? eſpecially when they joyned thoſe two Attributes of *Power* and *Goodneſs*, as ſufficient to prevent any Miſtake of him.

Lact. l. 1. c. 10.

c. 11.

That the Character given of this *Jupiter O. M.* by the *Romans* can belong only to the *Supreme God*, St. *Auguſtin* confeſſes, *that they believed him, whom they worſhipped in the Capitol, to be the King of the Gods as well as* Men; *and to repreſent this, they placed a Scepter in his hand, and built his Temple upon a high Hill; and that it is he of whom Virgil* ſaith, *Jovis omnia plena*; and the ſame in *Varro*'s Opinion *that was worſhipped by ſome without any Image*, by whom he means *the Jews*, ſaith St. *Auguſtin. Luc. Balbus* in *Cicero* ſaith, by *Jove* they underſtood *Dominatorem* Rerum *& omnia nutu regentem, & præſentem ac præpotentem Deum*: which are a full Deſcription of *God's infinite Power and Preſence and Government of the World.* When we call *Jupiter* Opt. Max. and *Salutaris*, and *Hoſpitalis* and *Stator*, *we mean*, ſaith *Tully*, *that the Safety of* Men *depends upon his Protection.* And that they gave him the Titles of *Opt. Max. to expreſs his Power and Goodneſs; but firſt Opt. then* Max. *becauſe it is a greater thing to do good, than to exerciſe Power. You may ſafely*, ſaith Seneca, *call God by the Titles of* Jupiter Opt. Max. *and* Tonans *and* Stator, *not from ſtopping the* Roman *Army, but becauſe all things do ſtand by him. And you may give him what Names you pleaſe, while you thereby expreſs his divine Power and Efficacy, as*

Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 4. c. 9.

Cicer. de Nat. Deor. l. 2. c. 1.

De Finib. Bon. & Mal. l. 3. c. 20.

Pro Domo ſua. c. 57.

De Nat. Deor. l. 2. c. 25.

Seneca de Benefic. l. 4. c. 7.

Liber Parens, *becauſe he is the Author of all things*, Hercules *becauſe of his irreſiſtible Force*, Mercury *for his Wiſdom. If you had received a Kindneſs from* Seneca, *and you ſhould ſay you owed it to* Annæus, *or* Lucius, *you would not change the Perſon but his Name: for what Name ſoever you call him by, he is the ſame Perſon ſtill; you may uſe what Name you pleaſe, while you mean the ſame thing.* And leſt we ſhould think this only a *Philoſophical Subtilty* in *Seneca*, he tells us elſewhere, *that their Anceſtors were not ſuch Fools to imagine that* Jove, *as they worſhipped him in the Capitol and elſewhere, did ſend forth Thunderbolts from his hand*, (as his Image was there placed ſitting in a chair of State, with ſometimes a Scepter, ſometimes a Globe in one hand, and a Thunderbolt in the other) *but by* Jove *they meant the ſame that we do, the Preſerver and Governor of the Univerſe, the Soul and Spirit, and Lord and Maker of the World:* which is as full a Teſtimony as can be wiſhed for, to our purpoſe. The Title of *Jupiter Omnipotens* is ſo frequent in *Virgil*, that it is needleſs to cite any Places for it; and he was particularly obſerved by the antient *Criticks*, to be ſo nice and exact in all matters that concerned their *Religion*, as if he had been *Pontifex Max.* as *Macrobius* obſerves: He is called in the known Verſes of *Valerius Soranus* produced by *Varro*

Senec. Natur. quæſt. l. 2. c. 45.

Virg. Georg. 2. 325. Æn. 1. 64. 2. 689. 3. 251. 4. 25. 6. 592. 7. 141. 770. &c.

Macrob. Saturn. l. 7. c. 1.

Jupiter Omnipotens Regum Rex ipſe, Deuſque
Progenitor, genitrixque Deum, Deus unus & omnis.

And this Man was accounted the moſt learned among the *Romans* before *Varro*; on which account his Teſtimony is the more conſiderable. But beſides the *Poets*, we find others attributing *Omnipotency* to their *Jove*; *Tacitus* diſputing what *God Serapis* was, ſays ſome called him *Jove, ut rerum omnium potentem*; whereby it appears that they looked on *Omnipotency* as proper to him: So in the Speech of young *Manlius* in *Livy* to *Germinius*, when he asked him, *when the Roman Army would come out*, he ſaid, *very ſpeedily*, and *Jupiter would come with them, as witneſs of their Falſeneſs, Jupiter qui plus poteſt polletque:* which ſignifies no leſs than an *Almighty Power*. When the miraculous Victory was obtained by *M. Antoninus* over the *Marcomanni* by the Prayers of the *Chriſtians* (as *Tertullian* and *Apollinaris* ſay upon good *grounds*, although the *Heathen Hiſtorians* attribute it to the Vertue of *Antoninus*, or to ſome *Magicians* with him) the whole Army made this Exclamation, ſaith *Tertullian*, *Deo Deorum & qui ſolus Potens*, whereby they did, ſaith he, *in Jovis Nomine Deo noſtro Teſtimonium reddere:* by which it is evident they intended this Honour to their own *Jove*; for in the whole Army only the *Legio Fulminatrix* are ſuppoſed to have been *Chriſtians*; and beſides this upon *Antoninus* his *Column* at Rome, *Baronius* tells us there is ſtill to be ſeen the *Effigies* of *Jupiter Pluvius*; deſtroying Men and Horſes with Thunder and Lightning. *Dio Chryſoſtome* who lived in *Trajan's* time, ſaith, *that by* Jupiter *whom the Poets call the Father of Gods and Men, was meant the firſt and greateſt God, the ſupreme Governour of the* World, *and King over all rational Beings; and that the* World *is* Jupiters *Houſe, or rather his City, being under his Care and Government; and that in their Prayers to him they called him Father:* which ſhews not only their Eſteem

Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 7. c. 9. c. 11.

Tacit. hiſt. l. 4. c. 84.

Liv. l. 8. c. 6.

Tertul. Adv. Scap. c. 4.

Baron. An. 176. n. 24.

Dio Chryſoſtom. orat. 36. p. 447.

of him, but the particular *worſhip* they gave to him *as ſupreme God.*

Beſides the *worſhip* of him in the *Temple*, they made *ſolemn Addreſſes*, and *Prayers* and *Vows* to him on ſpecial Occaſions. *Livy* mentions *Romulus* his *Prayer* to *Jove* with his *Arms* lifted up to Heaven, when his Army was flying, *Jupiter tuis juſſus Avibus*, &c. *At tu Pater Deûm Hominumque hinc ſaltem arce hoſtes*; and then makes a *Vow* to him of building a *Temple* in that Place *Statori Jovi*: and preſently he ſpeaks to his Souldiers, as if he were ſure his Prayers were heard, *Jupiter Opt. Max. reſiſtere atque iterare Pugnam jubet*: upon which *Livy* ſaith, *they ſtopped as if they had heard a Voice from Heaven. Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſæus* mentions his Prayer he made when the People choſe him *King*, Διΐ τε Βασιλεῖ ϗ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς, *to King Jupiter and the other God's*: as *Julius Cæſar* when *M. Anthony* would have put the *Diadem* on his Head, ſent it to the *Capitol* to the *Statue* of *Jupiter O. M.* with this ſaying, *ſolum Jovem Regem Romanorum eſſe.* When *Numa Pompilius* was to be inaugurated, the *Augur* made this *Prayer* in *Livy*, *Jupiter Pater, ſi eſt fas hunc Numam*, &c. When ſome were applauding the Felicity of *F. Camillus* upon the taking of *Veii*, *Plutarch* ſaith, he made this Appeal to Heaven, Ζεῦ μέγιστε ϗ θεοὶ χρηστῶν ἐπίσκοποι ϗ πονηρῶν ἔργων. *O mighty* Jove, *and ye Gods that behold the good and evil Actions of Men*, &c. When *Manlius Torquatus* found *Annius*, after his inſolent Speech againſt the *Romans in the Senate, lying dead at the Foot of the Steps of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus*; he cryed out, *Eſt cæleſte Numen, Es magne Jupiter; haud fruſtra te Patrem Deum Hominumque hac ſede ſacravimus. There is a God in Heaven, Thou art O mighty* Jove. *It is not in vain that we have conſecrated this Temple to thee the Father of* Gods *and* Men *Plautus* affords us many inſtances of *Prayers to the ſupreme God*; ſo *Hanno the Carthaginian* in his *Pœnulus*, *Magne Jupiter reſtitue certas mihi ex incertis opes*: and the *Punick Nurſe* cries out at the ſight of him, *proh ſupreme Jupiter!* and more fully *Hanno* in the following Scene.

Liv. l. 1. c. 12.

Dionyſ. Halic. l. 2. Sueton. Cæſar. c. 79.

Plutarch. in Cæſ. Dio. l. 44.

Plut. in Camill.

Liv. l. 8. c. 6.

Plaut. Pœnul. Act. 5. ſc. 3. ſc. 4.

> *Jupiter qui genus colis aliſque hominum, per quem vivimus,*
> *Vitale ævum: quem penès ſpes, vitæque ſunt hominum omnium:*
> *Da diem hunc ſoſpitem quæſo rebus meis agundis.*

And in his *Capteivi*,

Capt. Act. 4 ſc. 1.

> *Jupiter ſupreme ſervas me.*

and again,

> *Serva Jupiter ſupreme & me & meum gnatum mihi.*

Act. 5. ſc. 2.

It was a Cuſtom among the *Romans*, as *Turnebus* obſerves, to lift up their *eyes* to *Heaven*, and by way of Amplification to cry *ille Jupiter.* So *Plautus* in *Amphitryo*, *Quod ille faciat Jupiter*; and in his *Moſtellaria*, *Ita ille faxit Jupiter*: in his *Curculio*, *nec me ille ſinit Jupiter. Virgil* likewiſe hath many Prayers to the *ſupreme God* with the Acknowledgment of his Almighty *Power*; as in the Prayer of *Anchiſes*,

Turneb. Adverſ. l. 11. c. 17. Amphit. ſc. 1. Moſtel. Act. 2. ſc. 1. Curcul. c. 1.

Jupiter

Virgil. Æn. 2. 689. *Jupiter omnipotens, precibus ſi flecteris ullis,*
Aſpice nos, hoc tantum: & ſi pietate meremur,
Da deinde auxilium Pater, atque hæc omnia firma.

And in the Prayer of *Æneas*,

Æn. 5. 687. *Jupiter Omnipotens, ſi nondum exoſus ad unum*
Trojanos, ſi quid Pietas antiqua labores
Reſpicit humanos, da flammam evadere claſſi
Nunc Pater, & tenues Teucrûm res eripe letho.

So in the Prayer of *Aſcanius*,

Æn. 9. 625. *Conſtitit ante Jovem, ſupplex per vota precatus;*
Jupiter omnipotens audacibus annue cœptis.

Æn. 10. 18. In the Prayer of *Venus*,

O Pater, ô Hominum Divumque æterna Poteſtas,
(Namque aliud quid ſit quod jam implorare queamus?)

Which is after explained in theſe Words:

100. *Tum Pater omnipotens rerum cui ſumma Poteſtas*
Inſit.

And in the Prayer of *Turnus*,

569. *Omnipotens genitor tantôn' me crimine dignum*
Duxiſti?

But beſides *Virgil* (who was ſo *critical* in the Rites of *Religion* that he would never have brought in ſuch Prayers as theſe, if they had not been agreeable to the *Roman Cuſtoms*) we have the like inſtances in others, as in *Silius Italicus*,

Sili. Ital. l. 4. ——*Noſco te ſumme Deorum,*
Adſis ô firmeſque tuæ Pater alitis omen.

And in *Perſius*,

Perſ. Satyr. 3. *Magne Pater Divum ſævos punire Tyrannos*
Haud aliâ ratione velis——

But this was not only the Cuſtom of their *Poets*, whom *T. G.* may imagin to have been as extravagant in their *Prayers* as in their *Fables* (although the *Theatre* and *Poets* have ſeldom erred on the right ſide in *Religion*,) yet it will appear to have been the Practice of their *Orators*, upon *ſolemn occaſions* to make a particular *Addreſs* to *Jupiter* O. M. eſpecially in the beginning; as not only appears by *Pliny's Panegyrick*, but by the *Teſtimony* of *Valerius Maximus*, Valer. Max. Præf. *Nam ſi priſci oratores à Jove Opt. Max. bene orſi ſunt*; and *Cicero* quotes it as the old *formula* of beginning their Orations, *Jovem ego Opt. Max.* which himſelf practiſes in his Oration *pro Rabirio*; but in other Places reſerves it for an extraordinary occaſion. *Quo circa te Capitoline Jupiter, quem propter beneficia P. R.* Optimum, *propter vim maximum nominavit*; and at the Concluſion of his Orations againſt *Verres, Nunc te Jupiter* Optime *Maxime*, &c. but moſt emphatically *pro Milone, Tuque ex tuo edito monte Latiari Sancte Jupiter*, &c. (where the *Feriæ Latinæ* were kept.) And a little before, where he ſpeaks of thoſe that ſeemed to queſtion a divine Power, he breaks out into thoſe admirable Words, *Eſt, eſt profecto illa vis*, &c. And to confute *Servius* his Obſervation, *that they only invocated* Jove *in their Exordiums, becauſe they attributed the beginnings of things to him*, we ſee they made their ſolemn Addreſſes to *Jove* likewiſe in the Concluſion; *Vell. Paterculus* concludes his Book, *Jupiter Capitoline & auctor & ſtator* Romani *nominis*; and *Pliny* both in the *beginning and end, Te præcipuè Capitoline Jupiter precor*, as he ſpeaks at the Concluſion of his *Panegyrick*. But this was not only practiſed by *Orators*, but by their *Commanders* in the Field, as appears by that *Prayer* of *Vocula* in *Tacitus* when he was in a great ſtreight. *Te Jupiter Opt. Max. quem per octingentos viginti annos, tot triumphis coluimus*, &c. Thus we ſee that ſolemn Addreſſes were made to the *Supreme God*, by all ſorts of Perſons upon great occaſions: but this was not the only way whereby they teſtified their Devotion to him. For they erected *Altars* to him, as in that *Inſcription* which *Manutius* tranſcribed from the *Marble*.

Cic. Divin. in Q. Cæcil. Pro Domo ſua c. 57.

Pro Milon. c. 31.

Tacit. hiſt. l. 4. c. 58.

HANC. TIBI. ARAM. JUPITER. OPT. MAX. DICO. DEDICOQUE. UTI. SIS. VOLENS. PROPITIUS. MIHI. COLLEGISQUE MEIS. *&c.*

Inſcript. Antiq. 23. 12.

As *King Antiochus* in *Cicero* dedicated his rich Candleſtick made with admirable Workmanſhip of Gold and Jewels in theſe Words, *Dare, donare, dicare, conſecrare Jovi Opt. Max. teſtemque ipſum Jovem ſuæ Voluntatis ac Religionis adhibere.* In the old *Roman Inſcriptions* we find ſeveral *vows* made to *Jupiter* O. *M.* for the Safetyof the *Emperors*, as in theſe:

Cicer. in Verr. l. 4. c. 29.

I. O. M.

PRO. SALUTE. IMP. *&c.*

Inſcript. Ant. 11. 3, 4, 5.

Sometimes they made *Vows* for the *Return* of the *Emperors*, as in thoſe of the *Coſſ. Cl. Nero*, and *Quintilius Varus* for *Auguſtus*:

LUDOS. VOTIVOS. PRO. REDITU. IMP. CÆSARIS. DIVI. AUGUSTI. PONTIFICIS. MAXIMI. JOVI. OPTIMO. MAXIMO. FECIT.

11. 1, 2.

EX. S. C.

They made theſe *Inſcriptions* to *Jupiter O. M.* in behalf of
Horat. Od 1. l. 3. their *Emperors*, becauſe they believed them to be under his particular care, *tibi cura Magni Cæſaris fatis data*, ſaith *Horace*. Thence in the Inſcriptions,

JUPPITER.

20. 2. CUSTOS.

DOMUS. AUG.

And,

10. 6. NUMINI. DEORUM. AUG. JOVI. OPT. MAX. ÆDEM. VOTO. SUSCEPTO. Q. LEPIDUS.

It were endleſs to repeat the *Inſcriptions* that were made to him alone; or to him under his ſeveral Attributes that were peculiar to him, as,

17. 9. DEO. QUI. EST. MAXIMUS.

ΔΙΟΣ

ΜΕΓΙΣΤΟΥ

Or his other Titles, as

1064. 11. *CONSERVATOR. CUSTOS. STATOR.* ΣΩΤΗΡ.

Or to him, where he is diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the *Gods:* As in this,

I. O. M.

2. 11. ET. CONSESSUI. DEORUM. DEARUMQUE. PRO. SALUTE. IMPERII. ROMANI.

But theſe are ſufficient to my purpoſe, which was to ſhew, that the *Romans* did expreſs their devotion to the *ſupreme God*, in all their ſolemn *Acts* of *Religion*.

3. Of which there is but one part remaining, *viz.* in the way of *enquiring into the Mind of God*, which they ſuppoſed was to be done by *Divination*. And that they looked on this as a part of Religion,
is ſeen by *Tullies* dividing their *Religion in Sacra, & in Auſpicia, &*
De Nat. Deor. l. 3. c. 2. *in Monita*. Thence there were three chief *Colleges* of *Prieſts*; the
Pontifices, who looked after the rites of ſacrificing, the *Augures* and
De Leg. l. 2. c. 12. *Aruſpices*, who were the Judges in *Divination*. But the *College* of
De Aruſp. Reſ. c. 9. *Augures* as appears by many Paſſages in *Tully*, had a very great
Eſteem and Authority in the Common-wealth, ſo that nothing of
Plin. ep. l. 4. c. 8. moment was done without them: and the younger *Pliny* calls it
ſacerdotium

ſacerdotium priſcum, religioſum, ſacrum & inſigne: but the great reaſon of this ſeems to be, that they were ſacred to *Jove*; thence they are ſaid by *Tully*, to be *Interpretes, internuntiique Jovis Opt. Max.* and *Jovis conſiliarii & adminiſtri*; and the Birds were ſaid to be *aves internuntiæ Jovis*; and they who refuſed to hearken to them, *nolle moneri à Jove.* So that this ſort of *Prieſthood* was peculiar among them, to him whom they believed to be the *Supreme God.* And from hence we may underſtand the Paſſage in *Arrian*, where he blames the Perſons that came to the Augury with ſo much ſollicitude of Mind, which he calls ἐπὶ τ̃ θεὸν ἔρχεσθαι, *coming to God to know his Pleaſure as to particular Events*; which they did, ſaith he, *obſerving the Augury trembling*, and *crying* Κύριε ἐλέησον, *Lord have mercy upon me*: which is ſo plain a form of Supplication to the *ſupreme God*, that *Cardinal Bona* brings this as a particular inſtance of the *Addreſſes* they made to *him*: and as the common *Litany* of Mankind. Thus much I have thought neceſſary here, to clear not only the *Acknowledgment* but the worſhip of the *ſupreme God* among the *Romans.* I now proceed to other Teſtimonies of the *Fathers* in their diſputes againſt the *Heathen Idolaters.*

Phillip. 13. 5. de Div. l. 1. c. 34. 2. c. 34. c. 37.

Arian. l. 2. c. 7.

Card. Bona. Rerum Liturgic. l. 2. c. 4.

§ 7. Athenag. legat. pro Chriſt. p. 6. ed. Juſtin.

Athenagoras made an *Addreſs* to the ſame *Emperor* M. *Aurelius Antoninus* in the behalf of the *Chriſtians*, wherein he doth at large aſſert the concurrence of the *Heathens* with the *Chriſtians* in the belief *of one ſupreme God*; and proves it from the *Teſtimonies* of *Euripides, Sophocles, Philolaus*, and other *Pythagoreans*; and from *Plato* and *Ariſtotle*, and the *Stoicks*; concerning whom he adds, *that although they ſeemed to make many Gods, by the ſeveral names they gave according to the difference of matter which the divine Spirit did paſs through, yet in truth they did aſſert but one God*: nay, he ſaith farther, *that the Generality of* Mankind, *were agreed in this whether they would or no,* τὸ μὲν εἶναι ἓν τὸ θεῖον, *that there was but one God.* But then to the queſtion *why the Chriſtian* did refuſe to worſhip Images? He gives this conſiderable Anſwer; *If God and matter were but ſeveral Names for the ſame thing, we might be charged with Impiety, if we did not believe Stone, and Wood, and Silver and Gold to be Gods; and conſequently give divine Worſhip to them; but if theſe are infinitely diſtant from each other; as far as the Clay is from the Potter which forms and faſhions it, why are we charged with Impiety for not giving the ſame honour to the Clay that we do to the infinitely wiſe Framer of theſe things? And if the Artificer ſhews his Skill in the Veſſels he makes, the Honour is given to him and not to the Veſſels; ſo it is here, the honour and glory is not to be given to the matter, but to the wiſe Contriver, who is God himſelf: therefore if we look upon any of the ſeveral parts of matter as Gods, we ſhall thereby diſcover how little Senſe we have of the true God, by making things corruptible equal to him that is eternal.* But wherein could they make them equal? not believing them to be equal in Power and Wiſdom, for he ſuppoſed before, that one *Supreme God* was allowed on both ſides; it could be therefore no otherwiſe than by giving *divine honour* to the *Creature* as well as to the *Creator*: and that not for their own ſakes, for he ſtill ſuppoſeth them to be thought *the Works of God*; but although it were deſigned to give honour to the *ſupreme Architect* by falling down before any parts of matter, he thought it as ſenſleſs and unreaſonable a thing, as for a Man to ho-

P. 7.

P. 14.

nour an *Artificer* by falling down before his *Work.* It was not then we ſee the ſuppoſing *evil Spirits to dwell in Images*, which made the *Chriſtians* ſo peremptorily deny *divine Worſhip* to them; but becauſe in ſo doing they ſhould make the *Creature equal to the Creator. Although*, ſaith he, *the Beauty, and Greatneſs, and Capacity, and Figure and Order of the World, deſerve our Admiration; yet we ought not to worſhip the World, but only the Maker of it. As when any of your Subjects make their Addreſſes to you, would it be well taken for them to paſs you by, and turn themſelves to your Palaces? But Men are not ſo fooliſh as to do ſo, but they admire the Beauty and Excellency of them in paſſing by, and pay their whole reſpect and ſervice to your ſelves. If we look upon the World as a muſical Inſtrument, well tuned and harmoniouſly ſtruck, we ought not therefore to worſhip the Inſtrument, but him that makes the Muſick: and thoſe who are the Judges at the Muſick Exerciſes, do not crown the Vial, but him that plaid upon it.* If it be ſaid, that all this proceeds upon the ſuppoſition, *that the ſupreme God is paſſed by and hath no peculiar Honour given to him.* I anſwer, 1. The contrary appears, by what I have already ſaid; for they did give particular honour to the *ſupreme Deity* as ſuch. 2. It is unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that thoſe who believe one ſupreme God to be the Maker of all things, ſhould in their *inward intention* wholly paſs him by in the Worſhip they give to his Creatures. Mr. *Thorndike* indeed ſaith, *ſuppoſing in a Man an uncorrupted Opinion of the incomparable diſtance that indeed is found between God and the moſt excellent of his Creatures, it is impoſſible for him to attribute the Honour due to God alone to that which he conceiveth to be a meer Creature:* Which would be true, if all the honour due to God, did lie only in the *inward Eſteem* of our Minds; but as *Card. Tolet.* well obſerves, *altho' Idolatry do ſuppoſe an error in the mind, yet that error lies in judging that to deſerve divine Honour which doth not:* which may be conſiſtent with the Belief of the *ſupreme Excellency of God.* And I do not deny that thoſe who acknowledge one ſupreme God, may have their Minds ſo corrupted as to judge it fit to give that *divine Worſhip* to a *Creature* which is only due to the *Creator*; but I ſay, it is unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that as long as they acknowledge them to be *Creatures*, they ſhould not give at leaſt that *Relative Latria* to them, which *T. G.* ſaith, *is carried to the Creator at laſt.* But of theſe things afterwards. 3. The Reaſons which *Athenagoras* gives do equally hold, ſuppoſing the true God not to be wholly paſſed by: for the Creatures are ſtill at as great a diſtance from the Creator; which is the main Reaſon he gives againſt the Worſhip of them. 4. It is poſſible to ſuppoſe, that thoſe who believe a ſupreme excellent Being may yet give him no *external Adoration* at all; not out of any diſreſpect to him, but out of the great Eſteem they have of his Excellency; looking upon him, as far above all our Service and Adoration. And that this is not a bare Suppoſition of a thing only poſſible, appears by that Teſtimony of *Porphyrius* produced by St. *Cyril* againſt *Julian*; *Let us ſacrifice, but as becomes us, to the God over all,* i. e. *as a wiſe Man ſaid, by offering up no* ſenſible thing to *him. For every material thing is impure when compared with an immaterial: Therefore the beſt Sacrifice to God is to offer up our Lives to him, for even our Words and Thoughts are*

Of the Laws of the Church, ch. 25.

Tolet. Sum. Caſuum. l. 4. c. 14. n. 2.

Cyril. c. Jul. l. 2. p. 60.

below him) which is the moſt proper Hymn to him, and the moſt beneficial to ourſelves. And the ſame St. *Cyril* obſerves out of *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, that as* Numa *would allow no Image of* God *in the Temples*, becauſe *unſuitable to his Nature*; *ſo he would not have any material Sacrifices to be offered up to him on the ſame reaſon:* and ſome of the *Platoniſts* are quoted by him, ſaying, *that the ſupreme God being incorporeal, ſtands in need of nothing without him; but the other* Gods, *eſpecially thoſe that are viſible, ought to be pleaſed with inanimate Sacrifices.* Therefore we ought not to conclude, that the Heathens did not believe one *ſupreme God*, if we do not find any peculiar and external Sacrifices that were offered to him; for we ſee they might forbear them out of the Opinion they had of his ſupereminent Excellency. *Aquinas* ſuppoſeth this to have been one of the Principles of the *Heathens, that only viſible Sacrifices belonged to other Gods, and internal Acts of the Mind as being better, to the ſupreme* God; And the ſupreme and inviſible God's being ſo far above any need of our Service, was the reaſon given by the *Mandarins* in *China*, and the *Ynca's* of *Peru*, why they ſhewed ſo little outward *Reverence* towards him whom they believed to be the *ſupreme* God. Were theſe Perſons *Idolaters* for the worſhip they did not give to the *Creator*, or for the *Worſhip* they did give to his *Creatures?* and it is plain by *Athenagoras* the latter was the matter of their diſpute: for they did not quarrel with the *Chriſtians* about the *worſhip* of the *ſupreme God*; but for not worſhipping thoſe things they looked on as his *Creatures*; and if their Fault only had been, that they wholly *paſſed by the Creator*, this would have been no reaſon againſt the *Chriſtians*, who might have worſhipped the *Creator* and the Creatures together, and conſequently have freed themſelves from the force of the *Laws*, which required no more but giving *divine worſhip* to the *Deities* publickly worſhipped, without any Declaration of their Minds concerning them. For they might underſtand them as they pleaſed; as we ſee the wiſe Men among them did, without any Cenſure or Reproach from others. If it were lawful then for Chriſtians to give a *Relative Latria* to any Creatures with an intention to honour God thereby, I cannot ſee how the *Chriſtians* were excuſable in their Sufferings; for all that was required from them was only, to obey their *Laws* and offer Incenſe to their Gods. Nothing being expreſſed by the *Laws* as to the diſowning the *true God*, nor as to declaring in what Senſe they did intend to worſhip them; the *Emperour* declared, he was for the *Laws* being obſerved, and himſelf in his own Writings had expreſſed his mind as to *one* God; what was it then made the Chriſtians refuſe obeying the Laws, when ſo many Philoſophers had ſaid that theſe Gods were only parts of the Univerſe, and deſerved divine worſhip becauſe of God's Preſence in them? If they had not thought it Idolatry to give divine worſhip to any Creature, it is very hard to make out their title to Martyrdom. For if we look over the Acts of the Martyrs, we ſhall find it came to this pinch with them; *will you obey the Laws in offering incenſe, or will you not?* When *Juſtin Martyr* was ſummoned before *Ruſticus* the *Præfect* of the *City*, after ſome previous Diſcourſes, *Let us come*, ſaith he, *to the buſineſs in hand*; *Come you Chriſtians hither and ſacrifice with one conſent to the Gods*; *Juſtin* anſwers, *No true Chriſtian will forſake his Religion, and return*

Cyril. c. Julian. l. 6. p. 193.

l. 9. p. 311.

Aqn ui2 2. qu. 94. art. 2.

Baron. A. 165. n 5.

to errors and impiety : and the reſt agreeing with him; the Judge pronounced their ſentence, *that becauſe they would not ſacrifice to the Gods and obey the Emperors Edict, they ſhould be ſcourged, and have the puniſhment of Death inflicted upon them* : which was accordingly executed. When *Dionyſius Biſhop* of *Alexandria* was ſummoned before *Æmilianus*, he gives this account himſelf of the paſſages between them; that he told *Æmilianus* plainly, *that he would worſhip none but the true God, and that he would never depart from this reſolution*; the Governor diſmiſſes him for that time; the next time he lets him know the Emperor had ſo great a regard to their ſafety, *that if they would but act according to reaſon, and worſhip the Gods that preſerved the Empire, they might be ſafe. Dionyſius* anſwers, *We*, ſaith he, *worſhip the one true God the Maker of all things, who hath beſtowed the Empire on* Valerianus *and* Gallienus; *and to him we pray continually for the ſafety of the Empire.* But, ſaith *Æmilianus* again, *who forbids you, to worſhip that God you ſpeak of, and the other Gods too? Dionyſius* then gave that as his final anſwer, *we worſhip none elſe beſides him.* I might bring multitudes of inſtances to the ſame purpoſe, but I inſtance in theſe two, becauſe they were Men of eminency for their learning as well as piety. Now I appeal to the conſcience of *T. G.* whether upon the principles of worſhip which he delivers, theſe Men could have ſuffered for Conſcience ſake any otherwiſe than as *weak Brethren* that wanted good information. For they might have reſerved the *Sovereign worſhip* due only to God, on the account of his Supreme excellency, and have given only a *Relative Latria* to thoſe whom they called *Gods*, but in truth were only *Gods Creatures* and *Subjects*; and what harm was there in all this? O, *but*, ſaith *T. G. they were called Gods, but in truth were Devils whom they were to worſhip*; how doth that appear to have been the cauſe, when they ſay no ſuch thing, and give no ſuch reaſon of their refuſals? beſides they might make them *Gods* by giving them *abſolute Latria*, for that is due only to God himſelf; but no more was required of them, than to *ſacrifice* to them, and they never debarred them of the freedom of directing their intention to the *Supreme God*: and *T. G.* knows, *Acts go whither they are intended*, and thoſe whom they called *Gods*, they might underſtand them only by way *of participation*, or as *ſome Analogical Repreſentations of the true God. O but Sacrifice was required of them, and that is the Worſhip peculiar to God*: But how comes Sacrifice alone to belong to God? And what Sacrifice? *Burning of Incenſe*: And that *T. G.* knows, *is allowed* to be done to Creatures with a reſpect to God, by the *Rules* of their *Church*. So that for all that I can ſee, if *relative Latria* may be allowed to Creatures, the Primitive Chriſtians were not ſo wiſe, as they might have been; and the Modern Doctrines of Worſhip in the *Roman* Church, would have ſaved the lives of Thouſands of the *Primitive Martyrs*, and not only of the common ſort but of the beſt, and wiſeſt of them; who ſacrificed their lives on this Principle, that, *Divine Worſhip (and not* meerly *Sovereign Worſhip) is to be given to none, but to the Supreme* God. But if that paſs for good Divinity, *that they who believe one Supreme* God, *cannot poſſibly give the honour due to him to any Creature*: I do not ſee why the Chriſtians needed to have been ſo afraid of giving *Divine Worſhip* to any thing beſides God, for upon this Principle they were afraid of Impoſſibilities: For as long

Euſeb. l. 7. c. 11.

long as they preſerved in their minds a juſt eſteem of the incomparable excellency of God above his Creatures, they were uncapable of any real *Idolatry.* But I think it is hard to pitch upon a Principle more repugnant to the ſenſe of the *Primitive Church* than this is; as I hope to make it clear before I have done with this Argument.

Athenagoras proceeds to diſpute againſt the worſhipping *any of the parts of the Univerſe, how beautiful or uſeful ſoever they be; for why
ſhould we ſeek that from matter which it ſelf hath not, and can do nothing* P. 15.
but in obedience to a higher Cauſe? And let the things be never ſo beautiful, yet they retain the nature of Matter ſtill; for Plato *confeſſes that the Heavens and the Frame of the World are corporeal, and therefore ſubject to mutability.* But, ſaith he, *if I refuſe to worſhip the Heavens and Elements as Gods whoſe Workmanſhip I ſo much admire, becauſe I know them to be corruptible; How can I be perſwaded to do it to thoſe things, which I know to be made by Men? And thence ſhews not only the novelty of the Poetical Gods, but of the
art of framing Images;* which was ſo late, he ſaith, *that they were* P. 17.
able yet to name the firſt makers of them. But, becauſe it was pleaded by ſome among them, *that all the Worſhip they gave to their Images was only a relative Worſhip, and that they looked on them only as repreſentations of their Deities;* therefore he begs leave of the *Emperors,* to ſearch into the *nature* of their *Poetick Theology,* which he derives from *Orpheus,* as the reſt do; and overthrows the Worſhip of the Poetical Gods upon this Principle, *becauſe they were not Eternal,* and *were confeſſed to be at firſt made out of Matter; and
why ſhould we worſhip them which are material, and generated, and* P. 18.
lyable to all ſorts of Paſſions, according to the Poets deſcription of them? P. 20.
But, it may be, this was nothing but Poetical Figments, *and they ought all to be underſtood of the natures of things, as* Empedocles
explains them, why then, ſaith he, *ſhould we attribute the ſame honour* P. 22.
to Matter which is ſubject to corruption and mutation, as to the P. 23.
eternal, unbegotten, and immutable God? Jupiter *according to the* Stoicks *was the moſt active and fiery principle of Matter,* Juno *the Air,* Neptune *the Water; but they all agreed that by their* Deities *were underſtood the ſeveral parts of the Univerſe, although with different manners of Explication.* Now, ſaith he, *againſt the Stoicks I thus argue,* (and here *Athenagoras* knew, that the *Emperor M. Aurelius* would think himſelf particularly concerned) *if you own one Supreme God, eternal and unbegotten, and all other things to be made up of Matter, and the Spirit of God to receive different Names as it paſſes through the various changes of matter; then theſe ſeveral kinds of matter will make up one Body, whereof God is the Soul, and conſequently upon the general Conflagration,* (which the Stoicks acknowledged) *all the ſeveral names of Matter will be loſt by the corruptions of the kinds, and nothing will be then left but the Divine Spirit; why ſhould we therefore look on thoſe as Gods, that are lyable to ſuch a change?* And ſo he proceeds to argue againſt the other *hypotheſes,* as the *Egyptians* and others, whereby all their *Deities* were reduced to the *Principles* of *Nature* too, from the ſame Principle,
viz. that becauſe theſe things were made and corruptible, they were P. 24.
not capable of receiving Divine Honour from us. By all which we ſee, that the fundamental Principle which *Athenagoras* went upon in this elaborate Diſcourſe of his to one of the wiſeſt *Emperors* Rome ever had,

had, was this, that *nothing but the Eternal God ought to receive divine Worſhip from* Men; whether they called it *Sovereign* or *Relative*, or what Name ſoever they gave it; nay, although they did acknowledge *one ſupreme God*, yet if they gave *divine worſhip* to his *Creatures*; as the *Stoicks* did, the Chriſtians thought it ſo unlawful that they would rather die than comply with them in it. And here I appeal again to *T. G*'s Conſcience (for ſince he hath ſhewed me the way, I hope I may follow him in it) whether he think ſo *Wiſe* and *Vertuous* an *Emperor* as *Antoninus* was, would not have preſerved the *Chriſtians* from ſuffering Perſecution, (as they did very ſmartly in his days) if they would have declared themſelves to have underſtood the Principles of the *Roman Religion* after the *Emperors* own way, *viz. by believing one ſupreme* God; *and worſhipping the ſeveral Parts of the Univerſe under the Names of thoſe Deities, that were commonly received:* and they might have directed this worſhip as they had thought fit, and have diſowned all the ridiculous and prophane Stories of their *Poetical* Gods, as the *Stoicks* did; and what Principle then could hinder the Chriſtians from complying with the Laws but this, that they accounted it *Idolatry* to give *divine worſhip* to any created Being?

§ 8 From *Athenagoras* I proceed to *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who underſtood the Principles of the *Heathen Theology* as well as any; and expoſes all their *Poetical Fables* and *Greek Myſteries* with as much advantage as any Chriſtian Writer, in his *Admonition to the Greeks*. After he hath ſufficiently derided the *Poetical Theology* and the *Vulgar Idolatry*, he comes to the *Philoſophers* who did he ſaith εἰδωλοποιεῖν τ̃ ὕλην, make an *Idol* of *matter*, (Protrept. p. 42. Ed. Pariſ.) (the *Images* whereof were not ſurely the Repreſentation of a thing not exiſtent, as a *Centaur*. or *Sphinx*, and yet called an *Idol*) and after reckoning up *Thales*, *Anaximenes*, *Parmenides*, *Hippaſus*, *Heraclitus* and *Empedocles*, he calls them all *Atheiſts*, *becauſe with a fooliſh kind of wiſdom they did worſhip Matter*; and ſcorning to worſhip Wood and Stones did *deify* the *Mother* of them. And ſo runs out, after his way, into a Diſcourſe about the ſeveral Nations that deſpiſed *Images* and worſhipped the ſeveral *Parts* of the *Univerſe* and the Symbols of them, as the *Scythians*, *Sarmatians*, *Perſians*, and *Macedonians*, *who*, he ſaith, *were the Philoſophers Maſters in the worſhip of theſe Inferior Elements which were made to be ſerviceable to Men.* Then he reckons up other *Philoſophers* that worſhipped the *Stars*, as animated beings; others, the *Planets* and the *World*, and the *Stoicks* who ſaid, *God paſſed through the meaneſt Parts of matter:* yet after all P. 45. this, he confeſſeth, *that there is a certain divine Influence diſtilled upon all Men, eſpecially on thoſe who apply themſelves to Learning; by Vertue of which they are forced to acknowledge one God, incorruptible and unbegotten; who is the only true Being, and abides for ever above the higheſt Heavens, from whence he beholds all the things that are done in Heaven and Earth: who, according to* Euripides *ſees all things without being viſible himſelf.* And for the Proof of this, P. 46. he brings the *Teſtimonies* of *Plato*, *Antiſthenes* and *Xenophon*, who all acknowledge *God's incomparable Excellency*, as well as *Unity*; and then adds the *Teſtimonies of Cleanthes*, and the *Pythagoreans*; and not contented with the *Philoſopers* he heaps the Teſtimonies of the *Poets* to the ſame purpoſe, as *Aratus*, *Heſiod*, *Orpheus*, *Sophocles*,

cles, *Menander*, *Homer* and *Euripides*. In the fiſth *Book* of his *Miſcellanies* (for ſo his *Stromata* truly are) he falls upon this Subject again; and then ſaith to the ſame purpoſe, *that there is a natural Knowledge of one Omnipotent God, among all conſidering Men:* he P. 591. grants, the *Stoicks* Opinion about *God* to be agreeable to the *Scriptures* P. 597.; and ſhews, that *Thales* confeſſed *Gods Eternity* and *Omniſciency*; that *Epicharmus* attributed *Omnipotency* to him; and *Homer* the *Creation* of the *World*, which he deſcribed in the *Shield* of *Achilles*; and then makes this Obſervation (as though it were purpoſely P. 597. intended for *T. G.*) *he that is called both in Verſe and Proſe* P. 598. Ζεὺς or *Jupiter*, *carries our Apprehenſion to God*, (not to the *Arch-Devil* as **T. G.** ſaith) and *therefore he is ſaid to be all things, and to know all things, and to give and take away all things, and to be King over all:* that *Pindar* the *Bæotian* being a *Pythagorean*, ſaid, *there was one Maker of all things whom he called* Ἀριστοτέχναν *the Wiſe Artificer*, and then he repeats ſeveral of the *Teſtimonies* which he had produced before; to which he adds that of *Xenophanes Colophonisn* P. 601. proving God to be one and incorporeal; and of *Cleanthes*, reproving the Opinion of the vulgar about the *Deity*; and of *Euphorion*, and *Æſchilus* about *Jupiter*, which for *T. G's* better Information P. 603. I ſhall ſet down,

Ζεὺς ἐστιν αἰθὴρ, Ζεὺς δὲ γῆ, Ζεὺς δ' οὐρανὸς
Ζεύς τοι τὰ πάντα, χ' ὅτι τῶνδ' ὑπέρτερον.

Jupiter is æther and Earth and Heaven and all things, and if there be any thing above all, Jupiter *is it*; and *Clemens* is ſo far from thinking this an improper Speech, that he ſaith it was ſpoken ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ σεμνῶς σφόδρα *with a great deal of Decency and Gravity concerning God*. By this it appears, that they who boaſt ſo much of the *Fathers*, are not over converſant with them: but *Father Bellarmine*, or *Father Coccius*, ſerves for a whole *Jury* of them. But I commend *T. G.* for his Modeſty, for when he had ſaid, this was the Senſe of the *Fathers*, he produces no more but good *Father Origen*; and he is ſo kind hearted to him, that though I believe he hath heard how he hath been condemned for a Heretick, yet he with great Judgment ſuppoſes, that what he ſaid was the common Senſe of the *Fathers*. But beſides this, *Clemens* quotes a ſaying of *Heraclitus* P. 604. approved by *Plato*, wherein the only *Wiſe Being* is called by the Name of Ζεὺς, or *Jove*. And to ſhew that one ſupreme Being was received among the Greeks, he cites farther an expreſs Teſtimony of *Timæus Locrus*, wherein he ſaith, there *is one unbegotten Principle of all things*; *for if it were begotten it were no firſt Principle, but that out of which it were begotten would be that Principle:* which *Clemens* parallels with that ſaying of *Scripture*, *Hear*, *O Iſrael*, *the Lord thy God is one* God, *and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*. I omit the Teſtimonies of *Authors* cited before, but to them he adds *Diphilus* the *Comœdian*, who was a little younger than *Menander*, and lived in the time of the firſt *Ptolomy*; who ſpeaks plainly concerning the *Omniſcience*, *Providence* and *Juſtice* of *God* in the Verſes cited out of him; and calls *God the Lord of all, whoſe very Name is dreadful:* and whoſe Words afterwards are ſo full of *Emphaſis*, that I cannot forbear ſetting them down; (although I beg pardon for mixing ſo much of a foreign Language in an Engliſh Diſcourſe) he bids thoſe Men look to it, who preſume upon *Gods* P. 606. *patience* becauſe he doth not at preſent puniſh them.

> Ὁρᾶθ' ὅσοι δοκεῖτε οὐκ εἶναι θεόν.
> Ἔστιν γὰρ ἔστιν· εἰ δέ τις πράττει κακῶς,
> Κακὸς πεφυκὼς τὸν χρόνον κερδαινάτω·
> Χρόνῳ γὰρ οὗτος ὕστερον δώσει δίκην.

Look to it, you that think there is no God. There is, there is; if any Man do ill, let him think time is gain; For certainly, ſuffer he ſhall for what he hath done amiſs. But withal he quotes a Saying of *Xenocrates Chalcedonius*, wherein he calls God ὕπατον Δία *the ſu-* p. 604. *preme Jove*, and another of *Archilochus Parius* a very antient Poet, Cyril. c. (in the Twenty Third *Olimpiad* ſaith St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*) where- Jul. l. 1. in he begins Ω Ζεῦ *O Jove, thy Power is in Heaven, and thou ſeeſt all that is done there, whether good or evil*; and *Menander* ſaith, p. 609. *that God is in all things good*; and *Æſchylus* celebrates the mighty Power of God to this purpoſe. *Think not that God is like to what thou ſeeſt; thou knoweſt him not, for he is like to that which cannot be touched or ſeen. He makes the* Mountains *tremble, and the Sea to rage, when his commanding Eye doth on them look, for the great* God *can do what he thinks fit:* But *Diphilus* ſaith yet farther, *honour him alone that is the Father of all good things.* From all p. 611. which *Clemens* concludes, *that the Eaſt and Weſt, North and South have one and the ſame Anticipation concerning the Government of one* p. 612. *ſupreme Diſpoſer of things; becauſe the Knowledge of his moſt common Operations have equally reached to all; but eſpecially to the inquiſitive Philoſophers of* Greece, *who have attributed a wiſe Providence to the inviſible, and only, and moſt powerful, and moſt skilful Contriver of all things.*

§ 9. Although theſe things might be ſufficient to convince a modeſt Man, that the *Gentiles* who were charged with *Idolatry* by the *Primitive Fathers* did agree in the *Acknowledgment* of one *ſupreme Deity*, and were ſo thought to do, by thoſe who managed that charge againſt them; yet I ſhall proceed from *Clemens* to *Origen* his Diſciple: and ſee if the State of the *Controverſie* were altered in his time. The Diſpute between *Celſus* and him did not at all depend on this, *whether there were one ſupreme God or no*, or *whether Sovereign worſhip did belong to him*; for *Celſus* freely acknowledged both theſe. I know *Origen* ſeveral times charges him with being an *Epicurean*, but whatever his private Opinion was, he owns none of the *Epicurean* Principles about Religion in his Book againſt the *Chriſtians*, wherein he declares himſelf to be both for *God* and *Providence*. He calls God the *univerſal Reaſon, he acknowledges him to be the* Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5. p. 247. *Maker of all Immortal Beings, and that all things are from him*, and ſaith, *that God is common to all good, and ſtanding in need of no-* l. 6. p. 320. *thing, and without Envy:* nay he calls him τὸν μέγαν Θεὸν *the great* l. 4. p. 200. *God:* and ſaith, *that Men ought to undergo any Torments rather than* l. 8. p. 392. *to think or ſpeak any thing unworthy of him,* p. 421. *that he is at no time to be forſaken by us, neither Night nor Day, in publick or private, in our* p. 419. *Thoughts or Actions; but our Soul ought always to be intent upon him.* Thus far *Celſus* ſeems a good Chriſtian; what is the matter then be-

tween *Origen* and him, that they could not agree about divine Worſhip
ſince *Celſus* doth acknowledge the ſupreme Excellency of God,
and conſequently that *Sovereign Worſhip* is only due to him? Why
the Diſpute lay in this point, *Celſus* contended with great Vehemency,
*that ſince God made uſe of inferior Spirits to govern the World,
that thoſe ought to have divine Honours given to them, according to
the Cuſtoms of their ſeveral Countries; that this tended more to the
Honour of the ſupreme Deity: for that Devotion*, ſaith he, *is more* P. 421.
*perfect which paſſeth through all to him; that it was not to be conceived
that God ſhould envy the Honour of his own Miniſters; but we* P. 381.
ought rather to ſuppoſe that the great God is better pleaſed with it.
So that all that *Celſus* pleaded for, was either an Inferior *Service* of
Δουλεία, or at the utmoſt but a *Relative Latria*, a *divine worſhip which
was to fall after an inferior manner upon the lower Gods, but to be
finally terminated upon the ſupreme.* To this *Origen* anſwers two
ways. 1. By ſhewing that theſe Inferior *Deities* were not good *Angels*,
but *Dæmons, i. e. evil Spirits*; which he proves many ways but
chiefly by this, *that they ſeemed ſo covetous of divine worſhip from
Men.* 2. By inſiſting on this as the fundamental Principle of worſhip
in the Chriſtian Religion, *that divine worſhip is to be given
only to God himſelf; and to his Son Chriſt Jeſus.* This he inculcates
upon all occaſions; this he lays down in the beginning of his Book,
that God alone is to be worſhipped, all other things whether they have l. 1. p. 10.
*beings or have not, are to be paſſed by, and although ſome of them
may deſerve Honour, yet none of them do worſhip or adoration:* and
elſewhere, *that only the Maker of all things ought to be worſhipped,* l. 3. p. 158.
*admired and adored by us, that neither the Work of Mens hands,
nor thoſe aſſumed to the Honour of Gods can be decently worſhipped
by us, either without the ſupreme God, or together with him:* where
the *Latin Interpreter* hath apparently ſhuffled, rendring that Place
only thus, *nihilque præter eum aut pari honore cum eo*; as though all
that *Origen* condemned were only giving equal divine worſhip to
other things beſides God. Whereas *Celſus* never pleaded for that,
but that Men ſhould give τὰς προσηκούσας τιμὰς, *i. e.* in the very terms
of the *Council* of *Trent, due Veneration:* To which *Origen* anſwers l. 8. p. 414.
*we deſire only to be Followers of Chriſt who hath ſaid, thou ſhalt
worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve. It is true,* P. 415.
ſaith he, *ſeveral Nations have avoided the Worſhip of Images, ſome
for one Reaſon and ſome for another; but the Chriſtians and Jews
do it becauſe of that Law, thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God and him* l. 7. p. 275
*only ſhalt thou ſerve, and ſeveral Places to the ſame purpoſe, ſo that
we ought rather to die than to defile our ſelves with theſe Impieties.
And they who did forbear Images, did worſhip the Sun or Gods Creatures
which we are forbidden to do.* This he ſo frequently inſiſts
upon throughout his Books, that it would be to no purpoſe to bring
all the Places; theſe being ſufficient to ſhew, that the State of the
Controverſy about *Idolatry*, did not depend upon their giving *Sovereign
worſhip* to any thing beſides God, but any *divine worſhip* although
they did acknowledge the *ſupreme God.* As *Origen* himſelf
doth very often declare, *that the Heathens did.* St. *Paul*, he ſaith, l. 3 p. 140
*ſpake truly of ſome of the wiſe Men of Greece, that they knew God,
and that God was manifeſted to them*; and elſewhere, *we teſtifie truly
concerning them that they knew God; but their Fault was, that* l. 4. p. 181

after their grave Diſputations they worſhipped Idols and Dæmons as
l. 5. p. 260. *the reſt did. We cannot but aſſent,* ſaith he, *to what* Plato *hath*
ſaid concerning the chief Good: *for* God *hath manifeſted this to them*
l. 6. p. 276. *and whatever elſe they have ſaid well: but therefore they deſerved*
Puniſhment, becauſe when they had a right Apprehenſion of God, *they*
did not give him the worſhip which was worthy of him: And he quotes
p. 280. a little after *Plato*'s Epiſtle to *Hermias* and *Coriſcus*, wherein he appeals to God *as the Lord of all things:* and ſeveral other Paſſages,
p. 285. wherein his *Government*, and *Power*, and *Juſtice*, and *Excellency*
are truly ſet forth: and after ſeveral other Paſſages of *Plato* and *Celſus* about the ways of *knowing God*, which he allows, he concludes
p. 287. l. 7 p 360. with this, *that God is ſo great a Lover of Mankind that he made*
p. 363. *known his Truth and the Knowledge of himſelf not only to his own*
People, but to thoſe who were Strangers to the ſincere Worſhip and
Service of him. Judge now Reader, whether *Origen* himſelf, *T. G*'s
ſingle witneſs doth make the *ſupreme God* of the *Heathens* an *Arch-Devil*; and what Reaſon he had upon ſo ſlender a *Teſtimony* to cry
out, *the Fathers, the Fathers?*

§ 10. But I have not yet done with him; for if we come down lower
into the times of the *Chriſtian Church* when this *Controverſie* of
Idolatry was again revived in the Days of *Julian* the *Apoſtate*, we
ſhall find the very ſame Acknowledgments made by the moſt learned
and judicious *Fathers* of the *Chriſtian Church*. St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* who undertook to anſwer the three *Books* of *Julian* againſt *Chri-*
St. Cyril. Alex. c. Jul. l. 1. p. 16. *ſtianity*, ſaith, *that the Greeks did ſpeak admirable things concerning*
God, and that they did exceed themſelves in thoſe Diſcourſes; and
that they could not have attained to ſuch a Knowledge of God, *without ſome particular Manifeſtation of himſelf unto them.* And after-
wards he produces the *Teſtimonies* of *Orpheus*, and *Homer*, and *So-*
p. 26. *phocles* concerning him. *Thales*, he ſaith, *made God the Soul of the*
p. 28. *World; Democritus, an active Mind within a ſphere of fire; Ariſtotle*
a ſeparate form reſting upon the ſphere of the World; the Stoicks, an
active Fire paſſing through the Parts of the World. Of theſe things,
he ſaith, *Plutarch* and *Porphyrius* ſpeak, but above all he commends
p. 30. what *Pythagoras* and *Plato* and *Hermes* have ſaid of God: with ſeveral of the *Teſtimonies* before mentioned; ſome of which are repea-
Theod. de cur. Græc. ſerm. 2. ted by *Theodoret* to the ſame purpoſe. But theſe things will be made
more clear by conſidering the *State* of the *Controverſie* between *Ju-*
Cyril. l. 2. *lian* and St. *Cyril* about *Idolatry*. *Julian* confeſſeth, *that there is a*
p. 52. *natural Knowledge of God in the Minds of Men, from whence comes*
that common Inclination of all Mankind towards a Deity; and that
Suppoſition among all Men, that he who is the King over all hath his
p. 58. *Throne in Heaven: He acknowledgeth with* Plato, *that God is the*
Maker of all things, that he is the Father of the Gods too; (and
St. *Cyril* never quarrels with him for giving the Title of *Gods* to thoſe
ſuperior and *intelligent Beings:* for, ſaith he, *we grant that there*
p. 59. *are ſome in Heaven that are called both Gods and Lords; nay Men*
are called Gods *in Scripture*) Of theſe *Gods* according to *Plato*, *Ju-*
p. 65. *lian* ſaith, *ſome are viſible, as the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, and*
the Heavens, but theſe are only Images of the inviſible, and therefore Plato *calls theſe later* Θεοὶ Θεῶν, *being inviſible Deities repreſented by viſible: But one God is the Maker of them all.* But *Julian*
utterly rejected the *Poetical Fables* concerning the *Gods*, and that for

T. G's reaſon, *becauſe the Poets took the liberty to feign and ſay any thing*; nay, he calls them *incredible and monſtrous Fables*; and this was the *Scheme* of his *Theology, That there was one Supreme God the* Cyril. l. 2. p. 44. l. 4 p. 115. *common Father and Lord over all, who had diſtributed the ſeveral Nations and Cities of the World to particular Gods as Governors over them: But although all perfections were in the Supreme God, yet they were ſcattered and divided among the inferior Deities: and ſo* Mars *had the care of Wars, and* Minerva *of Counſels, and* Mercury *of things that required cunning more than courage; and every particular Nation followed the humour of the Gods that were ſet over them*; as he goes about to prove *by the different tempers of Nations.* To which *Cyril* anſwers. *That great Princes do chooſe ſome of the Wiſeſt of their* P. 121. *Subjects to be Governors of Provinces, but they who are ſo imployed do not govern them by their own Laws, but by their Princes, and on all occaſions ſet forth their greatneſs, and pay all duties to them; but theſe Deities aſſume thoſe honours to themſelves which are due only to God; and by bringing in Images into Temples of ſeveral forms and figures they endeavor to caſt diſhonor upon God; and by degrees draw Men to the neglect of him. Either then, God deſpiſes the ſervice of Men, or theſe are not faithful ſervants to him; by bringing in viſible objects of worſhip by ſetting up Images, and perſwading* Men *to make oblations, and offer ſacrifices to them. And becauſe it was ſo hard a matter to choke thoſe natural motions of* Mens *minds towards the Su-* P. 122. *preme God and Father of all, therefore they endeavoured to draw* Men *farther from him, by tempting them to all manner of Impiety. Whereas the good Angels we read of in Scripture, always directed* Men *to pay their honours and adoration, not to themſelves, but only to the Supreme* God: *and teach Men that it is not fit to give them to any of* P. 223. *his Miniſters and Servants: But theſe Deities of Julian are willing to receive worſhip from Men, and their Prayers, and Acknowledgments, and Praiſes, and Gifts, and Sacrifices*; (where we ſee he joyns them all together as parts of that *divine Worſhip* which is *proper* only to God:) But *Julian* is very much diſpleaſed at the *Second Commandment*, and would have been glad to have ſeen it ſtruck out of the number of Ten (as ſome in the World have done) *becauſe God there-* l. 5 155. *in expreſſes ſo much jealouſie for his own honour*; *Cyril* in anſwer to him ſhews, *that this is no way unbecoming* God *to be ſo much concerned for his honour, becauſe Mens greateſt happineſs,* (*as Alexander Aphrodiſienſis ſaid in his Book of Providence*) *lies in the due apprehenſion and ſervice of* God. By which we ſee, that the *Controverſie* about *Idolatry*, as it was hitherto managed between *Chriſtians* and *Heathens*, did ſuppoſe the belief of one *Supreme God* in thoſe who were charged with the practiſe of it.

After theſe, it may not be amiſs to conſider, what the ancient *Author* of the *Recognitions* under *Clemens* his name ſaith upon this ſubject of the *Heathen Idolatry*; he lived, ſaith *Cotelerius*, in the *Second Century*; if that be true, his Authority is the more conſiderable; however it is certain *Ruffinus* tranſlated this Book, and that makes it ancient enough to our purpoſe. He brings in the *Heathen Idola-* Clem. Recogn. l. 5. n. 19. *ters* pleading thus for themſelves, *We likewiſe acknowledge one God who is Lord over all, but yet the other are Gods too; as there is but one Cæſar who hath many Officers under him, as Præfects, Conſuls, Tribunes and other Magiſtrates; after the ſame manner we ſuppoſe,* *when there is but one Supreme God, he hath many other inferior Gods, as ſo many Officers under him, who are all ſubject to him, but yet over us.* To this, he brings in St. *Peter* anſwering, *that he deſires them to keep to their own ſimilitude; for as they who attribute the name of Cæſar to any inferior Officers, deſerve to be puniſhed; ſo will thoſe more ſeverely, who give the name of God to any of his Creatures.* Where the *name* is not to be taken alone, but as it implies the *Dignity* and *Authority* going along with it, and the profeſſing of that ſubjection which is only due to that *Authority*; for what injury were it to *Cæſar* for a Man only to have the name of *Cæſar*? but the injury lies in uſurping the *Authority* under that name; ſo the nature of *Idolatry* could not lie in giving the name of *Gods* to any *Creatures*, but in giving that *Worſhip* which that name calls for; and yet this *Worſhip* here is ſuppoſed to be conſiſtent with the acknowledgment of the *ſupreme excellency of God.*

§.11. If we now look into the ſenſe of the *Writers* of the *Latin Church* againſt the *Heathen Idolaters*, we ſhall find them agreeing with the other. Tertul. Apolog. c. 17. De Teſtim. animæ. *Tertullian* appeals to the Conſciences of Men for the cleareſt evidence of *one true and ſupreme God*; for in the midſt of all their Idolatries, they are apt upon any great occaſion *to lift up their hands and eyes to Heaven, where the only true, and great, and good God is*; and he mentions their common Phraſes, God *gives*, and God *ſees*, and *I commend you to* God, *and* God *will reſtore*; *all which do ſhew the natural Teſtimony of conſcience, as to the unity and ſupreme excellency of* God: and in his *Book ad Scapulam*, Ad Scap. c. 4. God *ſhewed himſelf to be the powerful* God *by what he did upon their ſupplications to him under the name of Jove.* *Minucius Felix* makes uſe of the ſame arguments, and ſaith, *they were clear arguments of their conſent with the* Minut. Fel. in Octav. p. 19. *Chriſtians in the belief of one* God, *and makes it no great matter what name they called him by*, as I have obſerved already, and afterwards produces many *Teſtimonies* of the *Philoſophers*, P. 21. *almoſt all*, he ſaith, *that they acknowledged one* God, *although under ſeveral names.* Arnob. c. gent. l. 2. p. 67. l.3.p.101. *Arnobius* takes it for granted, *that on both ſides they were agreed, that there was one Supreme God, Eternal and Inviſible and Father of all things, from whom all the Heathen Deities had their beginning*: But all the Diſpute was about giving *Divine Worſhip* to any elſe beſides him. Lact. l.1. S. 3. *Lactantius* ſaith, *there was no wiſe Man ever queſtioned the Being of one* God, *who made and governed all things*; yet becauſe he knew the World was full of Fools, he goes about to prove it at large from the *Teſtimonies* of *Poets* and *Philoſophers*, c. 5,6,&c. as ſo many had done before him: And for T. G's ſatisfaction, he ſaith, *that Orpheus* (although as good at *feigning* as any of the *Poets*) *could not by the Father of the Gods mean* Jupiter *the Son of* Saturn; yet who can tell, but ſuch a *Magician* as *Orpheus* is ſaid to have been, might mean an *Arch-Devil* by him? But I am ſure neither *Lactantius*, nor any of the *Fathers* ever thought ſo; for if they had, they would not ſo often have produced his *Teſtimony* to ſo little purpoſe. And to the *Greek Teſtimonies* mentioned before by others, *Lactantius* adds thoſe of *Cicero*, and *Seneca*, *who calls the inferiour Gods the children of the Supreme, and the Miniſters of his Kingdom.* Thus far we have the unanimous conſent of all the *Writers* of the *Chriſtian Church* againſt the *Heathen Idolatry*, that the *Heathens* S. Aug. de civ.Dei.l. 4.c.9. did acknowledge one Supreme God. St. *Auguſtin* tells us, that *Varro* thought, *that thoſe who worſhipped one God without Images, did* *mean the ſame by him that they did by their* Jove, *but only called him by another name*; by thoſe St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *Varro* meant the *Jews*, and he thought it no matter what name *God* is called by, ſo the ſame thing be meant. It is true St. *Auguſtin* argues againſt it from the *Poetical Fables* about *Saturn* and *Juno*; but withal he confeſſes, *that they thought it very unreaſonable, for their Religion to be charged with thoſe Fables which themſelves diſowned:* And therefore at laſt he could not deny, *that they believed themſelves, that by the* Jove *in the Capitol they underſtood and worſhipped the Spirit that quickens and fills the World, of which* Virgil *ſpake in thoſe words, Jovis omnia plena.* But he wonders *that ſince they acknowledged this to be the Supreme if not only Deity, the Romans did not rather content themſelves with the worſhip of him alone, than run about and make ſo many Addreſſes to the petty and inferiour Deities?* This indeed was a thing to be wondred at; and yet no doubt, they thought they had as good reaſons for it, as *T. G.* gives, *why incontinent Perſons ſhould rather make their Addreſſes to St.* Mary Magdalen *in Heaven, than to her Siſter* Martha, or to God himſelf. So the *Roman Women* thought *Lucina* and *Opis* better for a *good hour*, than *Ceres* or *Minerva*; and *Levana* and *Cunina* for new born *Children*, than *Vulcan* or *Apollo*; and yet S. *Auguſtin* tells us, many of them did not eſteem theſe, *as any diſtinct Deities*, but only as *repreſentations* of the *ſeveral powers* of the *ſame God* ſuitable to the conditions of Perſons: but *T. G.* will not ſay, that *by St. Mary Magdalen*, he only underſtood the power of *God's Grace* in converting *incontinent Perſons*; but if he had, he had given a much better reaſon of their praying to her: Yet even in ſuch a caſe St. *Auſtin* thinks it were better to pray directly to God himſelf. And the old *Roman Matrons* would have thought they could have directed ſuch Perſons to *Temples* proper for them, *viz.* thoſe of *Virtue* and *Chaſtity*, the one of which ſtood *ad Portam Capenam*, the other *in vico longo*. But I need not give ſuch particular directions, for I am afraid their *Ruines* are ſcarce left in *Rome*: for neither *Marlianus*, nor *Alexander Donatus* in their accurate deſcriptions of *Rome* can tell where to find them.

De conſenſu Evang. l. 1. c. 22.

c. 23. De Civ. Dei l. 7. c 9. c. 11. c. 13.

T. G. p. 369.

De Civ. Dei l. 4. c. 11. c. 24.

For our better underſtanding the *Controverſy* about *Idolatry* as it is repreſented by St. *Auguſtin*, we are to conſider that not only *Scævola* and *Balbus* in *Cicero*, but *Varro* and *Seneca*, and the reſt of their wiſer Men, did with great indignation reject the *Poetical Theology* as they called it; and wiſhed ſeveral things reformed in the *popular Religion*; and thought themſelves as unjuſtly charged with the practiſes of the People, as *T. G.* doth for their Church to be charged with all the *ridiculous Addreſſes* that ſome make to *Saints* among them; for *Varro* confeſſes that *the People were too apt to follow the Poets*, (as in the *Church* of *Rome* they are to pray by their *Legends*) but they thought the People were better let alone in their *Fopperies*, than to be ſuffered to break looſe from that ſubjection which their *Superſtition* kept them in; and with theſe St. *Auſtin* reckons the *Philoſophers*; *with whom*, he ſaith, *the Queſtion to be debated was this, whether we are bound only to worſhip one Supreme God the Maker of all things? or whether it be not lawful to worſhip many Gods, who are ſuppoſed to be made by him?* And after he hath diſcourſed againſt *Varro* and thoſe of his opinion, who reduced all their *Theology* to *Nature*, and made *God* to be the *Soul of the World*, and the *ſeveral parts* of the World

De Civ. Dei l. 4. c. 27, 30. 31. l. 6. c. 5, 6, 7. c. 10.

T. G. p. 368.

De Civ. Dei l. 4. c. 32.

l. 6. c. 1.

capable of *divine Worſhip* on that account; in his *eighth Book*, he undertakes thoſe who aſſerted *one Supreme Deity* above *Nature* and the *Cauſe of all* things, and yet pleaded for the *worſhip* of *inferior Deities*; he confeſſes, *that they had the knowledge of the true God, and* l. 8. c. 9. *brings the ſeveral places of St.* Paul mentioned in the entrance of this c. 10 c. 11. Diſcourſe to prove it: And enquiring how the *Philoſophers* came to ſuch knowledge of him, he firſt propounds the common opinion of the *Fathers* that they learnt it in *Egypt*, meeting with the *Books* of *Scripture* there, but he rather (and with good reaſon) reſolves it into the *natural knowledge of God*; *for*, ſaith he, *that which was known of God was manifeſt to them, for God had revealed it to them.* But it ſeems by St. *Auguſtin*, that there were two opinions among them at that time about *Divine worſhip*; for ſome, of whom he reckons c. 22. *Apuleius* the chief, were for the Worſhip of *Demons*, although they acknowledged them to be ſubject to *evil Paſſions*; yet they looked on them as *Interceſſors* between Men and the Gods, and therefore to be worſhipped; but others who kept cloſer to the Doctrine of *Plato*, believed none to be *Gods* but ſuch as were *certainly good*; c. 13, 22. but were ſhy of declaring their opinion againſt the *worſhip* of *De-* l. 9. c. 1. *mons* for fear of diſpleaſing the People by it: And with theſe St. *Auguſtin* declares he would have no Controverſy about the *name* c. 23. *of Gods*, as long as they believed them to be *created, immortal, good* and *happy not by themſelves, but by adhering to God*; *which*, he ſaith, *was the opinion either of all, or, at leaſt, the beſt of the Platoniſts.*

And now we are come to the true *ſtate* of the Controverſy, as l. 10. c. 1. it is managed by St. *Auguſtin* in his tenth *Book:* Which is, *whether thoſe Rites of Religious Worſhip which are uſed in the ſervice of the Supreme God, may be likewiſe uſed towards any created Being, though ſuppoſed to be of the higheſt excellency, and as near to* God *as we can ſuppoſe any Creature to be?* And that this, and this only is the *ſtate* of the *Controverſy*, I appeal to his own words, which I ſhall ſet down in the language he writ them, that I be not blamed with *artificial turning them to my own ſenſe: Hoc eſt, ut apertius dicam, utrum etiam ſibi an tantùm Deo ſuo, qui etiam noſter eſt, placeat eis ut ſacra faciamus, & ſacrificemus; vel aliqua noſtra ſeu nos ipſos Religionis ritibus conſecremus? i. e. That I may ſpeak plainly, whether it be pleaſing to them,* viz. *good Spirits, that we offer Divine Worſhip and Sacrifice to them; or that we conſecrate our ſelves, or any thing of ours to them by religious Rites? And this*, ſaith he, *is that Worſhip which is due to the Deity, which becauſe we cannot find one convenient word in Latin to expreſs it by, I would call* Latria, *as that Service which is due to Men is called by another name*, viz. *δȣλεία:* And he gives this reaſon why he made choice of *Latria* to ſignify *Divine Worſhip* in the *Latin Tongue*, becauſe the Latine word *colere* is ſo very *ambiguous*, it being applied to the *tilling* of land, *inhabiting of places*, and therefore *cultus* could not ſo properly be applied only to *Divine Worſhip*; nor yet *Religio*, becauſe that according to the cuſtom of the *Latins* is applied to other ſenſes; and the ſame reaſon he gives as to other names. For my part, I quarrel not at all with St. *Auguſtins uſe* of the word, and think it proper enough to apply it in his ſenſe: which comprehends in it, not meerly *Sacrifice*, but all thoſe *Religious Rites*, whereby we give

Worſhip to *God.* And nothing can to me appear more ſenſeleſs than to imagin that St. *Auguſtin* ſhould here ſpeak only of *Sovereign Worſhip* proper to God in regard of his *ſupreme Excellency*, diſtinguiſhing that from an *inferior kind of religious Worſhip due to created Excellency*, when it was agreed on both ſides, that there was one *ſupreme Excellency*, which was *incommunicable* to any Creatures, ſo that the Diſpute about *Worſhip* muſt ſuppoſe thoſe to be created and dependent Beings; which being ſuppoſed, it was impoſſible for them to believe they had *ſupreme Excellency* in them. But if it be ſaid that the Diſpute was, whether Sacrifice did not belong only to God? I ſhall hereafter ſhew, that there is no reaſon in the World to appropriate *divine worſhip* only to *ſacrifice*; my preſent Buſineſs is only to prove, that the *Controverſie* of *Idolatry* did on both ſides ſuppoſe *one ſupreme God*, which I think is manifeſt from St. *Auguſtin*, if any thing can be made ſo. But if this be not full enough to our purpoſe, we may add the plain Teſtimony of *Maximus Madaurenſis* to St. *Auſtin*, who ſaith, *that none but Madmen could deny that there was one ſupreme and eternal God who was the great Father of Nature, whoſe Influences diffuſed through the World, they worſhipped under different Names.* This Man ſeems to have been of *Varro's* way, and not of the *Platoniſts*, for he makes *God ſine prole*; and ſo underſtood all the *Heathen Deities* but as ſeveral *Titles* of the ſame *God*.

St. Aug. ep. 43.

In the ſame time with St. *Auguſtin Oroſius* lived, who ſaith, *that not only the Philoſophers found out one God the Maker of all things, to whom all things ought to be referred; but that the Pagans of their times, without Diſtinction, when they were diſputed with by Chriſtians, did confeſs that there was but one great God, who had ſeveral Miniſters under him.*

Paul. Oroſ. hiſt. l. 6. c. 1.

§ 12. After ſo full and clear evidence of the conſe[illegible] of all the *Fathers* in this matter, not taken from any ſingle or incoherent Paſſages, but from the *Series* and *Deſign* of their Diſcourſes, I can foreſee but one objection againſt it out of *Antiquity*, which I ſhall endeavour to remove. And that is from the Teſtimony of *Sanchoniathon* mentioned by *Euſebius* and St. *Cyril* concerning the *Phœnicians*, *that they worſhipped the Sun, Moon and Stars as the only Immortal Gods, among which the Sun was chief, whom they called Beelſamen Lord of Heaven; and their mortal Gods were Men deified for the Kindneſs they had done to the World.* To the ſame purpoſe *Maimonides* ſpeaks of the *Zabii*, *whoſe Sect*, he ſaith, *did over-run the Earth, that they had no other Gods but the Stars.* But although this take not off the force of our former evidence, which lay in this, that thoſe *Fathers* who did charge the Heathens with *Idolatry*, did at the ſame time confeſs, that they owned *one ſupreme God*; yet I ſhall endeavour to prove, that even the *Eaſtern Idolaters* did acknowledge *one ſupreme Deity*. *Gregorius Abulfarajus*, and *Shareſtanius*, both cited by our *Learned* Doct. *Pocock*, do expreſly contradict *Maimonides*, for one of them ſaith, *that they have very ſtrong Arguments to prove the Unity of God*; and the other, *that although they call Planets Gods, yet they look on them only as Mediators between the ſupreme God and Men*; and that *learned* and *judicious Perſon* thinks that we have more reaſon to believe *Gregorius Abulfarajus*, becauſe he converſed with many of their Writings in their own Language, whereas *Maimonides*

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 1. c. 6. c. 9. c. 10. S. Cyril. c. Julian. l. 6. p. 205. Maimon. More Nevoch. l. 3. c. 29.

Not. in Specim. Hiſtor. Arab. p. 143.

monides only ſaw the *Tranſlations* of ſome of them. *Shareſtanius* p. 140. makes this their great Principle, *that between the ſupreme* God *and us, there muſt be ſome Mediators,* which ſay they, *are pure ſpiritual Subſtances, which becauſe we cannot immediately converſe with, therefore we have need of ſome means of Communication with them; which ſome make to be the Celeſtial Houſes, and others Images. Thoſe who are for the Celeſtial Houſes, worſhip the Bodies of the Planets as the Habitations of the Living, rational and intellectual Subſtances which they ſuppoſe to animate them; and therefore they are very punctual in the Obſervations of them, and accordingly they make their Taliſmans; and if they have theſe about them, and the proper Garments on for the Planet, and the day and hour peculiar to him, and ſay the Forms of Prayer fitted for him, they do not queſtion, but they ſhall be heard in the things which depend upon his influence.* And theſe are the only Perſons I have heard of, that have diſcovered the Invention of making *aſtrological Prayers*; which ſeem to me to be built on as good *Reaſon*, as the *Predictions* are; and I doubt not but they were able to produce as many Experiments for the hearing of thoſe *Prayers*, as others do to juſtifie their Predictions. But there were others among them, that thought the *Planets* at too great a diſtance, and too often out of ſight, and therefore they would have more conſtant and *viſible Mediators*; for which purpoſe they made them *Images*, but they muſt be ſure to be of a *Figure* and *Metal*, proper to the *Planet*, with a due Obſervation of Days, Hours, Degrees, Minutes, Habits, Prayers, and whatever elſe they knew to be moſt pleaſing to the *wiſe* and *intelligent Planet.* Now by the help of theſe, they hoped to get the Favour of the *Houſes*, and by the favour of the *Houſes* they hoped for that of the *Intelligencies*, and by their favour they hoped for that of the *Supreme God.* But it ſeems there were ſome amongſt them who are called *Harbaniſta*, who ſuppoſed *God* to be one in Eſſence, but to be many in regard of the different Manifeſtations of himſelf to the *Planets* and other viſible Beings; and that he committed the Care of this lower World to the *Celeſtial Bodies* whom they called *Fathers*, the *elements Mothers*, and all *Compounds Children.* If the former Repreſentation of their Worſhip be true, and that they thought there was no Approach to the ſupreme Deity, but by M*ediators* (as it ſeems to be) that might give the occaſion to *Maimonides* and others, to ſay, *that they worſhipped only the Sun, Moon and Stars, and accounted them for their Gods*; becauſe it ſeems they gave no immediate Worſhip to the *ſupreme Deity*, but what honour they gave him was by paſſing through ſo many to him. And this may be a very probable reaſon why the *Sun* in the *Phœnician* and *Chaldean Theology* was looked on as the ſupreme *Deity*, *i. e. viſible*, and the higheſt *Mediator* to whom any Worſhip was offered: and therefore called by the *Chaldeans Baal*, by the *Phœnicians Beel Samen*, by the *Ammonites Molock*, by the *Perſians Mithras*; and by the *Moabites Baal Peor* and *Chemoſh*: ſo the Moon was called *Aſtaroth* or *Aſtarte*, and Malcha, or the *Queen* of *Heaven*: and *Saturn* worſhipped under the Name of *Ciun*, or *Cevan*; the *Pleiades of Succoth Benoth*: and it is not improbable, that from worſhipping the *Hoſt of Heaven* this *Sect* of *Idolaters* might have their Name from עבא *Saba*, rather than from *Sabius* a fabulous Son of *Seth*. *Greg. Abulfarajus* deſcribes the *Religion,*

gion of the old *Arabs* much after the ſame manner, that they all worſhipped the *Stars*, although ſome *Tribes* one more than another: and it is an ingenious Conjecture of Doct. *Pocock's*, that whereas *Herodotus* ſaith that the *Arabians* only worſhipped Ὀροτάλτ, as it is read in the *Bodley* MSS. and Ἀλιλὰτ, this latter *Alilahat* ſignifying *Daughters*, implies the *leſſer Deities*, and *Olla taal* the *ſupreme God*, as the Words ſignifie: which he proves from *Shareſtanius* that the old *Arabs* did acknowledge. *Abraham Ecchellenſis* ſpeaking of the *Religion* of the old *Arabians*, ſaith, *that thoſe who were of the Sect of Chaled, went upon this Principle, that there was one Creator and Governor of all things, moſt Powerful and moſt Wiſe: Beſides theſe, there were thoſe who worſhipped Intelligences, or Celeſtial Spirits; and theſe*, ſaith he, *although they confeſſed one Creator of the World, moſt holy, wiſe and powerful, yet they ſaid we had need of Mediators to him; therefore they invoked thoſe Spirits with all Rites of religious worſhip, and theſe*, ſaith he, *were called the Daughters of God, as they are in the Alcoran*: not much different from theſe, were *the Worſhippers of Images*, whom he deſcribes as we have done before. But he tells us, there was a *Sect of Dabritæ* among them whom he calls *Philoſophers*, who were meer *Atheiſts*, and *aſſerted the Eternity of the World*, and theſe being excepted, he ſaith, *that the antient Arabs did believe the Creation of the World*; and he tells out of them, their particular *Hiſtory* of it. But *Ecchellenſis* was aware of the parallel between the *worſhip* practiſed in the *Church* of *Rome*, and that among the *Arabians* ſuppoſing they acknowledged one true God, and therefore puts the Queſtion, *whether they did worſhip their Idols for Gods without Relation to any Superior, or only took them for ſecond Cauſes, and gave them the Name of Gods only analogically?* It was a Queſtion ſeaſonably put, but not ſo wiſely anſwered. For, as if he had quite forgotten, what he had ſaid before, he ſaith, *without all doubt the moſt of them looked upon the Gods they worſhipped as of ſupreme Authority, and Majeſty, and Independent of any other*. What, *although they acknowledged but one ſupreme God, and called all the leſſer Deities his Daughters! Although all of them, a very few excepted, believed the Creation of all things by one moſt Wiſe and Powerful Being!* But alas! he did not think of this Queſtion, when he ſaid the other things; and he was not bound to remember them now, but to ſay what ſerved beſt for his preſent purpoſe to clear the *Roman Church* from *Idolatry*. I will not deny then, but there might be a Sect of *Dabritæ*, who did only in name own any thing of God and Religion, that did aſſert the Eternity of the World, and that there were no other Gods, but the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars*, both among the *Phœnicians* and *Chaldæans* as well as *Arabians*; but I ſay, theſe were *Atheiſts* and not *Idolaters*; thoſe who were charged with *Idolatry* among them were ſuch as believed a *ſupreme Deity*, but gave *divine Honours* to Beings created by him.

Not. in Spec. p. 107.

Abr. Ecchellenſ. Hiſtor. Arab. c. 6. in Chron. Orient.

c. 9.

The like is ſuggeſted by ſome concerning the *Perſians*, as though they attributed *Omnipotency* and *divine Worſhip only to the Sun*; and thoſe who take all things of this nature upon truſt meerly from *Herodotus*, or *Juſtin*, or other *Greek* and *Latin* Writers, may think they have reaſon to believe it; but if we look into thoſe who have been moſt converſant in the *Perſian* Writings, we ſhall find a different account of them. *Jac. Golius* in his Notes on *Alferganus* ſaith, *that*

Gol. not. in Alferg. p. 20. *that the Perſians gave the Names of their Gods to their* Months *and*
Days; according to the antient Religion of the Perſians and Magi,
whereby they did believe their Gods *to preſide over them; for it*
was a Principle among them as well as other Nations of the Eaſt,
that the things of this lower World are adminiſtred by Angels: and
accordingly they had their particular Prayers and Devotions according
to the ſeveral Days and Months; *and not only ſo, but their very*
Meat, *Drink, clothing and Perfumes were different; and they had*
their Tables or Rubricks to inſtruct them. And what Worſhip they gave
p. 21. *to the Planets, was not,* ſaith he, *to themſelves but to thoſe Intelligencies,*
which they ſuppoſed to rule them; nay, they ſuppoſed particular
Spirits to rule over all the material Parts of the World; the Spirit
over Fire was called Adar *and* Aredbahiſt, *the Spirit over Herbs and*
Trees Chordad, *the Spirit over Bruits was* Bahmen, *the Spirit over*
the Earth was Asfendurmed; *and ſo they had an Angel of* Night,
and another of Death; and the Spirit over the Sun was called Mihrgîan,
from Mihr the Sun, (*whence the word* Mithras,) *but above all*
theſe, they believed there was one Supreme God *whom they called*
p. 40. Hormuz *and* Dei; *and the Perſian Writers ſay, that* Zoroaſter *appointed*
ſix great Feſtivals in the Year, in Remembrance of the ſix
p. 24. *days Creation.* And to this is very agreeable what the *Perſees* in
Indoſthan do to this day deliver of the Principles of their *Religion*;
Lords deſcript. of the Perſees, p 5. for, *they affirm* God *to be the maker of all things; but that he committed*
the Government *of the World to certain Spirits; and they worſhip*
the Fire as a Part of God, *and call the Sun and Moon* Gods
p. 8. *great Witneſſes*; and the Deſcription of them in *Varenius* fully accords
p. 44. Varen. de diverſ. gent. Relig. p. 269. with this, *that they acknowledged one ſupreme* God, *every*
where preſent, that governs the World, but he makes uſe of ſeven
chief Miniſters for the Management of it, one over Men, another over
Bruits, another over Fire as is before deſcribed; and under theſe
they place 25 *more, who are all to give an account to the ſupreme*
God *of their Adminiſtration.* With this account agrees the Relation
Voyage des Indes du Sr. Mandelſlo. l. 1. p. 215. of *Mandelſlo* concerning them, who ſaith, *that the Parſis believe that*
there is but one God *Preſerver of the Univerſe; that he acts alone*
and immediately in all things, and that the ſeven Servants of God,
for whom they have alſo a great Veneration, have only an Inferior
Adminiſtration whereof they are obliged to give account: and after
the enumerating theſe with their particular Charges, he reckons up
Twenty ſix under them with their ſeveral Names, but they call them
all in common Geſhoo, *i. e. Lords, and believe,* he ſaith, *that they*
have an abſolute Power over the Things, whereof God *hath intruſted*
them with the Adminiſtration. Whence it comes, that they make
no difficulty to worſhip them, and to invocate them in their Extremities
out of a Perſwaſion that God *will not deny them any thing they deſire*
Schickard. Tarich. p. 130. *on their Interceſſion. Schickard* relates a particular Story of the *Perſian*
King *Firutz*, or *Perozes*, which ſhews the Acknowledgment of
a *ſupreme Deity* among the *Perſians*; in his time, which was about
the time of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, there happened a mighty drought
in *Perſia*, ſo that it rained not for ſeven years, and when the Kings
Granaries were utterly exhauſted, and there was no hope of further
Supplies, he called his People out into the open Fields, and there
in a moſt humble manner he beſought *the great God Lord of Heaven*
and Earth, to ſend them Rain, and gave not over praying till

a

a plentiful Shower fell upon them: *which*, ſaith he, *is another Example, after the Ninivites, of Gods great Mercy after a publick and ſolemn Repentance.* But that this Prince was yet a Worſhipper of the *Sun*, appears by what follows when the *Emperor Zeno* had him at his Mercy, and made him promiſe Fidelity to him, by bowing of himſelf to him; he to avoid the Reproach of it among his People, carried himſelf ſo, that he ſeemed only to them to make his *Reverence* to the *Sun* according to the Cuſtom of his *Country*.

§ 13. But it will add yet more to the Conviction of *T. G.* and to the Diſcovery of the *Nature* of *Idolatry*, to ſhew that thoſe *Nations*, which are at this day charged with *Idolatry* by the *Church* of *Rome*, have acknowledged *one ſupreme God.* And I ſhall now ſhew that thoſe *Idolaters* who have underſtood their own Religion, have gone upon one of theſe three Principles, either (1.) that God hath committed the Government of the World under him to ſome Inferior *Deities*, which was the Principle of the *Platoniſts*, and of the *Arabians*, and *Perſians*. Or, (2.) that *God* is the *Soul* of the *World*, and therefore the Parts of it deſerve *divine Honour*, which was the Principle of *Varro* and the *Stoicks*. Or, (3.) That *God* is of ſo great Perfection and Excellency, that he is above our *Service*, and therefore what external Adoration we pay, ought to be to ſomething below him; which I ſhall ſhew to have been the Principle of thoſe who have given the leaſt external Adoration to the Supreme God.

Theſe things I ſhall make appear, by giving a brief Account of the *Idolatry* of thoſe Parts of the World, which the *Emiſſaries* of the *Church* of *Rome* have ſhewed their greateſt Zeal in endeavouring to convert from their *Idolatries*.

There are two *Sects* in the *Eaſt-Indies* (if I may call them ſo) from whom the ſeveral Nations which inhabit there have received what Principles of Religion they have; and thoſe are the *Brachmans* and the *Chineſes*; and the giving account of theſe *two*, will take in the Ways of *Worſhip* that are generally known among them.

For the *Brachmans*, I ſhall take my account chiefly from thoſe who have been converſant among them, and had the beſt reaſon to underſtand their Religion. *Francis Xaverius*, who went firſt upon that commendable Imployment of converting the *Indians*, ſaith, *that the Brachmans told him they knew very well there was but one God:* and one of the learned *Brachmans* in his diſcourſe with him not only confeſſed the ſame, but added, *that on Sundays, which their Teachers kept very exactly, they uſed only this Prayer, I adore thee O God with thy Grace and Help for ever. Turſellinus* ſaith, *that he confeſſed this to be one of their great Myſteries, that there was one God Maker of the World, who reigns in Heaven and ought to be worſhipped by Men*, and ſo doth *Jarricus. Bartoli* not only relates the ſame Paſſages, but gives this account of their *Theology*; *that they call the ſupreme God* Parabrama, *which in their Language ſignifies abſolutely perfect, being the Fountain of all things, exiſting from himſelf, and free from all Compoſition: that he committed to* Brama *the Care of all things about* Religion; *to* Wiſtnow, *another of his Sons, the Care of Mens rights and relieving them in their neceſſities*; to a third, *the Power over the Elements and over human Bodies: Theſe three they repreſent by an Image with three Heads ariſing all out of the ſame Trunk, theſe are highly eſteemed* and

Xaver. Epiſt. Indic. p. 11.

Turſell. vit. Xaver. l. 2. c. 9.

Jarric. Rer. Indic. c. 81.

Bartoli de vitâ & geſt. Xaverii l. 1. n. 30, 31.

and prayed to ; for they ſuppoſe Parabrama *to be at perfect Faſe, and to have committted the Care of all to them.* But the *Brachman Padmanaba* gave a more particular account of the Management of all things to *Abraham Rogers* who was well acquainted with him, and was fifteen years in thoſe Parts. *Next* to *Brama*, they make one *Dewendre* to be the *Superintendent Deity*, who hath many more under him ; and beſides theſe, they have particular *Deities*, over the ſeveral Parts of the World, as the *Perſians* had. They believe both *good* and *evil Spirits*, and call them by ſeveral Names : the former they call *Deütas* and the other *Ratsjaies*, and the *Father* of both ſorts to be *Brachman* the Son of *Brama*. *In particular caſes they have ſome*, ſaith Mr. *Lord* (who converſed among them and to whom *Monſ. Bernier* referrs us to one who gave a faithful account of them) *whom they honour as Saints and make their Addreſſes to ; as for Marriage they invocate* Hurinount, *for Health* Vagenaught, *for Succeſs in Wars* Bimohem, *for Relief* Syer, *&c.* And I ſuppoſe incontinent Perſons may have ſome one inſtead of St. *Mary Magdalen* to pray to. The Cuſtom of their daily Devotion as the *Brachman Padmanaba* ſaid, *was firſt to meditate of God before they riſe, then after they have waſhed themſelves they repeat Twenty Four Names of God, and touch Twenty Four Parts of their Bodies ; upon Sun riſing they ſay Prayers and pour down Water in Honour of the Sun, and then fall down upon their Knees and worſhip him, and after perform ſome Ceremonies to their Idols, which they repeat in the Evening.* The particular Devotion which they have to their *Saints*, and *Images*, and *Reliques* is fully deſcribed by *Boullaye-le-Gouz* in his late *Travels* into thoſe Parts. *Mandelſlo* ſaith, *that in the time of their publick Devotions, they have long Leſſons about the Lives and Miracles of their Saints, which the Bramans make uſe of, to perſwade the People to worſhip them, as Interceſſors with God for them.* Among their Saints *Ram* is in very great Eſtimation; being the Reſtorer of their *Religion*, and a great *Patron of their Bramans* ; *Kircher* ſuppoſeth him to be the ſame with him whom the *Japoneſe* call *Xaca*, and the *Chineſe Ken Kian* ſaith *Circher*, *Xè Kia* ſaith *Marini*, and thoſe of *Tunquin Chiaga*, or as *Marini Thic-Ca*, in all which Parts he is in very great *Veneration* ; him they look on as the great Propagator of their *Religion* in the *Eaſtern* Parts, and they ſay he had Eighty Thouſand Diſciples, but he choſe Ten out of them all to diſperſe his Opinions. From whence it is ſuppoſed that the *Religion* of the *Brachmans* hath ſpread it ſelf not only over *Indoſthan*, but *Camboia*, *Tunquin*, *Cochinchina*, nay *China* it ſelf, and *Japan* too ; where it is an uſual thing for Perſons to drown, burn or famiſh themſelves for the Honour of *Xaca*. This *Sect* was brought into *China* Sixty five years after Chriſt from *Indoſthan*, as *Trigautius*, (or rather *Matthæus Riccius* tells us, for *Bartoli* aſſures us, that *Trigautius* only publiſhed *Riccius* his Papers in his own Name) which he ſuppoſes, was brought in by a Miſtake for the Chriſtian Religion, (and ſurely it was a very great Miſtake) but for all that, *Trigautius* hath found a ſtrange Reſemblance between the Roman Religion and theirs. *For*, ſaith he, *they worſhip the Trinity after a certain manner, with an Image having three Heads and one Body ; they extol cœlibate to a high Degree ſo as to ſeem to condemn Marriage ; they forſake their Families, and go up and down begging*, (*i. e.* the Order of Friers among them,) *their*

very

Linda deſcript. Orbis, p. 1110.

Voyage des Indes du Sr. Mandelſlo l. 1. p. 201.

Lords deſcript. of the Banian Religion, p 60.
Berniers Memoires Tom. 3. p. 157.

Linda, p. 1108.

Les voyages & obſervat. du Sieur de la Boullaye-le-Gouz. c. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

Voyage des Indes du Sr. Mandelſlo, l. 1. *p.* 202, 204.

Lords deſcript. of Banyans, c. 14.

Kirch. China illuſtr. l. 3. *c.* 4.

Marini Relat. du Royaume de Tunquin. c. 9. *p.* 194

Bartoli de vit. Xaver. l 3. *n.* 5.

Trigaut. de exped. Chriſtianâ apud Sinas, l. 1. *c.* 10.

Bartoli Hiſtor. Aſiat. l. 1. *n.* 55.

very Rites and Cuſtoms are like ours; they have Images in their Temples, and their very Habits agree with ours. I deſire T. G. once more to make uſe of his Friends Kindneſs for *Trigautius*, that he may ſee, whether I have tranſlated him right or no. In all this, he mentions nothing of the Chriſtian Religion, but only the Rewards and Puniſhments of another World; which moſt Nations of the World have believed; and for their other Reſemblances much good may they do themſelves with ſuch Parts of Chriſtianity. To theſe *Bartoli* adds, *the worſhipping the Mother of God with a Child in her Arms, their Penances, Monaſteries, Nunneries, nay their very Beads and Indulgencies;*

Hiſtor. Aſiatic. l. 1. n. 75.

And *Semedo* ſaith of their *Prieſts, that they wear their Head and Beards ſhaved, they worſhip Idols; they marry not; they live in Convents Four or Five Hundred together, they beg, mutter Prayers; they ſing; they have ſeveral Offices and Prayers againſt Fire, Tempeſts, Misfortunes, and eſpecially for the dead; in which Functions they uſe ſacerdotal Garments; their Caps are like ours, and their ſprinkling bruſhes without any difference at all; they eat neither Fleſh, nor Fiſh, nor Eggs, neither do they drink Wine.*

Semedo Hiſt. of China p. 1. c. 18.

But for this laſt clauſe of *Fiſh* and *Wine*, I might have imagined he had been deſcribing a ſort of Men much nearer home. The ſame Reſemblances *Bartoli* finds, and ſtands amazed at in *Japan*; here again, he *finds one Image with three Heads for the Trinity, and forty hands to denote his Power, which they call* Denix; (but he ſaith, *their Philoſophers interpret it of the Sun, Moon, Elements and firſt matter,*) *here they croſs themſelves*, but with a St. *Andrews Croſs; and ſay their Prayers exactly with their Beads, of which they have One Hundred and Eighty on a ſtring;* and which is yet more obſervable, *they underſtand not one word of their Prayers, and yet they hope for Forgiveneſs of their Sins for ſaying them. They have a kind of Ave-Mary Bell for the times of their Prayers: have Pilgrimages to certain Places, and have great Indulgences promiſed them for viſiting them every year: they have a Tribunal of general Confeſſion; and Troops of Perſons who carry their Images in Proceſſion, and have great Honour to Reliques;* eſpecially to a *Tooth* of *Xaca* at *Meaco, which they look upon as of mighty Vertue, being brought forth, either to obtain Rain or Fair weather:* and which adds yet more cauſe of Admiration, *they have a Pope too*, the *Dairo*, whom he calls *Zazzus, who hath the chief care of Religion, and of canonizing whom he thinks fit, and thence have the Honour of* Cami's *or Saints; he conſecrates Patriarchs and Prelates, who make Prieſts with a power of ſacrificing with Odors, and of diſpoſing the Merits of* Xaca *and* Amida *for the benefit of the living and the dead, Beſides*, ſaith he, *they have Multitudes of religious Orders, black and grey, Eremitical and Cœnobitical; and Nuns which are very ſerviceable and kind to the* Bonzii, *who ſhave their Heads, profeſs cœlibate, abſtain from Fleſh, and Fiſh, and obſerve their Hours of Devotion to* Xaca. *Theſe things, Bartoli* ſaith, *he had from thoſe who were eye-witneſſes, and had been long converſant among them.*

Bartoli de vita & geſtis Fran. Xaverii, l. 3. n. 5. 6.

But to increaſe the Admiration yet more, *Greuber* in his late account of his Return from *China, A. D.* 1661. by the way of *Laſſa*, or *Barantola*, as *Kircher* calls it, but *Greuber* himſelf *Baranateka*, (where he ſaith, *no Chriſtian had ever been*) yet there he found *extreme Unction, ſolemn Proceſſions, worſhiping of Reliques, Monaſteries of* Men *and* Women, *bare-footed* Miſſionaries, *and ſeveral other things,*

Kircher's China illuſtr. part. 2. c. 1. Voyage du Greuber. p. 18

things, which cauſed amazement in him; but above all he wondred at their *Pope, to whom they give divine honours, and worſhip his very Excrements, and put them up in golden Boxes, as a moſt excellent Remedy againſt all Miſchiefs*; and to him all the *Kings* of *Tartary make their ſolemn Addreſſes, and receive their Crowns from him; and thoſe that come near him, kiſs his Toe,* as *Kircher* ſaith, *and give the ſame Adoration that they do to the Pope at* Rome; *and*, ſaith he, *is only due to him:* Which he looks on, as a notable trick of the *Devil*, to ſteal theſe cuſtoms from *Rome*, and to carry them into ſuch a remote part of the World, where he little dreamed of being found out in his Villany, had not *Greuber* chanced to have paſſed that way from *China*. I find theſe Authors very much puzzled, what account to give of all theſe cuſtoms and ceremonies of theirs among *Infidels* and *Idolaters: Kircher* runs back to *Presbyter John*, others to St. *Thomas*; when alas! they all came from the very ſame fountain, from whence they came into the *Roman Church*, viz. *Folly* and *Superſtition*.

Kirch. China, p. 2. c. 4.

§. 14. And they do not want wit to defend themſelves upon the very ſame grounds, that they do; as for inſtance, in their *worſhip* of *Images*, and *Saints*, (as they eſteem them) as moſt proper to our purpoſe. *Nicolaus Pimenta* in his Epiſtle to *Claudius Aquaviva General* of the *Jeſuits* from *Goa*, *A.D.* 1600. ſaith, *that when they diſputed with the Brachmans, about their worſhip, they told them; and we likewiſe worſhip one God as well as you, and refer all the honour to him which we give to other things.* I would he had told us what anſwer he gave them; but I find not a word of that; neither can I ſee what it was capable of, unleſs he told them, that they lied. And we have a conſiderable *Teſtimony* of an underſtanding *Gentleman* of *Rome*, who had the curioſity to enquire ſtrictly into the worſhip the *Gentiles* in *India* gave to their *Deities*; *that they have no other name to expreſs their Deity but* Deu *or* Deuru, *which are likewiſe given to Princes; from whence he infers that the Gods of the* Gentiles *although adored and worſhipped both in ancient and modern times, were never looked on in the ſame degree with* God *the Creator of the* Univerſe, *and wherein almoſt all Nations of the World have and do hold him, ſome calling him the firſt Cauſe, others the Soul of the World, others* Perabrahmi *as the* Gentiles *as this day in* India: *but the other* Gods *are and were always with them, as Saints are with us: of the truth whereof I have great arguments at leaſt among the Indian* Gentiles; *or at the higheſt they eſteemed them only as Men Deified by the Favour of* God, *as Hercules, Romulus, Auguſtus,* &c. *Monſ. Bernier* when he was at the *Univerſity* of the *Brachmans* in *Benares* upon *Ganges*, diſcourſing with one of the moſt learned Men among them, he propoſed to him the Queſtion, *about the adoration of their Idols*, and reproaching them with it, as a thing very unreaſonable; they gave him this remarkable anſwer, *We have indeed in our Temples ſtore of divers Statues, as thoſe of* Brahma, Mahadeu, Genich *and* Gavani, *who are ſome of the chief and moſt perfect* Deutas; *and we have alſo many others of leſs perfection, to whom we pay great honour, proſtrating our ſelves before them and preſenting them Flowers, Rice, Oyles, Saffron and ſuch things with much ceremony; but we do not believe theſe Statues to be* Brahma *or* Bechen, *&c. themſelves, but only their Images and Repreſentations, and we do not give them that honour but upon the account of what they repreſent. They are in our Temples, becauſe it is neceſſary for*

praying

Epiſtolæ Indic. Antw. 1605. p. 839.

Viaggi di Pietro Della Valle parte 3. Letter 6. n. 10.

Bernier Memoires Tom. 3. p. 171.

praying well, to have ſomething before our eyes that may fix the mind; and when we pray, it is not the Statue we pray to, but he that is repreſented by it. For the reſt we acknowledge, that 'tis God that is abſolute, and the only omnipotent Lord and Maſter. This, ſaith he, *was his anſwer without adding or ſubſtracting any thing.* And I deſire to be reſolved by *T. G.* whether upon theſe Principles they were guilty of *Idolatry*, or no? I am ſure their Church accounts them ſo; and yet they neither believe their *Images* to be *Gods*, nor *terminate* their *worſhip* upon them; and if they be guilty upon theſe Principles, *T.* G. can never clear the *Church* of *Rome.*

But beſides, they have another way of defending themſelves, which the ſame Author gives this account of, *viz. that God or that Sovereign being whom they call* Achar *(immutable) hath produced or drawn out of his own ſubſtance, not only ſouls, but alſo whatever is material and corporeal in the Univerſe, ſo that all the things in the world are but one and the ſame thing which is God himſelf; as all numbers are but one and the ſame unity repeated.* If this Principle of theirs were true, I hope they might ſtand upon even terms with *T.* G. as to the *adoration of the Hoſt.* For if the belief on one ſide will juſtify his Church from *Idolatry*, a ſufficient object of Adoration being ſuppoſed to be preſent, I hope the ſame ſuppoſition on their ſide may do it too; ſo that if Men can be but *fooliſh* and *extravagant* enough in their opinion about a thing, they need not doubt the lawfulneſs of the worſhip they pay to it. And that this is not a meer ſuppoſition not only appears by the Teſtimony of this inquiſitive Perſon, but by what *Trigautius* ſaith of the *Chineſes, that this opinion is very prevalent among the Learned Men there, that makes the World and God to be one ſubſtance, of which all particular things are members*; and by what *Alexander Valignanus, Provincial* of the *Jeſuits* in the *Indies* for Thirty years, hath ſaid upon this ſubject. In his Diſcourſe about the beſt means of converting the *Japoneſe*, printed by *Poſſevine*, he tells us of a *Sect* among them, *who hold but one Principle*, which they call *the firſt reaſon*, and the *true opinion*, and the *divine truth*, and *that this Principle is all things, and all things are nothing but it extended now and do return into it again upon their diſſolution, that the Soul of Man is the ſame with it, that* Men *by inward contemplation may now attain to a knowledge of and union with this firſt Principle*; and as one of the *Japoneſe* Converts ſaid, *after a* Man *hath ſpent Thirty Years in this contemplation, he is then fit to be Canonized, and to be worſhipped among their* Cami's *and* Fotoques. *This firſt Principle they grant to be one, abſolutely Perfect and Wiſe, but not thoughtful, but living in perfect eaſe and happineſs.* This, ſaith *Bernier*, *is the great Cabala of the* Brachmans *and* Perſians; and if *Valignanus* may be credited, *is ſo of the Japoneſes too:* and it ſeems to be the very ſame which *Orpheus* had from the *Egyptians*, and contains in it the moſt plauſible *Reaſon* of giving *divine worſhip* to any thing, which is propoſed for Adoration. *Valignanus* offers a great many Arguments againſt this Opinion, but I dare ſay not one of them ſtronger or plainer than thoſe which are daily brought againſt *Tranſubſtantiation:* and yet *T.* G. will by no means allow any *Idolatry* therein, becauſe the object ſuppoſed to be preſent, deſerves our Adoration. But the generality

P. 178.

Trigaut. de exp. apud Sinas; l. 1. c. 10.
Poſſevine Biblioth. l. 10. c. 2.

rality of the People *Valignanus* confeſſes did acknowledge a *Supreme Being* whom they called *Tento, and believed him to be the Governor of the* World, *and to him in their great diſtreſſes they made ſupplications, believing that all things are well known by him; but under him they ſuppoſe many* Cami's *and* Fotoques *to be, whom they acknowledge to have had a beginning, ſuch as* Xaca, *and* Amida, *and* Canon, *and* Toranga *and many others, to whom they make their daily Addreſſes in their Temples.* And the *Reaſons* which *Valignanus* gives againſt this way of Worſhip among them deſerves our conſideration. c. 5. 1. *Becauſe God only hath the power of conferring the Bleſſings of this life or another upon us*; and his Argument muſt hold as to both, or elſe it doth not reach home; for the *Japoneſes* are obſerved more to pray to their *Saints* or *Deities* for Riches, and Health and Honour, than for what belongs to another life. 2. *Becauſe* Xaca *and* Amida *and the reſt of the* Cami *and* Fotoque *were once Men, and therefore the adminiſtration of the World cannot be committed to them, being a thing above humane underſtanding*. Very well again: And if this Argument ſignify any thing, it muſt extend to their incapacity of receiving their Addreſſes for want of Divine Knowledge; otherwiſe they might pray to *Amida* and *Xaca* ſtill, as *Mediators* at leaſt between God and them. 3. *Becauſe the World was, before they had a Being, and conſequently was governed by that wiſe Being which made it; and he that diſpoſed of things then, doth ſo ſtill; therefore it is an abſurd thing pray to and adore ſuch Beings which did not make the World.* All which I grant to be reaſonably, and truly ſaid, and only deſire they may be remembred againſt another day: and what c. 6. he adds *about the great Affront which is offered to God, when the Honour which belongs to him is given to any Creatures, either dead Men, or Images, or Devils; and yet he makes no ſcruple notwithſtanding the former Pretences, to charge theſe Gentiles with Idolatry.*

§. 15. It remains now, that I conſider the *Religion* of the *Chineſes*; that I mean, which is properly theirs, and is by Writers commonly called the *firſt Sect* among them, and by Martinius the *Philoſophical* Martin. Præfat Atlant. Sinic. p. 7. *Sect.* Although he admires them for their *morality*; *yet*, he ſaith, *although anciently they did believe and worſhip one God, yet that now they have left off to worſhip him becauſe they do not know how to do it:* but *Greuber*, who came later from thence ſaith, *that they do profeſs to worſhip one Supreme Being which they call* Sciax-Ti, *and* Voyage du Greüber, p. 6. *adore him by certain Sacrifices of Paper and Incenſe. They worſhip no Pagod* or *Idol*, ſaith *Semedo*, *but acknowledge a Superiority or Deity, who is able to chaſtiſe or reward: But they have no* Semedo *hiſt. of* China ch. 18. *Churches wherein they worſhip him, nor any divine Service which they celebrate, nor any Prayers that they rehearſe, nor any Prieſts or Miniſters which officiate at his Service. Yet they ſpeak and write very honorably of him, neither do they attribute any undecent thing to him, as our Anceſtors did to their Gods: But they have Temples for Heaven and Earth in* Nankin *and* Pekim, *in which the King himſelf offers the Sacrifice; and in the Cities they have Temples for Tutelar Spirits, to which the* Mandarins *do Sacrifice; as, to the Spirits of the Rivers, Mountains and four parts of the world,* &c. *and there are Temples to the honour of great Benefa-*

ctors to the publick, and therein are placed their Images. Trigautius ſaith, *that he finds in their antient Books that the* Chineſes *did of old time worſhip one ſupreme God, whom they called King of Heaven, or by another Name Heaven and Earth: and beſides him they worſhipped tutelar Spirits*; to the ſame purpoſe with *Semedo*: and *the ſame*, he ſaith, *continues ſtill in the Learned Sect among them, whoſe firſt Author was their famous* Confucius: *To him they have a Temple erected in every City with his Image, or his Name in golden Letters, whither all the Magiſtrates every new or full Moon do reſort, to give Honour to* Confucius *with Bowings, and Wax-candles, and Incenſe: the ſame they do on his Birthday, and other ſet times; there to expreſs their Gratitude for the mighty Advantages they have had by his Doctrine, but they make no Prayers to him, and neither ſeek nor hope for any thing from him. They have likewiſe Temples to tutelar Spirits for every City and Tribunal; where they make Oblations, and burn Perfumes, acknowledging theſe to have Power to reward and puniſh. Bartoli* ſaith, *it is not out of any Contempt of Religion, but out of Reverence to the Deity becauſe of the Excellency of his Majeſty, that they ſuffer none but the King to offer Sacrifice to him: and accordingly the larger Power the Tutelar Spirits are ſuppoſed to have, the greater Magiſtrates are to attend their Service: and the leſſer thoſe of Cities, and Mountains, and Rivers.* But that which is more material to our preſent buſineſs, is, to conſider the *Reſolution* of a *caſe* of *Conſcience* not long ſince given at *Rome* by the *Congregation* of *Cardinals de propagandâ fide*, after adviſing with, and the full Conſent of the *Pope* obtained the Twelfth of *September* 1645. Which Reſolution, and decree was printed in the *Preſs* of the *Congregation* the ſame year, with the *Popes Decree* annexed to it, and his peremptory Command for the Obſervation of it by all *Miſſionaries*; and that *Copy* of the *Reſolution* I have ſeen, was atteſted by a publick *Notary* to agree with the *Original Decree:* which caſe will help us very much to the right Underſtanding the *Notion* of *Idolatry* according to the Senſe of the Church of *Rome*.

Trigaut. de Chriſt. exped. apud Sinas, l. 1. c. 10.

Bartoli Aſiat. hiſt. l. 1. n. 73.

The Caſe was this; the *Miſſionaries* of the *Society* of *Jeſuits*, having had a plentiful Harveſt in *China*, and many of the great Men embracing the *Chriſtian Religion* by their means: the *Miſſionaries* of other *Orders*, eſpecially the *Franciſcans*, had a great Curioſity to underſtand the Arts, which the *Jeſuits* uſed in prevailing with ſo many great Perſons to become *Chriſtians*; and upon full Enquiry, they found they give them great Liberty, as to the *five Precepts of the Church*, as they call them, *viz. hearing Maſs, annual Confeſſion, receiving the Sacrament at* Eaſter, *faſting at the ſolemn times, and Tenths and firſt Fruits:* beſides, they did forbear their *Ceremonies* of *Baptiſm, their Oyl* and *Spittle* in the *Ears*, and *Salt* in the *Mouth*, when they *baptized Women*, and giving *extreme Unction* to them, becauſe the *Jealouſie* of their *Husbands* would not permit them to uſe them; but that which is moſt to our purpoſe is the Liberty they gave the *Mandarins* in two things. 1. *To go to the Temple of the tutelar Spirit in every City,* as they are bound by Vertue of their Office to do twice a Month, or elſe they forfeit their places, and there to proſtrate themſelves before the *Idol*, with all the *external Acts of Adoration* that others uſed; and ſwearing before it when they enter into their office, ſo they did ſecretly convey a *Crucifix* among the Flowers, that lay upon the *Altar*, or hold it cunningly in their hands, and direct all their Adorations to the *Crucifix* by the inward Intention of their Minds. 2. *To go to the Temple of* Keum-Fucu, *or* Confucius, *twice a year, and to perform all the Solemnities there, that the reſt did:* and the ſame as to *the Temples of their Anceſtors which are erected to their Honour according to the Precepts of* Confucius; becauſe the *Chineſes* declared that they intended only to give the ſame Reverence to the *Memory* of their *Anceſtors*, which they would do to *themſelves* if they were ſtill living; and what they offer to them is nothing but what they would give them, if they were alive, without any Intention to beg any thing from them, when they know them to be dead: and the ſame Allowance they gave, as to the *Images of their Anceſtors*, about which many Ceremonies were uſed by them. The *Miſſionaries* of St. *Francis* order, being well informed of the *Truth* of theſe things, from the *Philippines*, they ſend a *Memorial* to the *King* of *Spain* concerning them, who by his *Ambaſſador* repreſents it to the *Pope*, whereupon the *Congregation* of *Cardinals* was called, and after great deliberation and adviſing with the *Pope* about it, they made their *Decree*, wherein, they by ſeveral *Reſolutions*, declare it *unlawful upon any of thoſe Pretences to uſe Acts in themſelves unlawful, and ſuperſtitious, although directed by their Intention to the worſhip of the true God.* And leaſt any ſhould imagin it was only *matter of Scandal*, which they ſtood upon (as *T. G.* doth, *about worſhipping towards the Sun*) they make uſe of ſeveral Expreſſions, on purpoſe to exclude this, for ſo they reſolve the ſeventh Quere, *nullatenus licere, it is by no means lawful*, and the eighth, *nullo prætextu, under no pretence whatſoever*, and to the ninth expreſly, *that it could not be ſalved propter abſentiam gentilium, if there were no Gentiles preſent:* From this *Reſolution* we may obſerve ſeveral things to our purpoſe. T.G.p.92.

1. That *Idolatry* is conſiſtent with the Belief of the *ſupreme God*, and reſerving *Sovereign worſhip as due only to him:* For the *Congregation* calls the *Image* of the *tutelar Spirit* an *Idol*, and conſequently the *Act of Adoration* muſt be *Idolatry*, yet it is very clear that the *Chineſes* (eſpecially the *Chriſtians*) did never intend to give to the *Tutelar Spirit* the *Honour proper* to the *ſupreme Deity:* And *Bartoli* hath at large proved, that the *Chineſes did of old acknowledge the true God*, and *his Providence over the World:* and *that their Princes do worſhip the ſame God ſtill, to whom they offer Sacrifice; and they call him by two Names*, Scianti, *which ſignifies ſupreme Monarch, and* Tienciù, *Lord of Heaven*, and as he tells us, *they put an apparent difference between* Tienciù *and* Tienſcin, *i. e. between God and Angels, and ſay that the Power of forgiving Sins belongs only to God and not to them;* that, Bartoli hiſt. Aſi. l. 1. n. 70.

that, *upon a Debate among the Miſſionaries about the uſe of theſe Words for the true God, and ſome Scruples raiſed from ſome Miſinterpretations of it by an Atheiſtical Sect among them, they were ſatisfied by plain and perſpicuous Teſtimonies out of their Books, that they could mean no other than the true God:* and *that he to whom the King every year offers ſacrifice is a pure Mind, free from all Mixture, governing all things, and therefore to him all the Acts of Sovereign worſhip are performed; ſuch as Sacrifices, Vows, Prayers and Thankſgivings.* Therefore the Worſhip they give to the *Tutelar Spirits* or *Guardian Angels,* (as they ſuppoſe them) muſt be of an *Inferior Nature,* and yet the *Congregation* of the *Cardinals* by the Direction of the *Pope,* condemn this for *Idolatry.*

2. That giving an *Inferior Worſhip* on the account of *created excellency,* when it appears to be *Religious,* is utterly *unlawful* among *Chriſtians.* For this is the only imaginable reaſon why the *Congregation* did ſo abſolutely condemn the worſhip of *Confucius* and their *Anceſtors*; and *Hurtado* in the explication of this Decree, confeſſes, *that the Chineſes did not eſteem* Confucius, *as a God, but only looked on him as a holy and virtuous Philoſopher*; *yet,* ſaith he, *becauſe they did thoſe acts to him which are only proper to God, they commit manifeſt Idolatry in it. For,* ſaith he, *they who give to a Creature the worſhip due only to God, do commit Idolatry; and from hence the Gentiles who acknowledged one God were Idolaters, becauſe they gave to the Creatures the honour due to him, in the doing of which they made an acknowledgment of divine Excellency in the things they gave it to.* By which it appears, that there are ſome external acts of *worſhip* ſo proper to *God,* that although a Man hath never ſo clear apprehenſion in his mind of the *Supreme excellency of God* above the Creatures he worſhips, yet the giving that worſhip to them makes his act *Idolatry.* The *Jeſuits* to excuſe theſe things, ſpeak very high things of *Confucius,* and of his admirable *Life* and *Doctrine*; and ſurely not without great reaſon, if their relations hold true, as I ſee no reaſon to ſuſpect them: but the more *Confucius* is extolled, the worſe they make their own caſe, for all theſe acts of *external worſhip* towards him, are condemned for *Idolatry:* and how then comes the *worſhip* of *Ignatius Loyola* to be otherwiſe, who, I dare ſay, never was ſo great a *Philoſopher,* nor did ſo much good in the World, as the *Jeſuits* ſay *Confucius* did? But at laſt, they would have all theſe honours to *Confucius* to be only *civil honours*; although *Trigautius* confeſſes, *that he hath a Temple in every City, that his Image with that of his Diſciples, is ſet up in it; that theſe Diſciples are looked on as a ſort of* Divi, *i. e. as Canonized Saints; that here they make uſe of all the Rites of Adoration, Genuflections, Wax-candles, Incenſe, Oblations,* Prayers only excepted: but we ſee, notwithſtanding all their pretences, the *Pope* and *Congregation* of *Cardinals* have condemned them as guilty of *Idolatry.*

Thom. Hurtado Reſolutiones de vero Martyrio Fidei, p. 487.

Martin. hiſt. Sinic. l. 4 p. 151. Bartoli hiſt. Aſiat. l. 1. n. 54. Trigaut. l. 1. c. 10.

3. That the *Pope* and *Congregation* of *Cardinals* were not of *T. G*'s mind, *that acts do certainly go whither they are intended:* For

all theſe *acts* of *worſhip* were directed by the *intention* of the Perſons to the ſecret *Crucifix*, which lay among the *flowers* upon the *Altar*; but notwithſtanding, this in their opinion were a fit object of worſhip, yet other circumſtances did ſo much alter the nature of it, that they declare theſe acts to be in themſelves unlawful. By actions going whither they are intended, I do not mean, as *T. G.* ſuggeſts, *that the Phyſical act of the mind doth not paſs to the object whither the act is directed, i. e.* that I do not think of that which I do think of; but my meaning is, that ſuch a directing the intention of the mind doth not give a *moral denomination* to the *nature* of the *action, viz.* that it becomes *lawful* or *unlawful*, by virtue of ſuch an intention of the mind, but that the *Law* of *God* may ſo determine the nature of our *acts* of *worſhip*, as to make them unlawful, whatever the *intention* of the mind be. And thus the *Congregation* of *Cardinals* here reſolves the caſe; the Perſons uſed only thoſe *acts* of *Adoration* that may be directed to *God*, by a ſecret *intention* of the mind; they ſuppoſe a *Crucifix* a fit object for *divine worſhip*, and going together into an *Idolatrous Temple*, and uſing all the external *equivocal acts* (as *T. G.* calls them) which the reſt did, they direct their *acts* by virtue of this Intention to the *Crucifix*; yet although the *Congregation* thought this *intention* rightly directed, they condemn the acts as in themſelves unlawful. But of theſe things hereafter; the firſt *Obſervation* being ſufficient to my preſent purpoſe, *viz.* to ſhew that according to the preſent ſenſe of the *Roman Church* the *practice* of *Idolatry* is conſiſtent with the acknowledgment of one *Supreme God*.

§. 16. From the *Idolatry* of the *Eaſt-Indies*, I proceed to that of the *Tartars*, whoſe Dominion hath extended it ſelf over that vaſt *Continent* from the utmoſt *North-Eaſt* parts, to the *borders* of *Europe* that way; and this account I ſhall give from the leaſt ſuſpected *witneſſes* in this matter, *viz.* the *Emiſſaries* of the *Roman Church*, who had converſed moſt among them, and made it their deſign to underſtand their *Religion*. In *A. D.* 1246. after the horrible Devaſtations made by the *Tartars* in *Poland* and *Hungary*, Pope *Innocent* IV. ſent *Johannes de Plano Carpini* as his *Legate*, or *Nuncio* to them: And after a Year and Four Months ſtay among them he gives this account of their Religion, *unum Deum credunt, quem credunt eſſe factorem omnium viſibilium, & inviſibilium; & credunt eum tam bonorum in hoc mundo quam pœnarum eſſe factorem; non tamen orationibus, vel laudibus aut ritu aliquo ipſum colunt. They believe one God, whom they believe to be the Maker of all things viſible and inviſible; and to be the Author of all worldly Goods and Puniſhments*; and yet he ſaith, *they had no manner of worſhip of him:* but their worſhip they gave to *Images*, which he there at large deſcribes. But there is an *inferior Deity*, whom he calls *Itoga*, *Paulus Venetus Natagay* which they believe to be the *God of the Earth, and him they worſhip with great Superſtition; and beſides they worſhip the Sun, Moon and Fire, and make Oblations to the Image of their firſt Emperor*; and the ſame thing is affirmed by *Vincentius Bellovacenſis*. After him, *Lewis* IX. of *France* ſent

Joh à Plano Carpini Libellus hiſtoricus de Tartaris c. 3.

Paul. Venet. de Reg. Orient. l. 1. c. 58. l. 3. c. 47.
Specul. hiſt. l. 29. c. 72, 74.

ſent *William de Rubruquis*, *a Franciſcan*, A. D. 1253. who paſſed through the ſeveral *Courts* of the *Tartarian Princes*, and gave an exact account to his *Prince* of the *Religion* he found among them. In the conference he had with *Mangu-Chan* (who was then *Emperor*) *about Religion*; the Emperor told him, We Moals (which is the Name they call themſelves by, that being the Name of the *Tribe* from whence *Jingiz-chan* came, the *Tartars* being another *Tribe*, but better known to the *Europeans*,) *We*, (ſaith he,) *believe that there is but one God, through whom we live and die; and we have an upright heart towards him:* and he added, *that as God had given to the hand five fingers, ſo he hath given many ways to* Men. But there was a *Sect* of *Idolaters* among them, whom he calls *Tuinians*, *who held two firſt Principles, and many Gods*; but it ſeems by their Diſcourſe, *that they acknowledged the Superiority of one above all the reſt.* For when the *Frier* ſaid *there was but one God*; the *Tuinian* who diſputed with him before *Mangu-Chan*, ſaid, *Fools ſay there is but one God, but wiſe Men ſay there are many; are there not great Lords in your Country? and here is a greater Lord* Mangu-Chan. *So is it of the Gods, becauſe in divers Countries there are divers.* And afterwards he acknowledged, *that there is one Higheſt God in the Heavens, whoſe Generation we know not yet, and ten are under him, and under them there is one Inferior: and in the Earth there are infinite.* And of another *Sect*, called *Jugurs*, he confeſſes, *that they believe one God, and yet make Idols; from whom the Tartars had their Letters*; and he affirms the ſame of the *Moals* or *Tartars* in general, and yet they make and worſhip many *Images: and their Prieſts pray by their Beads, having a ſtring with a Hundred or two of Nutſhels upon it; and the repeating of certain words with them, they account meritorious at God's hand.* *Haithon*, the *Armenian*, agrees with the former ſaying of the *Tartars*, *that they confeſs one immortal God.* *Gregorius Abul-pharajius* brings ſeveral examples of *Jingiz-Chans acknowledging one Supreme and Omnipotent God*, (who laid the Foundation of the *Tartarian Empire*) as, *when he made his Prayers to him upon the injury of* Gayer-Chan: *when he owned his Power to be given him from the God that is King over all and omnipotent*; *and therefore*, *Haithon* makes *that the firſt command of* Jingiz-Chan *to his followers, that they ought to believe and obey the immortal God, by whom he obtained his Empire.* And that the *Tartars*, who have not embraced *Mohometiſm*, did ſtill acknowledge and worſhip one *Supreme God maker of Heaven and Earth*, is confeſſed by *Jacobus Navarchus* among the *Indian Epiſtles*; and the ſame, *Nicephorus Calliſtus* affirms, of the ancient *Turks*, who where a race of *Tartars* living beyond the *Bactrian Mountains*.

Gul. de Rubruquis Itiner. c. 45.
c. 42.
c. 27.
Haithon. Armen. hiſt. Orient. c. 48.
Greg. Abulpharai. hiſt. Dynaſt. p. 285. p. 290.
Haithon. Hiſt. Orient. c. 16.
Jac. Navarch. Epiſt. Aſiatic. p. 344.
Niceph. Calliſth. l. 18. c. 30.

The like might be eaſily diſcovered of the moſt conſiderable *Nations* of the *Weſt-Indies*, if it would not have ſwelled this Diſcourſe into too great a Bulk; in general we take this remarkable *Teſtimony* of *Joſephus Acoſta*, a learned *Spaniſh Jeſuit*, who lived ſeventeen Years in thoſe Parts. *They* (ſaith he, ſpeaking of the *Indians*) *do commonly acknowledge a Supreme Lord and Author*

Joſeph. Acoſta *Natural and Moral Hiſtory of the Indies.* l. 5. c. 8.

thor of all things, which they of Peru *call* Viracocha, *and gave him Names of great Excellence, as* Pachacamac, *or* Pachaiackachic, *which is the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and* Uſapu *which is admirable, and ſuch like. Him they did worſhip as the chiefeſt of all, whom they did honour in beholding the Heaven. The like we ſee amongſt them of* Mexico, *and* China, *and all other Infidels. Which accordeth well with what is ſaid by St.* Paul *in the Acts of the Apoſtles, where he did ſee the Inſcription of an Altar* Ignoto Deo, To the unknown God : *Whereupon the Apoſtle took occaſion to preach unto them, ſaying, Him whom you worſhip without knowing him, do I preach unto you. In like ſort thoſe which at this day do preach the Goſpel to the Indians find no great Difficulty to perſwade them that there is a high God and Lord over all, and that this is the Chriſtians God, and the true God. As it is therefore a Truth conformable to Reaſon, that there is a Sovereign Lord and King of Heaven, whom the Gentiles with all their Infidelities and Idolatries have not denied, as we ſee in the Philoſophy of* Timæus *in* Plat. *in the Metaphyſicks of* Ariſtotle, *and in the* Aſclepius *of* Triſmegiſt, *as alſo in the* Poeſies *of* Homer *and* Virgil : *So the Preachers of the Goſpel have no great Difficulty to plant and perſwade this Truth of a Supreme God, be the Nations to whom they preach never ſo barbarous and bruitiſh. But it is hard to root out of their Minds that there is no other God, nor any other Deity than one ; and that all other things of themſelves have no Power, Being, nor Working proper to themſelves, but what this great and only Lord doth give and impart to them. To conclude, It is neceſſary to perſwade them by all means, in reproving their Errors, as well in that wherein they generally fail, in worſhipping more than one God, as in particular, which is much more to hold for Gods, and to demand Favors and Help of thoſe things which are not Gods, nor have any Power, but what the true God their Lord and Creator hath given.* And in another Place he ſaith, *Hoc enim commune apud omnes pene barbaros eſt, ut Deum quidem omnium rerum Supremum & ſumme bonum fateantur. This is common among almoſt all the barbarous Nations, to acknowledge one ſupreme God, infinitely good.* But there is ſo pregnant a Teſtimony concerning the Acknowledgment of a Supreme *Deity* among the *Yncas* of *Peru*, that it ought not to be ſlightly paſſed over. The thing it ſelf is confeſſed not only by *Acoſta*, but by *Euſebius Nierembergius*, *Auguſtinus de Zarate*, *Antonius de Calancha* who was himſelf a *Peruan* born, and afterwards an *Auguſtinian :* And theſe two mention the Conference between *Atahuallpa* the laſt of the *Yncas*, and *Vincentius de Valverde* about *Religion*, wherein, the *Ynca* told the Spaniſh Prieſt, *that they believed in* Pachacamac *the Creator of the World, and after him they worſhipped the Sun and Moon for their univerſal Influence on the World.* But the moſt perfect account of their way of Worſhip is delivered by *Garcilaſſo de la Vega* who was himſelf of the *Blood* of the *Yncas* by the *Mother*, and he corrects ſeveral Miſtakes of *Acoſta* and other *Spaniſh Authors*, which were occaſioned by their Ignorance of the *Peruvian Language* and *Cuſtoms*. He ſaith, *that* Manco Capac, (who was the Founder of the *Empire*

De procurandâ Indorum ſalute, l. 5. c. 10.

Euſeb. Nieremb. hiſt. Natur. l. 8. c. 13. Auguſt. de Zarate. l. 2. Anton. de Calancha apud Joach. Brul. hiſt. Peruan. l. 2. c. 5. Le Commenraire Royal des Ynca's liv. 2. c. 1.

pire of the *Yncas*) *did reduce the barbarous Indians from the promiſcuous Idolatry of almoſt all ſorts of Creatures before, to the Worſhip of the Sun, as the great Inſtrument of* Pachacamac *in the Government of the World; but although they had a great Veneration for the Moon, as Wife and Siſter of the Sun, yet he cannot find that they did ever worſhip her as a Goddeſs; or offer Sacrifices, and built Temples to her. Thunder and Lightning they called the Executioners of the Juſtice of the Sun; and did not look on them as Deities as the Spaniards imagined.* But the main thing he diſcovers as to their *Religion* is, *that they had only two* c. 2. *Deities, the one viſible, the Sun; the other inviſible, the Creator of the World, whom they called* Pachacamac, *from* Pacha *which ſignifies the World, and* Camac *from the Verb* Camar *to enliven, and that from* Cama *the Soul; ſo that* Pachacamac *is as much as the Soul of the World; which Word they had in ſo great Veneration that they durſt not pronounce it but with a great deal of Ceremony, and with the moſt humble Poſture of Adoration; which was the external Sovereign Worſhip which they gave to the Supreme Deity, and above what they gave to the Sun, whoſe Name they did uſually pronounce:* From whence he infers, *that although the external Worſhip of Sacrifices was performed to the Sun, yet they had in their Soul a greater Adoration to* Pachacamac, *as an inviſible Deity, that gave Being and Life to the World.* He ſaith, *that without all queſtion the* Yncas *and their* Amautas *or Philoſophers, did intend no other by this Word, but the true Sovereign Creator of the World; however the Spaniards thought ſome Devil was underſtood by it;* but, ſaith he, *the Indians when they meant the Devil they called him* Cupay; *and at the naming him did ſpit on the ground in token of Execration; but when they mentioned* Pachacamac, *they did it with all the Reverence and Devotion imaginable.* And withal he adds, *that whatever* Acoſta *and others ſay, this is the proper Name for God in the Peruvian Language; and they do not know how to expreſs him otherwiſe; and that all other Names given by the Spaniards, as* Tici Viracocha, Pachaia Chacher, Pacharurac, *do not ſet forth the unexpreſſible Majeſty of God in their Tongue, as* Pachacamac *doth.* He tells us, *that it was an inviolable Law of the* Yncas, *throughout their Empire, that divine Worſhip ſhould be given only to* Pachacamac *as* c. 3. p. 146. *the Sovereign Deity, and to the Sun for the great Benefit the World received by him; and that it was held a very reproachful thing among them to attribute the Name, Honour, Authority, Power of God or any other Divine Perfections to any ſublunary things; but they had an inferior Reverence for the Moon as Wife and Siſter of the Sun, and for the Stars, which they called her Daughters and Servants of her Houſe; and ſo they had for their* Yncas *too,* whoſe Bodies were ſet up in the *Temple* of the *Sun* in *Cozco*, on either ſide his *golden Image*; and in the *Chapple* of the *Moon* were the Bodies of the *Empreſſes* after the ſame manner; in which l. 3. c. 20. he obſerves, *that the* Yncas *were wont to make their Vows to the* c. 21. *Moon, and recommend themſelves to her as their Mother; but they offered no Sacrifices to her, as they did to the Sun.* They have likewiſe great reſpect for the *Stars*, and eſpecially for the *Planet Venus*, which they call *the Page of the Sun*; as they have for the *Thunder*, and *Lightning*, and *Thunderbolt*, which he ſaith again *they did not hold to be Gods, but to be his domeſtick Servants*; which the *Spaniards*, becauſe they repreſented them as *three in one*, miſtook for the *Trinity* worſhipped among them, which *Euſebius Nierembergius* from *Acoſta* calls *Tangatanga*: *Garcilaſſo* knew nothing of it, but ſaith, that they called them *Yllapa*. They have likewiſe a great Veneration for the *Rainbow* as the Production of the *Sun*; and for the *City* of *Cozco*; but as to all theſe, they give only an *inferior* and *honorary Worſhip* to them, but they reſerve the *Sovereign internal Worſhip* for *Pachacamac*, and *external* by *Sacrifice* for the *Sun*. This *Pachacamac*, although he had no *Temple* erected by the *Yncas*, yet the ſame Author tells us, *that under the Power of Cuyſmancu*, King of the *Yncas*, there was a l. 6. c. 30. Valley, called *the Valley of* Pachacamac, *where was a Temple erected to his Worſhip*; and when the *Ynca* of *Peru* demanded Subjection to him, and to joyn in the Worſhip of the *Sun*; he ſaid, Pachacamac *was Creator and Preſerver of all, and therefore greater than the Sun, whom they worſhipped with the utmoſt Expreſſions of Adoration; the King* c. 31. *himſelf not daring to enter the Temple with his Face towards his Image: And beſides him they only worſhipped the Oracle of* Rimac, *and* Mamacohca *i. e. the Sea; but for the Sun, they found too great Inconvenience by his Heat for them to worſhip him.* The *Ynca* replyed, *that they did not only worſhip the Sun, but* Pachacamac *too; but becauſe he was an inviſible and incomprehenſible Deity, they offered him no Sacrifices, nor built him any Temple; but they had the greateſt inward Veneration towards him, which they expreſſed by all poſſible Demonſtrations as oft as they mentioned his Name.* At laſt the Difference was compoſed on theſe terms, the *Yncas* were to retain the *Temple* of *Pachacamac*, but to forbear any *Image* of him, as unworthy of him, and human *Sacrifices*, and to receive the Worſhip of the *Sun*; and the *Yncas* to admit the *Oracle* of *Rimac*. *Huayna Capac*, one of the *Yncas*, made uſe of this Argument to the *High-Prieſt* his *Uncle*, that the *Sun* l. 9. c. 9. could not be the *Supreme God*; *who dares*, ſaid he, *command me to go a long Journy and never reſt? But if I command any Officer I have to go to* Chili, *he dares not diſobey; ſurely then*, ſaith he, *our Father the Sun* (ſo the *Yncas* ſtill called him) *muſt needs have a greater Lord than himſelf, which commands him to take ſuch a Journy every day.* By theſe things, it fully appears, that the mighty *Empire* of *Peru*, while it was under the Power of the *Yncas*, did acknowledge *one Supreme God*, to whom they gave *internal Worſhip* as moſt proper for him, and *external Adoration* at the mention of his Name, although they offered their *Sacrifices* to the *Sun*. And it is obſervable what the ſame excellent *Author* farther adds, *that the Indians worſhipped* Pachacamac, *un-* l. 9. c. 4. *der the very Title of the* Unknown God; which was the Inſcription on the *Altar* at *Athens*, from whence St. *Paul* ſaid, *whom ye ignorantly worſhip, him I declare unto you.*

Acoſta l. 5. c. 4. *Acoſta* ſaith, *that the ſupreme God was worſhipped in* Mexico *with a very Magnificent Temple, and after him the Sun*; in *Vir-* Hariot's deſcript. of Virgin. *ginia*, one that had it from intimate Familiarity with the *Prieſts* declares, *that they believe there are many Gods, which they call* Mantoac, *but of different Sorts and Degrees, one only chief and great God, which hath been from all Eternity. Who, as they affirm, when he purpoſed to make the World, made firſt other Gods* *of a principal Order, to be as Means and Inſtruments to be uſed in the Creation and Government to follow, and after, the Sun, Moon and Stars, as petty Gods, and Inſtruments of the other Order more principal.* And when *Tomocomo* a Principal Perſon of *Virginia* was here in *England,* he averred, *that they worſhipped the God that made Heaven and Earth: who was the Author of all good to them. Creuxius* the *Jeſuit,* in his late *Hiſtory* of *Canada,* ſaith, *that when* Paulus Juvenæus *diſcourſed with the Inhabitants about God, and deſcribing him to be of infinite Power, and that made Heaven and Earth, they cried out to each other* Atoachan, Atoachan, *intimating that all things were made by that God whom they worſhipped under that Name: but they believe the Seaſons of the year, and the Affairs of human Life to be managed by certain Spirits under him, whom they endeavour to propitiate by certain Rites of worſhip.*

Purchis Pilgr. l. 8. c. 6.

Creux. hiſt. Canad. l. 1. p. 78.

p. 86.

Leo Africanus, teſtifies concerning ſome of the antient *African Idolaters, that they worſhipped* Guighimo, *i. e. the Lord of Heaven; which Part of Religion,* he ſaith, *was not delivered to them, by any Prophet or Teacher, but was inſpired into them by God himſelf. Varenius* takes notice of the falſe and imperfect Deſcription which is commonly given of the *Religion* of the *Negroes,* and ſaith, *he underſtood by thoſe who lived long among them, that although they worſhip many Gods, yet they acknowledge one ſupreme, whom they call* Fetiſſo: *and believe him to be the Author both of the good and evil they receive, and therefore endeavour to appeaſe him by many Sacrifices, Ceremonies and Prayers. Mandelſlo* ſaith, of the Inhabitants of *Madagaſcar, that he was informed, that they believe there is one God who made Heaven and Earth; and will one day puniſh bad Actions and reward the Good. Joh. de Barros* ſaith, *that the Inhabitants of* Monomotapa, *believe in one God whom they call* Mozimo; and if we believe him, *they worſhip nothing elſe beſides him:* the ſame others ſay of the *Mordui,* a People that inhabit the farther Parts of *Muſcovy,* who declare, *that they worſhip only the Creator of the Univerſe to whom they offer the firſt Fruits of all things, even of their Meat and Drink, caſting ſome Parts of them towards Heaven: but they have no Idols, nor Baptiſm, and ſay they live according to Nature:* but *Brietius* ſaith, *they worſhip Idols, or are Mahumetans, Texeira* and *Pimenta* ſay that the *Sect* of the *Baneans* called *Lon-Kah, worſhip only the ſupreme God, without Idols;* but *Mexery hath Idols and doth worſhip them. Joſephus Indus, a Native of Cranganor* ſaith, *that the Gentile Idolaters there did worſhip the God of Heaven, under the Form of a Statue with three Faces, and his Hands folded, whom they called* Tambram: and he ſaith, *the King of* Calecut *is of the ſame Religion with them of* Cranganor: and *Ludovicus Vartomannus* ſaith, that in *Calecut,* they call the *Great* God Tamerani, *whom they believe to be the Maker of the World;* but he adds, *that they believe him to live at Eaſe, and that he hath committed the Government of the World to* Deumo, *whoſe Image they worſhip, having on his Head,* ſaith Vartomannus, *juſt ſuch a Crown as the Popes of* Rome *have, only it hath three horns upon it:* And the ſame is confeſſed by *Jarricus.* The People of *Narſinga* likewiſe *believe one ſupreme God, but worſhip Idols as the*

Leo Afric. deſcrip. Afric. l. 1.

Varen. de diverſ. gent. Relig. p. 304.

Mandelſlo *Voyage* l. 3.

Barros Dec. 1. l. 10. c. 1.

Linda deſcript. Orbis. p. 1149.

Archontolog. Coſmic. de Moſco. § 44.

Briet. Geog. To. 2. l. 6. c. 2.

Indiæ vera deſcript. p. 118.

Piment. in Ep. Ind.

Joſeph. Indi Navig. c. 3.

Lud. Vartom. Navig. l. 5. c. 21.

Jarric. Rerum Indic. l. 1. c. 4.

Linda. p. 1145. Linſchot. Navig. c. 33.

the reſt of the Indians do. Linſchoten, gives this General Teſtimony of them, *that although they worſhip the Sun and Moon, yet they acknowledge one* God, *Creator and Governor of all things; and do believe the Rewards and Puniſhments of another Life to be according to Mens good or bad Actions in this Life. But withal they worſhip Idols called* Pagodes, *after ſuch a terrible Repreſentation as we make of Devils, whom they aſſert to have lived formerly upon Earth, and to have been famous for Sanctity and Miracles, and to whom they addreſs themſelves, as Mediators to the ſupreme God for them.* The *Kingdom* of *Siam* is ſuppoſed to have been the Antient Seat of the *Bramans*, from whence the *Religion* of the *Indies* did ſpread it ſelf: and here *Schouten*, who lived long among them, ſaith, *that the common Perſwaſion of the Gentiles, although different in other Points, is, that there is one ſupreme God, who created all things, and after him many Inferior* Gods *in Heaven; that Men ſhall receive Rewards and Puniſhments in another Life according to their Actions here. And that this Religion hath been delivered down to them by the Succeſſion of many Ages; and confirmed by the Teſtimony of Saints, whoſe Memory they worſhip in their Images, which they have ſet up like ſo many leſſer Deities, who have merited Heaven by their good Works.* The Ceremonies of their Worſhip, the *Nature of their Images*, the *manner of their Oblations*, the *Cuſtoms* of their *Talapois*, (*or Friers*) are ſuch, that, ſome few things excepted, one would imagin no great difference between the *Varelles* of *Siam*, and the *Jeſuits Church* and Devotions there. *M. de Bourges*, who hath given an account of the late *French Miſſion* into thoſe Parts, confeſſes, *that their external Devotion to their Images is extraordinary, that they offer no bloody Sacrifices, but all their Oblations are of the Fruits of the Earth: and that they free themſelves from the Charge of Idolatry, becauſe they acknowledge and worſhip one* God, *who is Lord over all; and that their Images are intended to preſerve the Memories of their Saints, that by the ſight of them the People might be excited to imitate their Vertues. And it is very true*, ſaith he, *that the Prieſts of* Siam *do thus anſwer the Chriſtians who charge them with Idolatry, and think themſelves no more guilty than the Miſſionaries of the Church of* Rome *who charge them.* But he thinks, he hath cleared the difference between them by ſaying, *that thoſe of* Siam *are more uncertain in the Belief of the ſupreme God, and defective in giving any peculiar worſhip to him: and that they terminate their worſhip abſolutely upon their Idols, and aſk of them thoſe things, which God alone can give.* As to the former, we have ſeen the general Conſent of the *Indians* in *the Belief of a ſupreme* God, (which is no Token of their Uncertainty) and that many of them did think *internal Worſhip* moſt proper to him; and for the latter, if they ſuppoſe thoſe *Deities* to be ſo by *Participation*, and *ſubordinate* to the *ſupreme*, I do not ſee, how the difference is made appear between the *Addreſſes* they made to their *Saints* by their *Images*, and thoſe made in the *Church* of *Rome*; unleſs it be ſufficient to ſay, that the *Pope* at *Rome* hath only power to *canonize Saints*, and not the *High-Prieſt* of *Siam*. And therefore *Campanella* very wiſely confeſſes *upon theſe Principles, the Heathens were no more guilty of Idolatry than themſelves, in caſe the Perſons they worſhipped had real Vertues:* and *he doth not blame the wiſer Gentiles, but the common People who forgot the true God, and worſhipped their Varelles or Images* with the *worſhip of Latria*; which the *Church of Rome* likewiſe gives to the *Croſs*: but of theſe things afterwards.

Schoutens *deſcript. of* Siam. p. 141.

Relation du voyage de Monſ. l'Eveque de Beryte, c. 13. p. 170.

Campanel. Atheiſm. triumph. c. 11. p. 155.

If from the *Indies*, the Model of this Diſcourſe would allow us to ſearch into the *Idolatries* of theſe *Northern Parts*, we ſhould find that the Nations which were the deepeſt ſunk into Idolatry, did yet retain a ſenſe of one *Supreme Deity*. Among whom we may juſtly reckon our *Saxon Anceſtors*; and yet from the *Gothick Antiquities*, which have been lately publiſhed, we have reaſon to believe, *that there was a Supreme God acknowledged among them too*. For in the *Edda* of *Snorro Sturleſon* which contains the *ancient Religion of the Goths*; the firſt *Queſtion* propoſed is, *who was the Supreme and the moſt ancient of the Gods?* To which the *Anſwer* is, *that the moſt Ancient of the Gods is called* Alfader, *the Father of all: and he had twelve Names*, which are there enumerated: And after it is ſaid of him, *that This God lives for ever, and governs all things, that he made the Heaven, and Earth, and Air, and all things in them*; and which is the greateſt of all, *he made Man, and gave him a Soul that ſhould live for ever, although the Body be deſtroyed; and that thoſe who were good ſhould be with him in a Place called* Gimle *or* Wingulf, *but thoſe that were bad to* Hela, *and from thence to* Niflheim. *Which* Niflheim, they add, *was made many Ages before the Earth*; and then they proceed to the Creation of things, which is there reported after a fabulous manner. It is true, this Tradition came to be corrupted among them, when the Attributes and Worſhip belonging to this *God* were given to that *Prince* who conducted the *Goths* from their former Seat about the *Palus Mæotis* into the *Northern Regions*, who was called *Odin*, or *Woden*; and ſo there came in ſuch a Confuſion in their *Idolatry*, as was among the *Greeks* between *Jupiter Olympius*, and *him* of *Creet*. But ſince they do mention this *Odin* as chief of the *Aſæ*, and tell the Circumſtances of his leading the People firſt to one Place, then to another, they cannot mean by him, the *ſame God* whom they aſſert to have been from Eternity, and to have created all things: But all this Confuſion did ariſe among them and other Nations, when vain and ambitious Men did take upon them the Names of the *Deity* on purpoſe, that they might have Worſhip given to them; and ſuch a one this *Odin* is deſcribed to have been by all the *Northern Hiſtorians*; and from hence likewiſe the Names of *Deified Men*, have been given to him whom they worſhipped for the *Supreme God*. Thus alſo *Thor* was the *Son* of *Odin*; yet in ſome of the *Northern parts*, they worſhipped the *Supreme Deity* under his Name, attributing the Power over all things, even the *inferiour Deities* to him. And accordingly he was worſhipped *with a Crown on his Head, a Scepter in his Hand, and twelve Stars about him*; as he is deſcribed by *Olaus Magnus* and others; and *Joh. Magnus* ſaith, that *Thor* was worſhipped in the *Golden Temple* at *Upſalia, tanquam potentiſſimus & ſummus omnium Deorum*; and to this Day among the moſt barbarous *Laplanders*, the *Supreme God* is worſhipped under the ſame repreſentation of *Thor*, (as we are informed by a late credible Writer) and to him they give beſides the Name of *Jumala*: Under him they worſhip a *Deity*, whom they call *Storjunkare*, or *Vice-Roy*, like the *Tartars Natagay*; under whoſe care they ſuppoſe all inferiour Creatures to Man to be, and therefore, they living much by Hunting, make many Supplications to him, and Worſhip him under the repreſentation of a rough hollow Stone, which as rude and barbarous as they are, they are far enough from thinking to be the *Deity* it ſelf, but only a *Symbol* to repreſent him. And the

Edda Iſlandorum edita a Reſenio Hauniæ. A. D. 1665.

Mytholog. 304.

Olai Magni hiſt. l. 3. *c.* 3.

Steph. Stephan. Comment. in Sax. Gr. l. 6.

Ola. Worm. Mon. Dan. l. 1. *c.* 4.

Alb. Crant. Vandal. l. 1.

Joh. Magn. hiſt. Goth. l. 1. *c* 8.

Scheffer. Lappon. c. 7. *p.* 61. *c.* 10.

Indolatrous Inhabitants of *Samogitia,* although they worſhip a *multitude* of *Gods* under ſeveral Names, and as having a particular care over ſome things, and a ſort of Serpents as *Miniſters of their Gods,* yet they confeſs a *Supreme God*: So *Laſicius* ſaith, *they have one Omnipotent God, but many* Zemopacii, *or Terreſtrial Gods*; which he there at large enumerates; and the ſame is acknowledged by *John Meletius,* who lived among them, and deſcribes their Idolatrous Cuſtoms in an Epiſtle to *Georg. Sabinus, A. D.* 1553. who ſaith, *that in the firſt place they invocate* Occopirnus, *the God of Heaven and Earth*; *and then the inferiour Deities who are ſet over the Sea, Air, Spring, Woods,* &c. Thus far I have clearly proved, that the acknowledged *Idolatry* of the preſent World doth not exclude a *Supreme God,* but either the *Idolaters* ſuppoſe him to be above their *Worſhip,* or think it not *unlawful* to *worſhip inferiour Deities* with the ſame *external Acts of Worſhip* which they perform to the *Supreme God.*

Joh. Laſicius de Samogit. p. 46.
Joh. Meletii ep. de Relig. Boruſſ.

§. 17. The laſt thing I ſhall prove the conſiſtency of Idolatry with giving Sovereign Worſhip to the Supreme God by, is, from the *Teſtimony* of thoſe *Fathers* who have charged ſuch *Chriſtians* with *Idolatry,* concerning whom there could be no Diſpute whether they *believed* and *worſhipped* a *Supreme God.*

Athan. c. Arian. orat. 1. *p.* 286. *ed. Par.*

Athanaſius frequently lays to the charge of the *Arians, that by giving Adoration to the Son of God, ſuppoſing him to be a Creature, they did bring in the Heathen Idolatry among Chriſtians*; κτίσμα λέγοντες εἶναι τὸν Θεοῦ λόγον, καὶ ὡς ἂν Ἕλληνες, λατρεύοντες τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα Θεόν, which Words are the more remarkable, *becauſe he accuſes them of doing the ſame thing, which St.* Paul *charges the* Gentiles *with*; which therefore doth not imply, *the paſſing by the worſhip of the Creator, but giving the ſame divine Worſhip to a Creature, which they do to the Supreme God.* The ſame words he repeats afterwards in the ſame *Oration,* and deſires the *Arians* to ſhew the *difference* between the *Greeks* and *them,* if they *believed Chriſt not to be the true God, but only by participation,* as the *Greeks ſuppoſed their Gods to be.* The force of this argument were wholly loſt, if either the *Greeks* ſuppoſed many *independent Deities,* or *Idolatry* were inconſiſtent with the *acknowledgement* of one *True God*; for the *Arians* might upon either of thoſe grounds have ſhewed the *diſparity* between them and the *Greeks.* Afterwards he ſaith expreſly, *they fell into the Polytheiſm of the Greeks*; from whence it unavoidably follows, that their *Polytheiſm* did not ſuppoſe ſeveral *Deities* of *neceſſary* and *eternal Exiſtence*; but one *Original* and *Supreme God,* and the others only made ſo *by participation* from him. If it be impoſſible for a Man who hath a right Opinion of Gods *incomparable Excellency* above the moſt noble Creatures, to attribute the Honour due to *God* alone, to that which he conceiveth to be a *mere Creature*; then the *Arians* were unjuſtly charged with *Idolatry*; for they were ſuppoſed to do that, which it ſeems is impoſſible to be done: For they aſſerted, *Chriſt to be a meer Creature,* and yet *Athanaſius* ſaith, *they were therein guilty of Idolatry,* although they believed *God* to be incomparably above his Creatures, in as much as all Creatures, and Chriſt himſelf had what he had *by participation* from him: And whatever Excellencies are attributed to a meer Creature, as to Power, or Wiſdom, or Goodneſs, ſuppoſing them to be derivative from a Superior Being, they do ſtill ſuppoſe an incomparable diſtance between the Creator

P. 296.
P. 297.

and the Creature. And it is farther obſervable in *Athanaſius*, that he doth not lay the force of his Argument in any diſtinction of the *degrees* of the *divine Worſhip*, but uſeth promiſcuouſly the Terms of *Latria* and *Dulia*, as to the *worſhip* given to a *Creature*; for where he ſpeaks afterwards of the *Arians* and *Gentiles* agreeing in giving *divine worſhip* to a *Creature*, he thus expreſſes it, τῇ κτίσει δουλεύοντες παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα τὰ πάντα Θεὸν, giving the worſhip of *Dulia* to a *Creature*, as well as to the *Creator*; not as though he looked on the *worſhip* of *Dulia* as diſtinct from *Latria*, but by uſing theſe Words promiſcuouſly he ſhews, that he underſtood by both of them that divine Worſhip which is alone proper to God, and which being given to a *Creature*, makes it *Idolatry*. He farther ſaith, *that ſuppoſing what Excellencies we pleaſe in Chriſt, although derived from God, yet if we withal ſuppoſe him to be a mere Man, if we give divine worſhip to him, we ſhall be found* ἀνθρωπολάτραι *worſhippers of Man*, *i. e.* ſuch kind of *Idolaters* as the *Heathen* were in the *worſhip* of *Deified Men*: From which nothing can be more evident, than that the ſuppoſing the moſt real *Excellencies* in a *Creature* to have been by *participation* from *God*, doth not take off from the guilt of *Idolatry*, when that worſhip is given to the *Creature*, which belongs only to *God*. St. *Athanaſius* farther argues, *that nothing but the divine Nature is capable of adoration*, and not any *created Excellency* how great ſoever it be. *For*, ſaith he, *if the height of Glory did deſerve Adoration, then every Inferiour Creature ought to worſhip the Superior*; *but it is no ſuch matter*, κτίσματι γὰρ κτίσμα οὐ προσκυνεῖ, *for one Creature is not to worſhip another, but a Servant his Lord, and the Creature God. From hence* Peter *forbad* Cornelius, *who would have worſhipped him*, *ſaying*, *For I alſo am a Man. And the Angel St.* John, ſaying, *See thou do it not*, *for I am alſo thy Fellow-Servant*; *worſhip God.* Whence he infers, not that the Angel complemented St. *John*, nor that St. *Peter* did it only to *ſhew his Humility*, but Θεοῦ δὲ μόνου τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι, *that it is proper only to God to be worſhipped*, without any diſtinction of the nature, kinds or degrees of worſhip. But how many diſtinctions would *T. G.* and his Brethren make before they would grant that propoſition? It is true, ſay they, of *Latria*, *ſovereign and abſolute worſhip*, *which is proper only to God*; but not *of an inferiour kind of divine worſhip*, which *may be given to a Creature* on the *account* of *divine Excellencies* communicated to it by God: This we may ſuppoſe was the *Anſwer* of the *Arians*; but St. *Athanaſius* was not certainly ſo weak a Man to argue at this rate, if he had ſuppoſed this a ſufficient Anſwer; for he could not but foreſee it; and a Man of ſo much Underſtanding, as it is evident he was, would have prevented this Anſwer if he had thought it to the purpoſe; but inſtead of that, he ſets himſelf to prove, *that the Angels*, *knowing themſelves to be Creatures*, *have on that account rejected all divine Worſhip*; *on the other ſide the Angels are commanded to worſhip Chriſt*, *and Chriſt did receive divine worſhip*; *therefore*, ſaith he, *let the* Arians *burſt themſelves*, *they can never make it appear*, *that Chriſt would have been worſhipped if he had been a Creature*. And to prevent all ſubterfuges in this matter, in his 4th *Oration*, he argues *againſt joyning Chriſt together with God in our Prayers to him*, *if he were a Creature*, οὐκ ἂν γοῦν δέξαιτό τις λαβεῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν Ἀγγέλων, ἢ παρά τινος τῶν ἄλλων κτισμάτων. *No Man would ever pray to receive any thing from God and Angels*; *or from God and any Creature.* Little did *Athanaſius* think of *Mens joyning God and the Saints*, *or God and*

Orat. 3. p. 385.

P. 387.

P. 394.

Orat. 4. p. 464.

the Bleſſed Virgin in their Prayers and Praiſes: Little did he imagine, that ever it would have been received in the Chriſtian Church, to conclude their Books with a *Doxology* to *God* and the *Bleſſed Virgin*, *Laus Deo & Beatæ Virgini*, as many of the greateſt Reputation in the Church of *Rome* have done: And as *Baronius* hath done it very ſolemnly at the end of every *Tome* of his *Annals*; as at the concluſion of the firſt, after the mention of the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*, he Baron. A. Tom 1. in Fine. adds, *Nec non & ſanctiſſimæ virgini Dei Genitrici Mariæ, ut conciliatrici Divini Numinis; ipſi namque ſicut hæc omnia noſtra accepta ferimus, ita pariter & offerimus; ut ipſa eadem qualiacunque ſint dilecto filio ſuo porrigat*, &c. And in the end of the ſecond he hath theſe Words, Tom. 2. A. 306. in Fin. *Et beneficii memor actura gratias (oratio) ex more ad ſanctiſſimæ Dei Genitricis Mariæ pedes pronа ſe ſternat; ut Cui accepta fert Omnia, dono offerat quicquid a Deo ſe ejus precibus intelligit conſecutam.* Is not this joyning *God* and the *Creature* together, which *Athanaſius* ſuppoſes no Chriſtian would ever do? But ſuppoſing he did it, he doth not at all ſuppoſe them to be excuſed from *Idolatry* in ſo doing. But Athan. or. 4. p. 468. *Athanaſius* goes on ſhewing, *that if the* Arians *confeſs Chriſt to be God, and to be of a diſtinct Subſtance from his Father, they muſt bring in* Polytheiſm, *or at leaſt worſhip two* Gods, *the one uncreated and unbegotten, the other created and begotten; and in ſo doing they muſt oppoſe one to the other. For*, ſaith he, ὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τοῦτον ἐν ἐκείνῳ διὰ τὸ ξένας καὶ διαφόρους εἶναι τάς τε φύσεις καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας, *we cannot ſee one in the other, becauſe of their different Natures and Operations.* Which is an argument I deſire *T. G.* to conſider the weight of. He is proving, that ſuppoſing Chriſt to be of a different Nature from God, although he had all imaginable Excellencies in him communicated from the *Father*, yet God could not be worſhipped in the worſhipping of the *Son*; but theſe two worſhips muſt be oppoſite to each other, becauſe the one is the worſhip of a *created*, the other of an *increated Being*. How far was *Athanaſius* then from ſuppoſing, that the worſhip given to any *created Being* on the account of *communicated Excellencies*, is at laſt *carried* to the *Supreme*, and terminated only upon him? *For*, he ſaith, *that theſe two worſhips do* καταγωνίζεσθαι *fight one againſt the other; and therefore whoever do give ſuch different worſhips, they muſt bring in more Gods than one, which is an Apoſtaſie from one God*: Where we ſtill obſerve, that *Polytheiſm* is conſiſtent as well as *Idolatry*, with the acknowledgment of one *Supreme Being*; and that they are ſaid to worſhip *other Gods*, who do believe *the true*, but give *divine worſhip* to a *Creature*. And therefore he would have *the* Arians *to reckon themſelves together with the* Gentiles; *and although they ſhun the reproach of the Name, yet they hold the ſame Opinion with them: And it is to no purpoſe for them to ſay that they do not worſhip* Two uncreated Beings, *for this is only to deceive the ſimple; for although they do not worſhip Two Uncreated, yet they worſhip Two Gods of a different Nature, the one created, the other un-* P. 469. *created.* For, ſaith he in theſe remarkable Words, *if the Heathens worſhipped one uncreated and many created; and they worſhip one uncreated, and one created, what difference is there between them and the* Gentiles? *for that one whom they worſhip is but as the many which the* Gentiles, *being of the ſame created Nature together with them: Therefore*, he ſaith, *they deny Chriſt and joyn with the* Gentiles, *giving the ſame worſhip to ſeveral Gods.* I do not think any propoſition in *Euclid* can be made more clear, than it is from theſe Expreſſions of *Athanaſius*, that he believed *Idolatry* to be conſiſtent with the belief and worſhip of *one God*. The ſame thing he urges in other Places, but if this be not proof enough, I know not what will be.

Epiſt. ad Adelph. p. 157, 158, 160, 161.

St. Gregory Nazianzen *parallels thoſe who worſhipped the Son or Holy Ghoſt, ſuppoſing them to be Creatures, with thoſe who worſhipped* Aſtaroth, *or* Chemoſh, *or* Remphan, *becauſe they were Creatures too: For whatever difference of Honour or Glory there be, all Creatures are our Fellow-Servants, and therefore not to be worſhipped by us.* Might not the *Arians* have charged *Gregory Nazianzen* to have imitated *Julian* the *Apoſtate* upon as *good reaſon* as *T. G.* doth me? For, however in Words they profeſſed to abhor the Worſhip of *Aſtaroth*, or *Chemoſh*, or *Remphan*, as much as he did; yet he did not regard their Profeſſions, but thought it reaſonable to judge by the *Nature* of their *Actions*. And what Profaneneſs would *T. G.* have accounted this, to parallel the *Worſhip* of the *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt* with that of *Chemoſh* and *Aſtaroth?* Yet we ſee *Gregory* doth not forbear making uſe of the *ſimilitude* of the *Worſhip*, although there was ſo great a *diſparity* in the *Objects*. *Gregory Nyſſen* ſaith, *that the Devil by the means of Arianiſm brought Idolatry again inſenſibly into the World, perſuading Men to return to the Worſhip of the Creature by his Sophiſtry, and that* Arius, Eunomius, Eudoxius *and* Aetius *were his Inſtruments in reſtoring Idolatry under a pretence of Chriſtianity.* In another place he hath this conſiderable Paſſage, *God commands by the Prophet, that we ſhould have no new God, nor Worſhip any ſtrange God; but that is a new God which was not for ever; and that is a ſtrange God which is different from our God. Who is our God? the true God; who is a ſtrange God? he that hath a different Nature from the true God. He that makes the Son a Creature, makes him of a different Nature. And they who make him a Creature, do they Worſhip him or no? If not, they joyn with the Jews, if they do Worſhip him,* εἰδωλολατρῦσι, *they commit Idolatry. Therefore we muſt believe him to be the true Son of the true Father, that we may Worſhip him, and doing ſo, that we be not condemned as worſhipping a ſtrange God.* To the ſame purpoſe he argues againſt *Eunomius*; *that it is the property of Idolaters to Worſhip the Creature, or any new or ſtrange God; and that they who divide the Father and the Son, muſt either wholly take away the Worſhip of the Son, or they muſt Worſhip an Idol* (the very word uſed by S. *Gregory*) *making a Creature and not God the Object of their Worſhip,* καὶ Χριςῦ ὄνομα τῷ εἰδώλῳ θέμενος, *placing the Name of Chriſt upon an Idol: that this was the fault of the Heathen Idolaters that they did* δουλεύειν τοῖς μὴ φύσει Θεοῖς, *Worſhip thoſe which were not Gods by Nature, and therefore could not Worſhip the true God:* Where it is Obſervable, that he uſes the Word δουλεύειν both for the *Worſhip* given to *Idols* by the *Heathens*, and for that which is *proper to God*: From which it is evident, that theſe *Fathers* knew of no ſuch *Diſtinction* of the *Nature* of *divine Worſhip*, as is underſtood of the *Roman Church* under the Terms of *Latria* and *Dulia*: For if they had, having to deal with ſubtile Adverſaries, they would not have failed to have explained themſelves in the matter; which had been abſolutely neceſſary to the force of their own Arguments, if any ſuch Diſtinction had been known or allowed in the Chriſtian Church. Again he ſaith, *that he that puts the Name of Son to a Creature* ἐν τοῖς εἰδωλολάτραις τετάξεται *muſt be reckoned among Idolaters; for they*, ſaith he, *called* Dagon, *and* Bel *and the* Dragon God: *but for all that they did not Worſhip of God*; and *therefore he ſtill urgeth againſt* Eunomius, *that either with the Jews he muſt deny the Worſhip*

Greg. Nazian. orat. 40. p. 669.

Greg. Nyſſen in laud. Baſil. Tom. 3. p. 484.

De Fide ad ſimpl. Tom. 3. p. 38.

Greg. Nyſſen. c. Eunom. orat. 2. p. 450.

P. 437. 453.

Orat. 4. p. 563.

P. 443. *Worſhip of Chriſt, or he muſt joyn with the Gentiles in the Worſhip of the Creature.*

S. Baſil homil 27. Sabel. & Ari. St. *Baſil* charges the *Arians* and *Eunomians* with bringing in the *Polytheiſm* and *Idolatry* of the *Greeks*; for *they who ſay, that the Son of God is a Creature, and yet worſhip him as God, do worſhip a Creature and not the Creator, and ſo introduce Gentiliſm again.* And againſt *Eunomius*, C. Eunom. l. 4. ὅτι οὐ κτίσμα ὁ υἱός. he urges the ſame *Places* and *Reaſons*, which I have already mentioned out of *Nyſſen*, viz. *that if Chriſt be not the eternal God, he muſt be a new and ſtrange God; and to worſhip that which by Nature is not God, is the fault* S. Paul *charges the Heathen idolaters with.*

Epiph. hereſ. 64. n. 8. *Epiphanius* proves, *that Chriſt's being a Creature, and having Divine Worſhip given him, are inconſiſtent according to the Scriptures:* And *that thoſe who worſhip a Creature, fall under St.* Paul's *reprehenſion of the Heathen Idolaters, who did call the creatures God: but true faith teaches us to worſhip the Creator, and not the Creature.* He thinks *this Rule* ſufficient againſt all the *Arts* and *Sophiſtry* of Men, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ κτιστὸν οὐ προσκυνητόν, *that no Creature ought to be worſhipped. For,* ſaith he, *upon the ſame reaſon we worſhip one, we may worſhip all together with their Creator,* μετὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς κτιστοῦ: Where we ſee he doth not ſpeak of ſuch *worſhip* as doth exclude the *Creator*, but of that which is ſuppoſed *to be joyned together with his*; not of a *Sovereign worſhip* to be given to them, but ſuch as doth ſuppoſe the diſtance between the *Creator* and his *Creatures*. Hereſ. 69. n. 31. *Upon this Principle*, he ſaith, *the* Arians *made the Son of God like to the Idols of the Heathens; for if he be not the true God, he is not to be worſhiped*; nay, he adds, that *thoſe who ſaid Chriſt was to be worſhiped although a Creature, did build up* Babylon *again, and ſet up the Image of* Nebuchadnezzar, *and by their Words, as by Muſical Inſtruments, draw* n. 36. *Men to the worſhip of an Image rather than of the true God. Is it credible,* ſaith he, *that God ſhould make a Creature to be worſhipped, when he hath forbidden Men to make any Likeneſs of things in Heaven or Earth, and to fall down and worſhip it? When the Apoſtle makes this the Idolatry of the Heathen that they worſhipped the Creature as well as the Creator: wherein they became Fools; for it is a fooliſh thing to attribute Divinity to a Creature, and to break the firſt Commandment of the Law,* Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve. *Therefore,* ſaith he, *the holy Church of God doth not worſhip any Creature, but the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, together with the Holy-Ghoſt.* To the very ſame purpoſe, he ſpeaks in his *Ancoratus*. Ancor. n. 50. *If the Son of God be a Creature, he is not to be worſhipped; for it is folly and wickedneſs to worſhip a Creature.* But theſe are not the only Perſons whom *Epiphanius* charges with ſuch *Idolatry* as is conſiſtent with the belief of one True God, for he charges thoſe with Hereſ. 78. n. 23. *Idolatry* who gave *Divine worſhip* to the *Bleſſed Virgin*; and ſaith, *that this was that very Idolatry which God condemned in the People of* Iſrael, ἔσονται γὰρ νεκροῖς λατρεύοντες *there ſhall be worſhippers of the Dead:* Which worſhip of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, was *offering up a Cake to her* (which ſurely is not ſo much as Mens offering up *themſelves* to be her *Slaves*, and offering up their *Devotions* and Services to her) yet this *Epiphanius* cries out Hereſ. 79. n. 4. upon *as rank Idolatry, and deſtructive to their Souls who did it, and the Device of the Devil; who always brought in Idolatry,* ſaith he, *under fair* 78. n. 23. 79. n. 5. *pretences. Which of all the Prophets ever ſuffered a Man to be worſhipped, not to ſpeak of a Woman? And although ſhe have never ſo great Excellencies, yet her Nature remains the ſame with others: But neither is* Elias *to be worſhipped, although ſtill alive; nor St.* John, *although he received extraordinary* *favour from Chriſt ; nor* Thecla, *nor any other of the Saints. For,* ſaith he, *the old Deceit ſhall not prevail over us, to leave the living God, and to worſhip the things that are made by him : For they, ſaith* St. Paul, *ſerved and worſhipped the Creature more than the Creator, and therein became Fools. But if it be not lawful to worſhip Angels, how much leſs to worſhip the Daughter of* Anna*? Of whom our Saviour ſaid on purpoſe* τί ἐμοὶ ϗ σοί ; *what have I to do with thee? Leſt any ſhould think more than was fitting of her, he calls her Woman, as foreſeeing the Schiſms and Hereſies that would come into the World on her account.* We are not to imagine that theſe People were ſo ſilly to take the *Bleſſed Virgin* for the *Great God,* nor that they did forſake the worſhip of *God* and *Chriſt* for that of the *B. Virgin*; but all that *Epiphanius* ſaith of them is, *that they brought her in* ἀντὶ Θεοῦ *in ſtead of a Deity, i. e. that they gave divine honour to her ; and whoſoever did give this to a Creature, they looked on them as guilty of forſaking the true God, however they might in words ſtill profeſs and acknowledge him*; *So he* charges thoſe with *Idolatry* who worſhipped *Jephtha's* Daughter, and *Thermutis* the Daughter of *Pharoah* ; but it were madneſs to think that either of theſe were eſteemed by their Worſhippers, *the Supreme Deity.* But *Epiphanius* fully explains himſelf, when he ſaith *that Idolatry comes into the World through an adulterous Inclination of the Mind, which cannot be contented with one God alone ; like an adulterous Woman that is not ſatisfied with the chaſt Embraces of one Husband, and wanders in her Luſt after many Lovers.* Therefore as Adultery is conſiſtent with the owning of one lawful Husband, ſo is Idolatry with the profeſſion of one true God. Therefore *Epiphanius* bids Men, *have a care of too great an admiration of the Saints, leſt it ſhould lead them into this dangerous Error ; that the ſafeſt way is to honour their Lord ; that thoſe are equally to blame who too much extol the Bleſſed Virgin, as thoſe who depreſs and viliſie her ; too great Praiſes being apt to become an occaſion of others falling* : and therefore he repeats it twice as the ſaying he would have all Chriſtians remember, ἡ Μαρία ἐν τιμῇ, ὁ Θεὸς προσκυνείσθω, *Honour the Virgin, but worſhip God,* and leſt any ſhould think *Worſhip* were a part of that *Honour* which was due to her, he ſaith expreſly, τὴν Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνείτω, *Let no Man worſhip the Bleſſed Virgin: for that belongs neither to the Woman, nor to her Husband, nor to Angels, but to God alone.* How punctually hath the *Church* of *Rome* followed the *Counſel* of *Epiphanius*? But of this at large hereafter.

n. 4.

78. *n.* 24.

79. *n.* 4.

78. *n.* 23.

79. *n.* 1.

78. *n.* 23.

79. *n.* 7.

St Cyril of *Alexandria* likewiſe makes thoſe guilty of *Heathen Idolatry,* of *worſhipping the Creature rather than the Creator,* who give *adoration* to *Chriſt,* ſuppoſing him to be a *Creature :* and he undertakes to demonſtrate out of Scripture, *that no Creature ought to be worſhipped as God ; and that nothing which doth give adoration to God, ought to receive it from others :* which he proves, from the *Examples* of *Peter* to *Cornelius,* the *Angels* to *St. John,* and *Manoe* ; and *that whatever excellency we ſuppoſe in Creatures, it doth not make them capable of divine Worſhip ; but although they have different Excellencies, yet one ſort is not to worſhip another, but all of them are to worſhip God alone, and his Son Chriſt Jeſus.* Again, *if Chriſt be not God, and we give him worſhip, we ſhall be found* κτίσματι παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα δουλεύοντες, *worſhipping the Creature rather than the Creator* ; (where we are to obſerve that *St. Cryil* applies δουλεύοντες to proper *divine worſhip.*) *Again, it is written, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve ; how then, if he be a Creature, can he be worſhipped by us?* And elſewhere

St. Cyril. Alex. Theſaur. aſſert. 15. *p.* 149.

Aſſert. 32. *p.* 307.

P. 314.

De Incarn. unigeniti p. 700.

elſewhere, *the Queſtion being propoſed, whether we may worſhip Chriſt as Man? he anſwers,* God *forbid*: *for,* ſaith he, *this would be vanity, errour and deceit; and we ſhould differ nothing from thoſe who worſhipped the* Creature *rather than the* Creator, *and be liable to the ſame charge* St. Paul *draws up againſt the Heathen Idolaters,* viz. *that they changed the Truth of* God *into a Lie,* &c. and at large there ſhews, *that this would be relapſing into the old Idolatry.* In his *Commentaries* on *St. John* he ſhews, *that although Chriſt had never ſo Divine Excellencies communicated to him, yet he was not a fit Object for our worſhip if he were not the true* God, *becauſe we are bound to ſerve and worſhip* God *alone: And that if he be not ſo, not only Mankind but the Angels will be guilty of Idolatry in giving him Adoration. In his Dialogues about the Trinity,* he ſaith, *it is one of the great bleſſings we have by Chriſt, to be delivered from the Worſhip of the Creature; but in caſe we return to that, the inſtitution of* Moſes *will be found better than that of Chriſtianity; for that did ſtrictly forbid all worſhip of Creatures, and called Men from them to the worſhip of God alone; that this was the repraoch of the* Gentiles, *that they worſhipped Creatures,* and *that the Chriſtians returned to* Gentiliſm, *if they worſhipped a Creature together with God;* τῇ κτίσει συναναπλέκοντες τὴν φύσει Θεὸν: and afterwards, he calls this *a falling from Chriſt*; all which doth fully diſcover *St. Cyril*'s judgement that *Idolatry* is conſiſtent with the *acknowledgment* and *worſhip* of one *Supreme God.*

Concil. Epheſ. Cyril. λόγ. προσφ. *Sect.* 31.
Comment. in Evang. Joh. l. 2. *p.* 217.
l. 10. *p.* 850.
Dialog. 4. *de Trinit. p.* 512.
P. 528. 529.
Dial. 5. *p.* 566.

Theodoret ſaith, *he that came to take away the worſhip of the Creature, would never ſet it up again: for this would be a moſt abſurd thing, to bring them back again,* τῇ τῶν ποιημάτων δουλείᾳ *to the worſhip of Creatures,* where he uſes *dulia* likewiſe for the *adoration* that is *due to the Son and Holy Ghoſt.*

Theodor. de hæret. fab. l. 5. *c.* 3. *v. Theod. in Exod. q.* 37. *in Rom.* 1. 24.

S. Chryſoſtom ſaith, *that the* Arians *and* Macedonians *making one Great God, and another leſs and created God, did bring in* Gentiliſm *again, For it is that which teacheth Men to worſhip a Creature, and to make one great God, and others inferiour. Such as theſe St* Paul *condemns, for giving worſhip to a Creature: And they are accurſed according to the Law of* Moſes: *Which ſaith, Curſed is every one who worſhips a Creature, or any thing that is made.*

St. Chryſoſt. Tom. 6. περὶ Τριάδος *p.* 955.

S. Ambroſe goes farther and ſaith, *S. Paul foreſaw that Chriſtians would be brought to the worſhip of Creatures, and therefore not only condemns the* Gentiles, *but warns the Chriſtians by ſaying, that* God *would damn thoſe who worſhip the Creature rather than the Creator. Either therefore let the* Arians *ceaſe to worſhip him whom they call a Creature; or ceaſe to call him a Creature whom they worſhip; leſt under the Name of worſhippers, they be found to commit the greater Sacrilege,*

S. Ambroſ. de Fide, l. 1. *c.* 7. *ad Grat. De Fide c. Arian. c.* 2. *De Incarn. Sacr. c.* 8.

St. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *that the* Arians *by giving worſhip to Chriſt as* God, *whom they believed to be a Creature, did make more Gods than one, and break the Law of* God *which did forbid the worſhip of more than one* God; *and ſet up Idols to themſelves, although they acknowledged one great* God, *and made the Son and Holy Ghoſt leſſer and inferiour* Gods.

S. Aug. c. Sermon. Arian. c. 29. *c. Max.* '. 1. . 3. *c.* 4. *Ep.* 66.

From this unanimous Conſent of the *Fathers* in charging the *Arians* with *Idolatry*, it moſt evidently follows, that according to them, *Idolatry* is conſiſtent with the *belief* and *worſhip of one Supreme God*; which is not the *only* conſiderable Advantage we gain by thoſe Teſtimonies, but from them it likewiſe appears, 1. That it is *Idolatry* to give *divine worſhip* to any *Creature*, how great ſoever the *Excellencies* of that *Creature* be; for none can be imagined greater, than thoſe which the *Arians* attributed to the *Son* of *God*. 2. That the *Fathers* looked on the *worſhip* of *Dulia* as *divine worſhip*; as appears by their applying that Term to the worſhip which was given to Chriſt. 3. That the Name of an *Idol* doth belong to the moſt *real* and *excellent Being*, when *divine worſhip* is given to it; for they give this Name to Chriſt himſelf, when he is worſhipped as a *Creature*. 4. That *relative Latria* is *Idolatry*, when given to any *Creature*. For this was all the *Arians* ſubterfuge, *that it could not be Idolatry to worſhip Chriſt as a Creature, becauſe they worſhipped him only as the Image of God, and relatively terminating their worſhip on God the Father through him*: Notwithſtanding which Anſwer of theirs, the *Fathers* with one conſent declare ſuch worſhip to be *Idolatry*; and that it would make way for the *worſhip* of any *Creature*, and was the *introducing of Heathen Idolatry* under a pretence of *Chriſtianity*. Theſe things which are here only obſerved in paſſage, will be of great *uſe* in the following *Diſcourſes*.

CHAP. II.

Of the Nature of Divine Worſhip.

§. 1. I Now come to the ſecond Enquiry, *Wherein the Nature of that divine worſhip lies, which being given to a Creature makes that worſhip Idolatry?* And that I may proceed with all poſſible clearneſs in this matter, I ſhall enquire, 1. What *Worſhip* is? 2. What *Divine Worſhip* is, and what are the proper *acts* of it? 3. How the applying of theſe *Acts* to a *Creature*, doth make the *worſhip* of it *Idolatry*?

1. What *Worſhip* is? *Aquinas* hath given this diſtinction between *Honour* and *Worſhip*; that Honour is *quædam recognitio excellentiæ alicujus, an acknowledgment of anothers excellency*, but *cultus* or *worſhip in quodam obſequio conſiſtit*, implies *ſubjection* to another. The foundation of this diſtinction doth not lie ſo much in the force and ſigfication of the Words, as in the different *effects* that *excellency* alone conſidered hath upon our Minds; from what it hath when it is joyned with *Superiority* and a *Power* over us. Meer *excellency* doth produce only in our Minds a due *eſteem* according to the nature and degrees of it; which is a *debitum morale*, as the Schoolmen ſpeak, from us towards it, *i. e.* ſomething which according to Nature and Reaſon we ought to give it, and therefore it is accounted a part of *natural juſtice*, to eſteem whatever excellencies we apprehend to be in others, although we receive no benefit by them ourſelves; and whatever implies a real excellency, whether it be intellectual or moral, whether infinite or finite, whether natural or acquired, it deſerves an eſtimation ſuitable to its kind and degree. But the *Honour* which is due to *Excellency* doth not only lie in an act of the Mind, but in a correſpondent inclination of the Will to teſtifie that eſteem by ſuch outward Expreſſions as may manifeſt it to others; and that either by *Words*, which is called *Praiſe*, or by *Geſtures*, as *bowings* of the Body; or by *Facts*, as *Gifts*, *Statues*, &c. all theſe *Aquinas* tells us

Aquin. 2. 2. q. 102. *art.* 2.

do belong to *Honour*. But *Worſhip* implies ſomething beyond this, which is *Subjection* to another, on the account of his *Power* over us; for we may expreſs *Honour* and *Eſteem* towards *Equals* or *Inferiours*, becauſe the reaſon of it may be in thoſe as well as others; therefore there muſt be a different Duty in us with reſpect to *Superiority*; and this is *Worſhip*. So the *Schoolmen* define *Adoration*; *adorare non dicimur, niſi in dignitate conſtitutos, quos nobis Superiores cognoſcimus*, ſaith *Vaſquez*. *Honor poteſt eſſe ad æqualem*, ſaith *Suarez*, *juxta illud ad Rom.* **12.** *honore invicem prævenientes*; *adoratio vero reſpicit alium ut excellentem & ſuperiorem. Ex parte adorantis plane neceſſarium eſt*, ſaith Tannerus, *ut is rem adorandum concipiat, tanquam aliquo modo ſe ſuperiorem ſeu præſtantiorem.* But more fully *Bernardus Pujol*, *adoratio eſt ſubmiſſio quædam & quaſi humiliatio, quam ſubditus facit propter excellentiam ſuperioris, & in honorem illius*: And *Gamachæus*, *Adoratio eſſentialiter includit ſubjectionem ac ſubmiſſionem aliquam. Adoratio eſt inferioris ad ſuperiorem*, ſaith *Tſambertus*: *Cardinal Lugo* goes farther, ſaying of *Cultus*, *ſe apud probatos auctores videre, ſemper eam vocem applicari ad ſignificandam reverentiam erga ſuperiores.* And although *Arriaga* thinks *Cultus* of a larger ſignification, yet the definition he gives of *Adoration* is, that it is *honor exhibitus ſuperiori in ſignum ſubmiſſionis & humiliationis. Bellarmine* makes the firſt act of *Adoration*, to be in the Mind, and that only the apprehenſion of the Excellency of the Object; but the ſecond in the Will, to be not only an inclination of it towards the Object, but a willing by ſome *internal* or *external act* to acknowledge the *Excellency* of the Object, and our *Subjection*: And to theſe he adds, the *external Act*, either of *bowing* the Head, or *bending* the Knee, or ſome other *token* of *Subjection*. So that *Bellarmine* agrees with the reſt in making the formal act of *Adoration* to be *Subjection to* a *Superior*: But withal, he makes the meer apprehenſion of *Excellency* to include the *formal Reaſon* of it; whereas meer Excellency without *Superiority* doth not require any *Subjection* but only *Eſtimation*. For let us apprehend never ſo great Excellency in a *Perſon* that hath no *Authority over us*, the only effect of it in us, is only a *mighty Eſtimation*; whereas the apprehenſion of *Power* and *Authority* in a *Perſon*, where there is not that Opinion of *Excellency* doth naturally incline Men to *Submiſſion* to him. Nay, although we apprehend a Conjunction of *Excellency* and *Power* together, if that Power doth not reſpect *us*, we find no inclination in our ſelves by any Acts to teſtifie our Subjection to it. As if we apprehend the greateſt things in the World of the *Emperor* of *China*, or *Japan*; how doth that apprehenſion move us to expreſs any acts of Subjection to either of them? We are well enough contented for all that to let them Govern at home, and think it more our own Intereſt and Duty to ſubmit to thoſe who have the Power over our *Selves*. Nay, yet farther, if according to the *Epicurean Hypotheſis*, we could ſuppoſe God himſelf to be a moſt excellent Being, but to exerciſe no *Power* or *Authority* over the World, there would be ſtill reaſon for a great Eſteem left, but not for the *Subjection* of our ſelves to him: And we might expreſs that Eſteem by *Praiſes*, and other *teſtimonies* of his *Honour*; but there would be no ground for any proper *Service* or *Worſhip* of him; either in Prayers or Thankſgivings, or any Rites of *Religious Worſhip* which imply any *dependence* upon him, or *Subjection* to him. So that the Notion of *Honour* and

q. 103. art. 1.

Vaſquez in 3 *part. Tho. diſp.* 93. *c.* 1.

Suarez. in 3. *part. diſp.* 51. *q.* 25. *ſect.* 1.

Tanner. Theolog. Schol ſt. Diſp. 5. de Rel. *q.* 2. *dub.* 1. *n.* 27.

Pujol. de *ſacro adorat. cultu diſp* 1. *ſect.* 1.

Gamachæ. *Comment. in* 3. *p. Th. q.* 25. *de* Adorat.

Tſambert. in 3. *part. Thom. ad q.* 25.

Lugo de myſterio Incarn. diſp. 33. *n.* 2.

Arriaga in 3. *Th. diſp.* 50. *ſect.* 1.

Bellarm. de *ſanct. beatit. l.* 1. *c.* 12.

Worſhip are in themſelves diſtinct things, the one ariſing from the apprehenſion of *Excellency*, and the formal Reaſon of the other, being *Superiority* and a *Power* over us.

§. 2. 2. For the *Nature* of *Divine Worſhip*; it muſt conſiſt *in ſuch a Subjection of our ſelves to God, as is moſt ſuitable to the apprehenſions we ought to have of his infinite Power and Sovereignty over us.* And becauſe his *Sovereignty* is *ſupreme, abſolute* and *peculiar* to himſelf; therefore our Worſhip of him muſt approach as near to the Expreſſion of this, as it is poſſible for us to come, *i. e.* it muſt be of the higheſt Nature, with the greateſt ſubmiſſion of our Souls to him; it muſt be entire, not divided between him and others, and it muſt have ſuch a *peculiarity* in it, as may not be given to any beſides himſelf. For whatever *Worſhip* is common to him and others, doth not ſerve to expreſs the Senſe of our Minds as to his *peculiar Sovereignty* over us; and this is one of the inviolable *Rights* of *Sovereignty*, to have ſuch acts of *Worſhip* appropriated to it, that the giving of theſe to any other, is a violation of the *Royal Dignity:* And this hath been looked on as a *Crimen Læſæ Majeſtatis*, and to deſerve as high a puniſhment as any other whatſoever; becauſe it is an immediate attempt upon the *Sovereign Power*, and whatever leſſens it tends to overthrow it. If then God be acknowledged by all to have the *only Supreme Power* over us, nothing can be more unreaſonable in it ſelf, nor a greater Affront to his Majeſty, than to make all outward Expreſſions of our Duty to him, common to himſelf and his Creatures.

I know it is not denied by *T. G.* or his Brethren, *that there is a Sovereign Worſhip belongs to God:* But we are to conſider, that withal they tell us, (1.) *That the external acts of Adoration or Worſhip are equivocal, and ſometimes may ſignifie the Honour which belongs to God, and ſometimes that which belongs to the Creature.* (2.) *That even Sacrifice it ſelf, which they look on as moſt peculiar to God, and an acknowledgment of the abſolute Worſhip due to him, doth receive the formality of ſuch an act from an intention to profeſs a total ſubmiſſion of our ſelves to God as the Supreme Author of Life and Death; otherwiſe* T. G. ſaith, *the material action of Sacrifice may be done for ſeveral ends and intentions.* By which it appears that upon the whole matter, the *Nature* of *divine Worſhip* is not, according to them, to be taken from any *external acts*, but from the *inward intention* of the Mind.

T. G. p. 178.
p. 288.
T.G.p.182.

But that there are ſome *peculiar external acts* of *divine Worſhip* which ought to be attributed to none but to God himſelf; I prove, 1. From the *nature and deſign of religious Worſhip*. 2. From *the Law of God appropriating ſome acts only to God.* 3. *From the practiſe of the Chriſtian Church, condemning thoſe for Idolatry, who have given them to any Creature.*

1. From *the nature and deſign of Religious Worſhip*, which is to put a difference between the *Worſhip* we give to *God* and to his *Creatures*. For ſince *God* hath appointed *Government* among Men, it is plain that his intention was, that ſome kind of Worſhip ſhould be given from ſome of his Creatures to others, although of the ſame Nature with themſelves; for where there is a power to Puniſh and to Reward, there is the foundation of *Worſhip* in thoſe who are under that Power; which *Worſhip* lies in expreſſing a due regard to that

Power, by a care not to provoke it, and an endeavour to obtain the favour of it; which being among Mankind living in *Society* with each other, is therefore called *Civil Worſhip.* Which Denomination it doth not loſe, although we give that worſhip to *Superiors* upon a *Religious Account*, *i. e.* though I give worſhip to my Sovereign with a reſpect *to God*, becauſe he hath commanded it, and I intend to Honour him by it; yet the Worſhip doth not take its Denomination from my Intention, but from the Nature of the Act, which being Civil, the Worſhip continues to bear that Name. By which we ſee that the *external Circumſtances* which do accompany Mens Acts, are thoſe which do ſo circumſcribe and limit them, that from thence they become either *Civil* or *Religious.* I cannot therefore but extremely wonder, to ſee Men of Underſtanding ſo much to ſeek in this matter, *becauſe the ſame external acts are common to divine and civil Worſhip*; but what then? Doth it therefore follow, that there is no certain way to diſcriminate theſe one from the other? I grant the ſame *external act* of *Adoration* may be uſed to Men which is uſed to God; as *Abraham* bowed to the *Children* of *Heth* in token of *civil Reſpect*, as well as when he worſhipped *God*; but could not any one that conſidered the *Circumſtances*, make a plain difference between theſe two ſorts of *Adoration?* When the *Roman Emperors* would have *divine Honours* given to them, were any of the People of *Rome* ſo ſenſeleſs to ſay, they knew no difference between them and the *Worſhip* given them before, becauſe they might uſe the ſame *external acts of Adoration* in both Caſes? Suppoſe the Pope one Day to ſit on a Throne as a Temporal Prince, and on that account ſummoning his Subjects to give *homage* to him, and another Day to be placed upon the *Altar*, as he is after his Election, by the Orders of the *Roman Church*, there to receive *Adoration* from the *Cardinals*, as the *Vicar* of *Chriſt*; would any Man ſay he could ſee no difference in theſe, becauſe the ſame Poſtures may be uſed in both? Although then the *outward acts* may be the ſame, yet the *ſignification* of thoſe *acts* may be far from *equivocal*, becauſe determined by the *Circumſtances* which do accompany them. I grant then, that the meer external act of Adoration in bowing or kneeling, may be given both on the account of *Honour* and *Worſhip*, *i. e.* upon the account of Excellency and Superiority; as ſome of the *Patriarchs* bowed to *Angels*, as a token of *Honour* of their Excellencies, and not out of *Religious Worſhip*; and Men may bow and kneel to their Sovereign Princes on the account of *Civil Worſhip*; and Children to their Parents in token of their ſubjection to them; as well as *Creatures* to their *Creator* in their ſolemn Acts of *Devotion*: But I ſay in all theſe Caſes, the different ſignification of theſe acts is to be gathered from the *Circumſtances* of them.

Ceremon. Rom. l. 1. ſect. 6.

§. 3. And that acts of *Religious* and *Civil Worſhip* might be diſtinguiſhed from each other, came the appointment of ſet *Times* and *Places*, and *ſolemn Rites* for the performance of *Religious Worſhip.* From hence *Cicero* gives that definition of *Religion*, *Religio eſt, quæ ſuperioris cujuſdam naturæ (quam divinam vocant) curam ceremoniamque affert:* Therefore they thought the ſolemn *Rites* and *Circumſtances* of *Religious Worſhip* were ſufficient to diſcriminate the *Nature* of that Worſhip from any other; and theſe they thought ſo peculiar to the *divine Nature*, that whatever Being they gave this ſolemn Worſhip to, they thought to deſerve the Name of a *Deity*, although inferiour

De Invent. l. 2. c. 53.

and ſubordinate; becauſe theſe acts of Worſhip were appropriated to a *Divine Being*. *Aquinas* cannot deny *that there are ſome external acts of Religion ſo peculiar to God, that they ought not to be given to any other; and on this account he makes Religion a Moral Vertue, and a part of Juſtice*, *becauſe it is its Office* reddere cultum debitum Deo, *to give God the Worship which belongs to him*; *now*, ſaith he, *becauſe the Excellency of God is peculiar to himſelf, being infinitely above all others, therefore the Worship which belongs to him ought to be peculiar. Ad Religionem pertinet*, ſaith *Cajetan*, *exhibere reverentiam uni Deo, ſecundum unam rationem, in quantum ſc. eſt primum principium creationis & gubernationis rerum*. But ſince this *reaſon* of *Religious Worſhip*, from the *Creation and Government* of the *World*, is ſo *peculiar* to God, as to be *incommunicable* to any elſe beſides him, is there not all the reaſon in the World that the Acts of this Worſhip ſhould be peculiar to him too? And upon this ground *Aquinas* doth grant it in the Caſe of Sacrifice; *Hoc etiam videmus in omni Republica obſervari, quod ſummum Rectorem aliquo ſigno ſingulari honorant, quod cuicunque alteri deferretur eſſet crimen læſæ Majeſtatis; & ideo in lege divina ſtatuitur pœna mortis iis qui divinum honorem aliis exhibent.* From whence we infer, not only that there ought to be peculiar *external Acts* of *Religious Worſhip* appropriated to God, but that the giving the Worſhip done by thoſe Acts to any Creature, is a Crime of the higheſt Nature. The ſame *Aquinas*, diſputing againſt the *Heathens*, ſaith, *that it is an unreaſonable thing, to thoſe that hold one firſt Principle, to give divine Worſhip to any other beſides him; and we give worſhip to God, not that he needs it; but that hereby the belief of one God may be confirmed in us by external and ſenſible Acts, which cannot be done*, ſaith he, *unleſs there be ſome peculiar Acts of his Worſhip, and this we call divine Worſhip*. Beſides, *this external Worſhip is neceſſary to Men, to raiſe in their Minds a ſpiritual Reverence of God; and we find that Cuſtom hath a great Influence on Mens Minds; but it is a cuſtom among Men, that the Honour or Worſhip given to the Supreme Governour ſhould be given to none elſe; therefore it ought to be much more ſo towards* God; *becauſe if a liberty be allowed of giving this Worſhip to others of a higher rank and not only to the Supreme, then Men and Angels might give divine Worſhip to one another.* To which he adds, *that the benefits we receive from God are peculiar to him, as that of Creation and Preſervation, and that he is our Lord by a proper Title; and Angels and the beſt of Creatures are but his Servants, therefore we ought not to give the ſame Worſhip to them that we do to God as our Lord.* In his *Diſputation* about *Idolatry*, he ſhews, *that the Command* Exod. 20, *doth reach to external as well as internal Worſhip*; and he argues againſt thoſe, *who pleaded that all viſible and external Worſhip ought to be given to other Gods, and only internal to the ſupreme God; as being much better*, upon this Principle, *that the external belongs only to him, to whom the internal belongs*; and he diſputes againſt thoſe *Hereticks*, who *thought it lawful in time of Perſecution to give external Worſhip to Idols, as long as they preſerved the true Faith in their Minds; for*, ſaith he, *the external Worſhip is a Profeſſion or Sign of the internal, but as it is a pernicious thing for a Man to ſpeak contrary to his Mind; ſo it is to act contrary to it: and therefore S.* Auguſtin *condemned* Seneca *as ſo much the more culpable in the worſhip of Idols, becauſe he acted againſt the Senſe of his own Mind.* In the next *Article*, he ſhews,

Aq. 2. 2. q. 81. art. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Cajet. Comment. in Aq. 2. 2. q. 81. *art.* 3.

Aq. 2. 2. q. 85. *art.* 2.

Aqu. c. Gentes c. 120.

Aq. 2. 2. q. 94. *art.* 2.

art. 3.

that Idolatry is a Sin of the higheſt Nature; *for*, ſaith he, *as in a Common-wealth, it is the greateſt Crime to give the Honour due to the Sovereign to any other (for this is as much as lies in a Man to put all things into Diſorder and Confuſion) ſo among the Sins that are committed againſt God, that ſeems to be the greateſt, whereby a Man gives divine Worſhip to a Creature*: And ſaith, *that it includes Blaſphemy in it, becauſe it takes away from God the peculiarity of his Dominion*; *Cajetan* there ſaith, *that the Idolater, as much as in him lies, tollit à Deo ſuam ſingularem excellentiam qua ſolus eſt Deus*; *robs God of that peculiar Excellency whereby he is God alone.* Thus we ſee the neceſſity of ſome peculiar *external Acts of divine Worſhip* is aſſerted by theſe Men, in order to the preſerving the Belief and Worſhip of one *God* in the World. *Suarez* grants, *that as the Excellency of* God *is ſingular and above all Creatures; ſo he ought to have a ſingular and incommunicable Worſhip, as is plain from thoſe Words of Scripture, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*: But then he makes this *Worſhip peculiar* to God, to conſiſt *chiefly in the internal acts of the Mind, which only in themſelves, and of their own Nature, are ſuch as do belong to the worſhip of* God; *but external acts are not ſo determined of themſelves, but they may be given either to* God *or to the Creature*: However, he grants, that *although outward acts be in themſelves indifferent, yet when ſufficient Authority hath appropriated ſome acts as peculiar to divine Worſhip, they ought to be uſed for no other purpoſe; and that if theſe acts of Worſhip be applied to a Creature, it makes that Worſhip at leaſt external* Idolatry, *if it be not done* ex animo *and out of a falſe Opinion.*

Suarez in 3. p. q. 25. diſp. 51. ſect. 4.

§. 4. In this point of the *external acts* of *divine worſhip*, theſe two things may be obſerved of the *Divines* of the *Roman Church*.

1. That in the *general* they confeſs, that there ought to be ſome *peculiar external acts of divine worſhip*, as moſt agreeable to God's incommunicable Excellency; and in particular, when they are preſſed with any difficulties from *Scripture* or *Fathers*, about not giving *divine worſhip to a Creature*, then they are ſure to tell us, thoſe Places are to be underſtood *of the worſhip that is proper only to God.* Thus they think to eſcape the force of that Place which is ſo evident, that it blinds them with the Light of it; *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*; which was certainly underſtood of an *external act* of *worſhip*; for the Devil ſaid to Chriſt, *Fall down and worſhip me.* Yes, ſay they, *that is very true of the Adoration proper to* God; but what is that? For they ſay there is no outward act of Adoration but is common to God and his Creatures. *Tannerus* excepts *no Creature*, *inanimate or animate*, *but only the Devil*; yet leſt he ſhould have gone too far in this, he ſaith afterwards, *that Phyſically ſpeaking, God may be worſhipped in any Creature, but then Men muſt have a care that they do not truly and properly worſhip the thing it ſelf; but only uſe the external ſigns of divine Honour before it, applying them to what is repreſented.* I confeſs this gives a very ſlender account of our Saviour's Anſwer, for it ſeems he might *phyſically ſpeaking*, have worſhipped God, by *falling down before the Devil*; all the danger was in the *ſcandal* and *indecency* of it: But being done in a *Wilderneſs*, the *Scandal* of it, as to Men at leaſt, had not been great. *Vaſquez* reſolves the Caſe, *that if the Devil appear to a Man, he may do all the external acts of Adoration before him, provided he be not well aſſured it is the Devil, and that he direct his worſhip to God*: And that he proves by

Mat. 4. 10.

Tanner. To. 3. diſp. 5. de Rel. q. 2. dub. 1. n. 19.

Vaſquez in 3. p. Thom. diſp. 110 c. 5.

by this demonſtrative Argument, *becauſe all external acts of Adoration are to be directed by the inward intention of the Mind*; but he confeſſes *many of their Divines allow only a conditional Adoration in this caſe*; however, it ſeems our Saviour ſpake a little too peremptorily, in utterly refuſing it upon any term. But then they tell us, the Devil was too ſaucy, and demanded the *abſolute Worſhip proper only to God*, *i. e.* ſaith *Vaſquez*, *not meerly the external act of Adoration, but that inward ſubmiſſion of Mind which is only due to God*, which is more than appears by the Words. *Bellarmine* and the reſt of them ſay, that *our Saviour refuſed to give the Worſhip of* Latria *to the Devil*; by which it ſeems, our Saviour did not Anſwer to the purpoſe, for the Devil expreſſed no more, than *falling down and worſhipping him*; which according to them might be done without *Latria*, by the *ſame external act*, but not the ſame *intention of Mind*: Which not being in the power of him that demands, but only of him that gives, nothing had been more neceſſary than to have expreſly required the *intention of the Mind*, otherwiſe the Devil might have been eaſily cheated by directing *the intention of the external act* quite another way; but for all that we can ſee, the Devil was then to learn theſe Subtilties. However, this now ſerves to turn off the plaineſt Places that would ſeem to prove, that *all external acts of Religious Worſhip are to be given only to God. The Hereticks*, ſaith *Ariaga*, *object many things out of Scriptures, and Fathers, and Councils, in which it is ſaid, that God only is to be worſhipped; but to all theſe we anſwer in one Word, that they only ſpeak of the Worſhip of* Latria, *which is proper to God*: And ſo they would have anſwered thouſands of Places more, as well as thoſe that are urged againſt them; ſo that the reſerving this *Worſhip* as *peculiar to God*, ſerves them to very good purpoſe, *viz.* to turn off as with a wet Finger whatſoever is urged againſt them. So *Bernardus Pujol* without more ado ſends away all the *Teſtimonies of the Fathers*, *Ad loca ſanctorum Patrum reſpondemus, illa intelligenda eſſe de adoratione Latriæ quæ ſoli Deo tribuitur*; and ſo fare them well, without any farther Examination. And yet ſome of theſe Men upon better Thoughts have concluded, that ſome of the Places of Scripture cannot be underſtood of the Worſhip of *Latria*. For although *Aquinas*, *Tannerus* and ſeveral others, anſwer the Inſtance of *Mordecai* refuſing to Worſhip *Aman*, with the common ſhift, *that he would not give* Latria *to him*, yet *Cajetan*, *Suarez*, *Vaſquez*, *Pujol* and *Arriaga*, all conclude, *that this is not to be underſtood of the Worſhip of* Latria; *but that* Mordecai *refuſed to uſe the ſame external act of Adoration, which among the Jews they were wont to give to God*: Wherein *Cajetan* thinks, *he was not ſo wiſe as he might have been, becauſe* Jacob *worſhipped his Brother* Eſau; *Arriaga*, *that he did well, though he followed an erring Conſcience*: *Suarez*, *Vaſquez and Pujol*, *that he did prudently, becauſe the conſtant uſing of that act of Adoration to* Aman, *which among them did belong to the Worſhip of God, would have tended to the diſhonour of God and Religion, and have been a great ſcandal to the Jews*. Neither is *Cajetan* ſatisfy'd with the ſame Anſwer to the Inſtance of St. *John*'s offering to Worſhip the *Angel*, *for this were*, ſaith he, *to charge St.* John *with committing a very great Sin, which the Angel hindred him from the conſummation of*: *But*, ſaith he, *St.* John *intended no more than the greateſt external act of Reverence*; *but becauſe ſo great Reverence ought to be reſerved only to God, that ſome outward Reverence might* be

Diſp. 94. c. 1.

Bellarm. de ſanct. beatit. l. 1. c. 14.

Arriag. in 3. p. Thom. diſp. 54. ſect. 1. n. 5.

Pujol de cultu Adorat. diſp. 2. ſect. 3. in fin.

Aq. 2. 2. q. 84. art 1.

Tanner. ubi ſupra.

Cajet. in Aq.

Suarez in 3. p. diſp. 52. ſect. 3.

Vaſquez in diſp. 97. c. 3.

Pujol ib.

be appropriated to him, therefore the Angel forbad him giving it to him. Suarez confeſſes, *that it cannot be underſtood of* Latria, *but that the Angel put it off with a Complement, as St.* Peter *did to* Cornelius; and with him the reſt agree, either *as a Complement to his Perſon*, or *to human Nature ſince the Incarnation*: But *Aquinas* pertinently ſaith, *it was to avoid the occaſion of Idolatry, becauſe the Angel immediately adds, Worſhip God.* Thus far we find they go in the avoiding of Difficulties.

2. But when they deliver their Minds freely, they reſerve no one act of *external Adoration* as *proper to God, and to be performed by all Chriſtians. Bellarmine* ſaith, that *fere omnes actus exteriores communes ſunt omni adorationi, almoſt all external acts are common to the adoration of God and the Creatures, excepting Sacrifice, and what belongs to that, as Temples, Altars and Prieſts*, which, he ſaith, *God hath reſerved to himſelf. Arriaga* ſaith, “That there is no external acts of Adoration but may be given to Creatures, excepting only Sacrifice; *Suarez*, that Sacrifice it ſelf doth not ſignifie our Acknowledgment of God's Sovereignty of it ſelf, but only by Cuſtom and Impoſition; for the killing of a Sacrifice doth not of it ſelf ſignifie, that God is the Author of Life and Death. And for other parts of *Religious Worſhip*, he confeſſes, that Temples are erected, and Feſtivals kept to the Honour of Saints, at leaſt ſecondarily; that they are worſhipped with Faſtings, Vigils, Pilgrimages, and ſuch like; that their Worſhip is deſervedly called Religious Worſhip. 1. Becauſe it conſiſts of Religious Actions. 2. Becauſe it is ſo nearly conjoyned with Divine Worſhip. 3. Becauſe it tends to Mens Improvement in Religion. 4. Becauſe it is founded in Sanctity, which is next to Religion. It ſeems then nothing is left to God, but having the ſame things done to him in the firſt Place, which may in a ſecondary reſpect be done to his Creatures; for we are told, *that even Sacrifice it ſelf may be offered to God for the Honour of his Creatures.* But what is this *Sacrifice* now among Chriſtians, which is peculiar to God? *There is no other*, ſaith *Arriaga*, *but that of the Altar*; *and this*, as *Cajetan* obſerves, *cannot reach to all Chriſtians, but only belongs to the Prieſts to offer it*: But inſtead of this, he ſaith from *Aquinas*, *that two ſorts of Spiritual Sacrifices do belong to all*, viz. *the offering up of their Minds in devotion to God, and the offering up the acts of other Vertues.* So that at laſt we ſee no *one external act of proper Religious Worſhip* is by them left *as peculiar to God*, which all Mankind are obliged to perform.

De ſanct. beat. l. 1. *c.* 12.

Arriag. ad 3. *p. diſp.* 51. *ſect.* 6. *in fine.* *Suarez. i* 3. *p. quæſt.* 51. *ſect.* 4. *quæſt.* 52. *ſect.* 3.

T. G. p. 393.

Diſput. 52. *ſect.* 2. *Cajet. in* 2. 2. *q.* 86. *art.* 4.

And to this purpoſe we have the plain Reſolution of Cardinal *Lugo*, which I the rather mention, becauſe of his great Authority, and Eminency, and Writing ſince the reſt: He puts the Queſtion, Whether there be any ſign or external act of Adoration, which it is not lawful to give to any, but to God alone? *For*, ſaith he, *genuflection, and ſmiting the Breaſt, and ſuch like, are given to Saints.* To this he anſwers, “1. That it is poſſible ſuch a ſign or external act may be inſtituted by Men, as may ſignifie only that Worſhip which is proper to God. 2. That Sacrifice is not properly an act of Adoration, but of another kind diſtinct from it. 3. That there is no one external act of Adoration, which is proper to *Latria*, or the worſhip peculiar to God.

Lugo de Myſt. Incarn. diſp. 33. *ſect.* 1. *n.* 22, *&c.*

§. 5. But to what end was there any ſuch thing as *Publick Religious Worſhip* among Men, on the account of *Gods peculiar Sovereignty* over us, if the *acts* of that Worſhip be not *appropriated* to himſelf? For there is no neceſſity of *Publick Worſhip* for the acts of the *Mind*, which are performed out of the view of others. What is *Publick* muſt be *External*; and if there be any neceſſity that God be publickly owned and worſhipped by us, as *our only Lord and Almighty Maker of Heaven and Earth*; the very ſame natural Reaſon which directs to this, doth likewiſe ſhew, that what is intended for his Publick Worſhip, ought to be communicated to none elſe beſides him. Neither is it enough, *that he have the firſt and chief Place in Worſhip*, which only implies a *ſuperiority* of *Order* and *Degree*; but ſince he is acknowledged to be infinitely above all Creatures, and to be the *ſole Creator and Governor of the World*, the acts of *Worſhip* to him as ſuch, ought to be peculiar, and appropriated wholly to himſelf: For if other *Beings* come to have a ſhare, although *ſecondarily*, with him in the acts of Worſhip, they ought to have a ſhare with him in the proper reaſon of that Worſhip, *i. e.* in the *Creation* and *Government* of the World. But if *Creation* and *Providence* be the *Foundations* of *divine Worſhip*, and thoſe do ſuppoſe *infinite* and *incommunicable Perfections*, on what pretence of Reaſon can Beings infinitely diſtant from God, come to have a ſhare in the Acts of *Religious Worſhip*, which were purpoſely deſigned for the acknowledgment of ſuch a *Being*, whom the moſt *excellent Creatures* are bound to *adore* as well as we? Is not this joyning *Subjects* together with their *Sovereign* in the higheſt Expreſſions of our Duty to him? What Prince in the World could bear ſuch an Affront from an *Ambaſſador* of a *Foreign Prince*, as that in a publick *Audience*, when he is introduced on purpoſe to expreſs the *Honour* that is to be given to the *Perſon* of the *King*, he ſhould uſe all the ſame Expreſſions of it to his *Servants* and *Subjects* which ſtand about him, that he doth to himſelf? Would this be a juſt excuſe, *that theſe were done to him in the firſt Place, and only ſecondarily to his Servants*? And if this would not be born by one Prince from the Subject of another, how much leſs from his own? And if Princes will not bear this from their Subjects, who are of the ſame Nature with themſelves; how can Men be ſo vain as to imagine the great *God* will bear it from his Creatures, to have no Publick Religious Act of Worſhip given to himſelf, but what is given to thoſe who are confeſſed to be infinitely diſtant from him? It is not the ſuppoſition of *Excellency* in them will ever juſtifie this: For let their *Excellency* be never ſo great, it is ſtill but a *created Excellency*: And their *Excellency* can never make them ſo much *above us*, as their being *created* makes them *inferiour* to *God*; and in acts of *Religious Worſhip*, we ought not ſo much to conſider our diſtance from them, as their diſtance from *God*. Let them be never ſo much *above us*, they are *Creatures* ſtill, and that ſets them at an *infinite Diſtance* from him, whereas all their *Excellencies* can make them but *finitely Diſtant* from us. Let them be never ſo *Excellent*, they ſtill worſhip the ſame *God* that we do, and with the moſt profound *Adoration* of Him; and if their *Excellency* be conſiſtent with their Worſhip of a *Being infinitely* above them, it is not ſufficient to make them an Object of *Adoration* to us. We are willing to give them the utmoſt, their *Excellency* requires from us (provided, we be well aſſured of it) and that is, a mighty eſteem of them, and a readineſs to expreſs our Honour in celebrating their Praiſes, and commending them as Heroick Patterns of Goodneſs, and (ſuppoſing them actually preſent with us) the expreſſing our eſteem in the higheſt tokens of reſpect that are uſed among Men: Thus far we go; and if thoſe Beings are ſuch, as we ſuppoſe them, they would not have us to go farther; but (as the *Angel* ſaid to St. *John*) they would bid us, *Worſhip God.* But we dare not uſe the ſame ſolemn *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip* in *Places* and at *Times* ſet apart for the Service of the *Great God*, to any of his *Creatures* how excellent ſoever they be; for this is an encroachment upon the *Divine Majeſty*, and as *Cajetan* expreſſes it, *A taking away from him, as much as in us lies, that peculiar Excellency whereby he is God over all, Bleſſed for evermore.* We dare not apply thoſe things to the Worſhip of his Creatures, which God hath ever appropriated to his own Worſhip as the proper acts of it; ſuch as *Sacrifice, Incenſe*, &c. we dare not give that *Honour* to his Servants, which *God* hath forbidden to be given to any Creature, ſuch as *Incurvation* to *Images, Invocation of Perſons*, &c. we dare not expreſs our *Adoration* of any created Being in ſuch a way as doth ſuppoſe thoſe *Perfections* which can be only in an uncreated Being, as *knowing the deſires of our Hearts, help in Trouble, pardon of Sin, ſtrength in Grace*, and *receiving to Glory*; we dare not make the outward acts of *Religious Worſhip* common to *God* and his *Creatures*, which was intended for a publick manifeſtation of the peculiar Service we owe to the *Creator* and *Governor* of the World.

And herein thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* fall ſhort of the *Heathens* themſelves, who had ſo great an apprehenſion of the neceſſity of ſome *appropriate acts* of *Divine Worſhip*, that ſome of them have choſen to die, rather than to give them to what they did not believe to be
Arrian. de exped. Alex. l. 4. Curt. l. 8. *God.* We have a remarkable Story to this purpoſe in *Arrian* and *Curtius* concerning *Calliſthenes. Alexander* arriving at that Degree of Vanity, as to deſire to have *Divine Worſhip* given him, and the Matter being ſtarted out of deſign among the *Courtiers*, either by *Anaxarchus*, as *Arrian*, or *Cleo* the *Sicilian*, as *Curtius* ſaith; and the way of doing it propoſed, *viz. by Incenſe and Proſtration*; *Calliſthenes* vehemently oppoſed it, *as that which would confound the difference of Human and Divine Worſhip, which had been preſerved inviolable among them. The Worſhip of the Gods had been kept up in Temples, with Altars, and Images, and Sacrifices, and Hymns, and Proſtrations, and ſuch like: But it is by no means fitting*, ſaith he, *for us to confound theſe things, either by lifting up Men to the Honours of the Gods, or depreſſing the Gods to the Honours of Men. For, neither would* Alexander *ſuffer any Man to uſurp his Royal Dignity by the Votes of Men; how much more juſtly may the Gods diſdain for any Man to take their Honours to himſelf?* Which freedom of Speech coſt *Calliſthenes* his Life, a little after. And
Plutarch vit. Artaxerx. Ælian. Var. hiſt. l. 1. c. 21. it appears by *Plutarch, That the* Greeks *thought it a mean and baſe thing for any of them, when ſent on an Embaſſy to the Kings of* Perſia, *to proſtrate themſelves before them, becauſe this was only allowed among them in Divine Adoration*; *therefore*, ſaith he, *when* Pelopidas *and* Iſmenias *were ſent to* Artaxerxes, Pelopidas *did nothing unworthy, but* Iſmenias *let fall his Ring to the Ground, and ſtooping for that, was thought to make his Adoration*; which was altogether as good a ſhift as the *Jeſuits* adviſing

viſing the *Crucifix* to be held in the *Mandarine*'s Hands while they made their *Adorations* in the *Heathen Temples* in *China*. Conon *refuſed to make his Adoration, as a Diſgrace to his City*; and *Iſocrates* accuſeth the *Perſians* for doing it, *becauſe herein they ſhewed, that they deſpiſed the Gods rather than Men, by proſtituting their Honours to their Princes. Herodotus* mentions *Sperchies* and *Bulis*, *who could not with the greateſt violence be brought to give Adoration to* Xerxes, *becauſe it was againſt the Law of their Country to give divine Honour to Men. Valerius Maximus* ſaith, *the* Athenians *put* Timagoras *to Death for doing it*; ſo ſtrong an apprehenſion had poſſeſſed them, that the manner of Worſhip which they uſed to their *Gods* ſhould be preſerved *ſacred* and *inviolable*. And yet *Artabanus* in *Plutarch*, when he was perſwading *Themiſtocles* to do it, made uſe of the very Argument of a *relative Latria*, viz. *that he was to do it to the King, as the Image of God that preſerves all things*; which according to *T. G.* and his Brethren, was a ſufficient *ſalvo* for it. For why may not a Prince have this *relative Latria* given him, with far better Reaſon than a *ſenſeleſs Image*, in as much as he repreſents *God* with much more *Authority* and *Majeſty* than any *Image* can do? I confeſs *Cajetan* hath in ſome meaſure propoſed this *Objection*, but he only puts it *as to Man in general, as made after the Image of God*, viz. *why God may not be worſhipped in that Image as well as in an inanimate one?* And the Anſwer he gives, ſhews how much he was troubled with it; for he diſtinguiſhes of a *twofold Image*, viz. *one that is capable of no Honour for it ſelf; and another that is*, viz. *a rational Image, ſuch as Man is*; *now*, ſaith he, *we may give a relative* Latria, *where the Image is not capable of Honour for it ſelf, but not where it is*. For what reaſon, I beſeech him? I had thought, the more lively the *repreſentation* had been, and the more excellent the *Image*, it had been the greater *Motive* what was repreſented by it. Otherwiſe the more deformed and unlike the *Image* is, the fitter it were for Worſhip; and I ſhould think there were no compariſon between the repreſentation of *God*, in the Perfections of Mens Minds, and their Dominion over the inferior Creatures, and that which is made of dull and ſenſeleſs Matter: And among Men no *Image* ſo fit to repreſent God, as that of a *Mighty Prince* ſitting upon his Throne of *Majeſty*, which ſtrikes more awe and terrour into Mens Minds, than the Picture of an *old Man upon a Church Wall*: and notwithſtanding what *T. G.* hath admirably ſaid on behalf of Pictures (which I ſhall conſider in its due Place) I am ſtill apt to think, that the nearer any Being approaches to *God* in *Majeſty* and *Wiſdom*, it doth give more lively and powerful repreſentation of him, as an Object of Worſhip; why then may not we worſhip *God* in the Perſon of a great *Prince*, better than in a curious *Image* or *Picture*? All the Senſe that I can find by way of Anſwer in *Cajetan* is this, *That we ought not to worſhip God in a Man, although he be the Image of God, to avoid the danger of giving divine Worſhip to a Creature*: Very well! but is it not a greater fault to give *divine Worſhip* to *Mans Creature* than to *Gods*? For a *Picture* at the beſt is but the *Work of Mens Hands*. But he cannot deny, *that in ſuch a caſe the* Latria *paſſes to God, through ſuch an Image as a Man or a Prince is*; *but becauſe of the danger Men are in of giving divine Worſhip to Creatures, they ought to abſtain from it*. Very good! but is there not as much danger of Mens worſhipping *Stocks*, and *Stones*, and *Images*, as there

Juſtin. l. 6.
Iſocrat. Panegyr.

Herod. l. 7.
Val. Max. l. 6. c. 3.

Plutarch in Themiſt.

T. G. p. 190

Cajet. in Aq. 2. 2. qu. 103. art. 3.

T. G. p. 88, 89.

is in worſhipping *Princes* or *Mankind?* And if a *relative Latria* will not juſtifie the one, much leſs certainly can it do the other. But of this hereafter. The thing I obſerve now is, how careful even the *Heathens* have been, notwithſtanding they heard of the ſame Pleas that are uſed in the *Church* of *Rome*, to preſerve the *Cuſtoms* of *external Adoration peculiar* to their *Gods*.

§. 7. 2. I come now to ſhew, *That God by his Law hath appropriated ſome external acts of Worſhip to himſelf, ſo as to make it unlawful to* Maimon. de Idol. c. 3. ſect. 2, 3, 4, 5. *uſe them to any other beſides him.* Maimonides ſaith, *That to make a Man guilty of Idolatry by the Law of* Moſes, *it was neceſſary that he were convicted of one of theſe two things.* 1. *Either that he did uſe the acts of Worſhip proper to the Idol, therefore the Sanhedrin were to enquire not only whom Men worſhipped, but in what manner.* Or, 2. *That he made uſe of any of thoſe acts of Worſhip to an Idol, which God hath appropriated to himſelf*, for which he inſtanceth in *Incurvation, Sacrifice, Incenſe* and *Oblations*: And adds, *That whatever Worſhip was made proper to God by their Law, the uſing of that to an Idol, although it were not the proper Worſhip of that Idol, made a Man guilty of Idolatry.* Here are two things farther to be enquired into. 1. *What thoſe acts are which God did appropriate to himſelf?* 2. *How far Gods appropriating them to himſelf doth now concern us?* i. e. whether the *Church* hath any *liberty* to alter the Nature of thoſe *acts*, ſo as to make any to be common to *God* and his *Creatures*, which were then *peculiar* to God?

1. *What thoſe acts are which God did appropriate to himſelf?* i. e. which he commanded to be uſed to himſelf, and did forbid to be uſed to any other.

1. And of theſe, the moſt indiſputable between us and our Adverſaries is *Sacrifice*. For they confeſs in Words, that *Sacrifice is ſo peculiar to God that it ought not to be offered to any elſe*; becauſe the Words of *Scripture* are ſo plain to this purpoſe. *He that ſacrificeth to* Exod. 22. 20. *any God ſave unto the Lord only, ſhall ſurely be put to Death*: Which Aquin. 2. 2. q. 85. art. 2. Words are cited by *Aquinas* to this purpoſe; and my Adverſary T. G. doth confeſs, *that the offering of Sacrifice not only by the cuſtom of the* T. G. p. 389 *Church, but of all Mankind, as St.* Auſtin *teacheth, is appropriated to ſignifie the abſolute worſhip due only to God.* It ſeems ſo much the more ſtrange to me, that after this he ſhould contend, *that Saints may have a ſhare in the Honour of Sacrifices*, but he pretends, *that all that their Church means by it, is no more than giving God thanks by a Sacrifice of-* p. 395. *fered to him for the Vertues and Prerogatives (for inſtance) he beſtowed on the Bleſſed Virgin, although the Sacrifice be offered to God and not to her.* What the ſenſe of their *Church* is, will be beſt underſtood by the practice of it. In the *Miſſal* of *Sarum*, *A. D.* 1554. and in an old *Sariſbury Miſſal*, *A. D.* 1494. I find this Prayer to be uſed by the *Prieſt*, when he *offers* the *Sacrifice*, as the expreſs Words of the Rubrick are,

> *Suſcipe ſancta Trinitas hanc oblationem quam ego indignus peccator offero in honore tuo, B. Mariæ & omnium ſanctorum pro peccatis & offenſionibus meis, & pro ſalute vivorum & requie omnium fidelium defunctorum. In nomine Patris & Filii & ſpiritus ſancti acceptum ſit omnipotenti Deo hoc ſacrificium novum.*

In the *old* and *new Roman Miſſal*, and the *Miſſal* of *Paris*, 1520. and the *Miſſal* of *Lyons*, it is thus, *Suſcipe ſancta Trinitas hanc oblationem quam tibi offerrimus ob memoriam paſſionis, reſurrectionis, & aſcenſionis Jeſu Chriſti Domini noſtri; & in honore* B. *Mariæ ſemper Virginis, & B. Johannis Baptiſtæ, & ſanctorum Apoſtolorum, Pauli, & iſtorum & omnium ſanctorum, ut illis proficiat ad honorem, nobis autem ad ſalutem, & illi pro nobis intercedere dignentur in cœlis, quorum memoriam facimus in terris, per Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum.*

In the old *Monaſtick Miſſals*, mentioned by **Cardinal Bona**, the *Offertory* ran in this *Form*,

Bona de Rebus Liturg. l. 2. c. 9.

Suſcipe ſancta Trinitas unus Deus, hanc oblationem quam tibi offerimus in memoriam beatæ Paſſionis, Reſurrectionis, & Aſcenſionis Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, & in honorem B. *Mariæ ſemper Virginis, genitricis ejuſdem Domini noſtri, & omnium ſanctorum & ſanctarum, Cæleſtiam virtutum, & vivificæ crucis, ut eam acceptare digneris, pro nobis peccatoribus. & pro animabus omnium Fidelium defunctorum.*

In the *Ambroſian Miſſal*, it runs thus,

Et ſuſcipe ſancta Trinitas hanc oblationem quam tibi offerimus pro regimine & cuſtodia atque unitate catholicæ fidei, & pro veneratione quoque B. *Dei genitricis Mariæ, omniumque ſimul ſanctorum tuorum; & pro ſalute & incolumitate famulorum, famularumque tuarum,* &c.

In the old *Miſſal* of *Illyricus*, publiſhed by **Cardinal Bona**, the form in other things agrees with the *Roman Miſſal*, only after *Jeſu Chriſti*, it hath, *& in honorem ſanctorum tuorum, qui tibi placuerunt ab initio mundi, & eorum quorum hodie Feſtivitas celebratur, & quorum hic nomina & reliquiæ habentur, ut illis proficiat ad honorem, nobis autem ad ſalutem,* &c.

B.na Append. p. 545

I deſire to know of T. G. *whether this be no more than giving God thanks for their Vertues*, when a *propitiatory Sacrifice* is offered up to God for *their Honour*? And *that their Honour may be increaſed by it*; and at the ſame time to pray, *that they would intercede with God for them.* What *is joyning Creatures together with God in the Honour of Sacrifice*, if this be not? How comes a *propitiatory Sacrifice for Sin*, and that both *for the Quick and the Dead*, to be turned into *Sacrifice* of *Thankſgiving* for the *Graces* of a particular *Saint*? How ſtrangely would it have ſounded among the *Jews*, for a Man to have offered a *Sin-offering* to give God *thanks* for the *Faith* of *Abraham*, or the *Meekneſs* of *Moſes*, or the *Wiſdom* of *Solomon*? And at the ſame time when this *Sacrifice* was pretended to be *offered only to God*, to *pray* that *they would intercede with God for him.* Is not the *Addreſs* to be made to *him* to whom the *Sacrifice* is offered? And yet we find, that this is not only *practiſed* but juſtified and defended in the *Roman Church*; for Bellarmine not only ſaith, *that the Maſs of St.* Peter *is ſo called, becauſe it is offered to God to give thanks for the Glory conferred on him, but becauſe he is at the ſame time called upon as a Patron and Advocate with God.* But ſaith T. G. *Honour is nothing but a Teſtimony or Proteſtation of ſome Excellency; and whether thanks be given to God by Words or by Sacrifice for the Gifts and Graces he hath beſtowed on ſuch a Perſon, it is an evident* Proteſtation *of ſuch Excellency in that Perſon, and conſequently for his Honour, though both Words and Sacrifice be directed to* God, *and not to him.* Who denies, *that it is for the Honour of a Perſon to praiſe God for him*? But the Queſtion is, if *Sacrifice* be *appropriated* to the *ſole Honour of God*, how the *Honour* of *Saints* comes to be *declared* by it? For a Man *whoſe Underſtanding is not ſhrunk up as Beggars*

Bellarm. de cultu ſanct. l. 3. c. 4.

gars Arms uſe to be, might have *ſtretched it* at leaſt ſo far, as to have conſidered, that *Sacrifice* being an *external ſign*, there are two things to be looked at in it. 1. The *ſignification* of that ſign. 2. The *term* to which it is directed. Now the main thing to be regarded in it as to *Honour*, is not the *direction* of it to its *term* by the *Mind*, for that is *ſecret*; but the *external ſignification* of it among Men. For, ſaith *Aquinas*, *the reaſon of Sacrifices is, that Men by ſome ſenſible external Actings ſhould make a Proteſtation by offering them to God, of the Subjection and Honour that is due to him*: Now if this *ſign* may be made uſe of to ſignifie any other thing, it is not a *peculiar* and *appropriate* ſign only for that purpoſe to teſtifie our *Subjection* to God. And to return the *kindneſs* of his *Twitch*, by an Example far more pertinent to the purpoſe than his was, how ſtrange would it have been thought among the *Perſians*, where *Proſtration* was appropriated to their *King* as a ſign of *Subjection* to him *alone*, for a Man to have ſaid to him, *Sir, I fall down before you in Honour of the Captain of your Guards*; or *of ſuch and ſuch a Miniſter of State*: Would the King have taken this for an *appropriate act* of *Honour* to himſelf? So that though he *falls down only to the King*, if he *declares* he intends it for the *Honour of* another, he takes away by his Words, the *ſignificancy* of his Action: Thus if *Sacrifice* be ſo *appropriate* to the *Honour* of *God*, that it cannot ſignifie any thing elſe; then it is *nonſenſe* to *Sacrifice to God* for the *Honour* of another; if it may ſignifie any thing elſe, and be ſo uſed in the *Church* of *Rome*, then they do not reſerve ſo much as *Sacrifice* for an *appropriate ſign* of the *abſolute worſhip of God*.

§. 8.
Mat. 4. 10.
Concil. Nicen. 2. *Leonard Ruben. de Idolol. l.* 2. *c.* 15. *n.* 1. *Bellar. de ſanct. Beatit. l.* 1. *c.* 14

§. 8. *Religious Adoration* is *appropriated to God* in *Scripture*; for ſo the Command runs, as it is explained by our *Saviour*, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* They who would make *the reſtrictive Particle belong to the latter Clauſe and not to the firſt*, do not attend to the reaſon of our Saviours uſing theſe Words, which was to reject the *Devils* Temptation about *Adoration*; and it would not have had force againſt the Temptation, if Men were more at liberty as to *worſhip*, than they are as to *Service*. And it is obſerved by thoſe who have moſt conſidered the importance of the *Hebrew* Word שחה, that it doth not ſignifie an *act* of the *Mind*, but of the *Body*, either by *incurvation* or *proſtration*. Although *Adoration* be ſometimes taken for all the *external acts of Religious Worſhip*, as *John* 4. 20. *Acts* 8. 27. yet the general *ſignification* of it, is that *act* of *Religious Worſhip* which is performed by the *Motion* of the *Body*. And ſo *Adoration* is accounted in the *Schools* one particular *part* of *proper Religious Worſhip*; *Aquinas* puts it before *Sacrifice*, and makes that Place of our *Saviour* the foundatien of it; and among *external ſigns* he makes *this the greateſt*; *and that it is intended not barely to declare our inward Reverence, but that by the uſe of this, our inward Devotion may be more excited, it being natural for us to proceed from ſenſible to intellectual acts.* And it is obſerved by *Yſambertus*, a late *Profeſſor* of *Divinity* in the *Sorbon*, *That where ever the Scripture ſpeaks of Adoration, it is always expreſſed by ſome external ſign, as a note of Subjection in him that adores towards him that is adored*: (which Obſervation, if underſtood of a *corporeal ſign*, is not intended for *Angels*, but *Men*, for *Adoration* is in *Scripture* attributed to Angels.) And he well obſerves, as to the Senſe of *Aquinas*, *That he muſt make the external ſign neceſſary to the formal act of Adoration, becauſe he ranks Prayer among the internal acts, which he could do upon no other reaſon, but becauſe Prayer may have its compleat act in the Mind, which he ſuppoſed that Adoration could not*; and withal he proves (contrary to the Opinion of *Suarez*) *That the internal acts of Vertue, though deſigned by the Mind, as a token of ſubmiſſion to God, cannot be the proper acts of Adoration, becauſe they are not adequate and proportionable ſigns to expreſs our ſubmiſſion to God.* And therefore *Damaſcen* defined *Adoration* to be σημεῖον ὑποπτώσεως, *a ſign of Subjection*, and *Anaſtaſius*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, ἔμφασις τιμῆς, an *outward Expreſſion of Honour*, by which, ſaith *Vaſquez*. he doth not mean any *bare Honour*, but that which implies *ſubjection*, But *Damaſcen* yet more fully ſaith, it *is a ſign*, not barely of *Honour*, but ὑποβάσεως ϗ ταπεινώσεως, of *Submiſſion* and *Humility*, not as it is taken for that *particular Vertue*, whereby an inordinate value of our ſelves is repreſſed, but as it implies an *Acknowledgment of Gods Superiority and Dominion* over us. And it is obſervable, that St. *Auguſtine*, where he ſpeaks of thoſe things which are moſt peculiar to the *worſhip* of God, he joyns *Adoration* and *Sacrifice* together. *Putaverunt quidam deferendum Angelis honorem vel adorando vel ſacrificando, qui debetur Deo; & eorum ſunt admonitione prohibiti, juſſique ſunt hæc ei deferre cui uni fas eſſe noverunt*; whereby we ſee he makes *external Adoration as peculiar to God as Sacrifice*; and *Ludovicus Vives* there ſaith, *That he meant by the Angel that refuſed Adoration, the Angel that forbad St.* John, *and bad him to worſhip God.* Which makes me wonder that T.G. ſhould make *the act of Adoration equivocal, and only Sacrifice according to St.* Auguſtine, *to be appropriated to ſignifie the abſolute worſhip of God*; for St. *Auguſtine* joyns both together, and makes one as *unlawful* to be given to any Creature as the other. How then comes St. *Auguſtine*'s Authority to be quitted for the one, and ſo greedily embraced for the other? Is it that *Sacrifice* doth of *it ſelf more properly ſignifie our inward and total ſubjection of our ſelves to God than the other doth?* But it would become *T. G*'s learning to inform us in this matter; ſince the beſt learned of their Divines do confeſs, *That Sacrifice doth not naturally ſignifie any worſhip of God but only by the impoſition of Men, and that which it ſignifies*, ſay they, *is Gods being Author of Life and Death, and if we take away this impoſition it contains nothing of divine worſhip in it*; ſo *Suarez*, who ſaith, *he follows St.* Auguſtine *in it.* How comes the *deſtruction* of any *Creature* under our Command to ſignifie the *inward ſubjection* of our *ſelves* to God? What pleaſure can we conceive the Almighty ſhould take in ſeeing us to deſtroy his Creatures for his ſake? Our Minds may be as far from ſubmitting to God, as theſe things are of themſelves from ſignifying ſuch a ſubmiſſion. Nay, how comes a Sacrifice to ſtand ſo much in our ſtead, that becauſe we take away the Life of that, therefore we *own* God *as our Lord?* It might rather of it ſelf, that we have the *Power of Life and Death over Beaſts*, than that God hath it over us; yet all that *Sacrifice* ſignifies, ſaith *Vaſquez*, is, *that God is acknowledged thereby to be the Author of Life and Death*; and *to this end*, ſaith *Yſambertus*, *it is neceſſary that the thing be deſtroyed, becauſe the reaſon of Sacrifice lies in the deſtruction of a thing offered to God.* Be it ſo: but of all things in the world, it would never have come into my mind, nor I think into any man's well in his ſenſes, *to offer up God himſelf unto*

God

Damaſcen. orat. 3. p. 775.

Synod. 7. *Act.* 1.

Vaſq. in 3. p. *diſp.* 93. c. 4.

Aug. de Civit Dei. l. 10. c. 19.

Suarez ad 3. p. *Th.* q. 25. *diſp.* 51. *ſect.* 4.

Vaſquez ad 3. p. *diſp.* 93. q. 25. art. 5.

Yſambert. ad 3. p. q. 25. *diſp.* 1. art. 4. in fine.

God as a Sacrifice, in order to the teſtifying the devoting of our ſelves unto him; and yet this, after all their talk, comes to be that *external Sacrifice* which is the only *appropriate ſign* of the *abſolute worſhip of God*, viz. the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, wherein the Prieſt is believed, *to offer up God himſelf under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine to the Eternal God in token of our ſubjection to him.* Methinks yet it were ſomewhat more reaſonable to offer up *brute Creatures* that are under us, than *God* that is ſo infinitely above us; and ſuch is the weakneſs of my underſtanding, that this ſeems to be rather an argument of *our power* over *God*, than of our *ſubjection* to Him. But ſince the *formal reaſon* of a *Sacrifice* is ſaid *to lie in the deſtruction of it*, Good Lord! what thoughts muſt theſe men have in their minds, (if they have any) when they think it in their *power*, firſt *to make their God* by ſpeaking five words; then *to offer him up as a Sacrifice*; then to ſuppoſe *him deſtroyed*, and all this to teſtifie *their ſubmiſſion to God!* I want words to expreſs the intolerable blaſphemy and abſurdity of theſe things. *Yet this*, ſaith T. G. *is ſo appropriate a ſign of the abſolute worſhip of God, that That Religion which admits no external viſible Sacrifice, muſt needs be deficient in the moſt ſignal part of the publick worſhip of God.* What *external viſible Sacrifice* have you that we have not, beſides that of *God himſelf* whom you believe to be perſonally preſent as the *Object of divine worſhip* under the *ſpecies of Bread and Wine?* and yet when you have pleaded ſo much for this *preſence* to juſtifie your *Adoration*, you then make a *Sacrifice* of Him; and that he may be ſo, you grant it is neceſſary *there be ſome deſtruction of what was before*, i. e. (if to the purpoſe) *of him that was the Sacrifice*, and not *the body and blood of Chriſt.* But ſuppoſe you only make him a *Sacrifice* as to *his body and blood*, and not as to *his divine nature*; what becomes then of the *body and blood of Chriſt?* for, *it muſt be deſtroyed to make a Sacrifice*; where, how, by what means comes the body and blood of Chriſt to be deſtroyed? *When you ſay, it is there without the qualities of a body, that it cannot be ſeen, or felt, or taſted*; and yet is capable of *being deſtroyed:* ſuppoſe all this be paſſed over, how comes the offering up *the very body and blood of Chriſt to God* to ſignifie our *abſolute worſhip* of him? Will nothing elſe ſatisfie to teſtifie, that we are his *ſubjects*, unleſs we offer up to him the *body* and *blood* of his *own Son? Is this indeed the moſt ſignal part of divine worſhip, which we muſt be deficient in, if we have it not?* We do from our ſouls praiſe God for thar unvaluable *Sacrifice*, the *Son* of *God* was pleaſed to make of his own *life*, when he was *incarnate* in our *nature*, We do frequently commemorate this Sacrifice of his according to his own *inſtitution*; and in the doing of that, we *offer up our ſelves unto Him as a reaſonable ſervice*; *We adore*, and *magnify Him* for all His *mercies*, eſpecially the ſending of His *Son to die for us*, as the greateſt of all: But we dare not let it enter into our thoughts, that we ſhould ever eat or ſwallow down *the very body and blood of Chriſt*; and then pretend we have *offered it up to God* as a *Sacrifice*, and that in token of our *abſolute worſhip* of Him. But ſetting aſide the nature of this *Sacrifice*, which is the only *external* and *viſible ſign of appropriate worſhip to God*, they pretend to have; I deſire yet to know how a *Sacrifice* doth come to ſignifie this *abſolute worſhip* more than *adoration?* Not by nature, for the lowly *ſubmiſſion* of our bodies ſeems more naturally to ſignifie the behaviour of our minds, than any thing without us can do? if it be by *inſtitution*, it muſt be either *Gods* or *mans*; if *mans*, then either offering *Sacrifice* to a creature is *Idolatry*;

Tanner. ad 3.p.diſp.5. de Relig. q. 3. dub. 1. n. 8.

T.G.p.391.

or not: if not, then *giving abſolute worſhip to a creature* is no *Idolatry*; if it be, then it is *Idolatry* to make uſe of the *outward ſigns of divine worſhip* which *mankind* have agreed upon, to any thing elſe but *God*. If it be ſaid to be *God's Inſtitution*, then it follows that the applying any *outward ſigns of worſhip which God hath appropriated to himſelf, to any Creature*, is *Idolatry*; which is as much as I deſire, for then it will equally hold for *Religious Adoration*; eſpecially if the principle of *Arriaga* hold true, *that the value of Sacrifice lies in the act of adoration performed by it*.

Arriaga in 3 p.Thom. Diſp. 50. ſect. 4. n. 45.

But T. G. pleads, *That the act of adoration is equivocal*, that is, that we read in Scripture, that it hath been given to *men* as well as to *God*, and therefore cannot be ſuch an *appropriate ſign of divine worſhip*. To this I have already anſwered, by diſtinguiſhing the *Act*, and the *ſignification* of it; the *external act* I grant may be performed upon ſeveral grounds; As 1. *Civil ſubjection*, as by *Nathan* to *David*, 1 Kings 1. 23. 2. *Civil reſpect*, as by *Abraham* to the *Children* of *Heth*, Gen. 23. 7. 3. *Religious reſpect*, or as ſome call it, *Moral Reverence*, i. e. out of an opinion of *great ſanctity*, without *ſuperiority*, as Nebuchadnezzar to *Daniel*, Dan. 2. 46. And ſo *Abraham* bowed to the *Angels*, Gen. 18. 2. if he knew them to be what they were; but if not, as appears more probable both of *him* and *Lot*, by *Heb.* 13. 2. then it was only an expreſſion of *civil reſpect* to them. 4. Out of a *ſudden tranſport*, as St. *John* did to the *Angel* twice, which he would not have done a ſecond time, if he had conſidered his being checked for the firſt, *Rev.* 19. 10. 22. 8, 9. Now if theſe things may by their *circumſtances* and *occaſions* be apparently differenced from each other, and from that *Religious adoration* which God doth require to be given to himſelf, then there can be no reaſon from thence to make the *ſignification* of *external adoration* to be *equivocal*. There is the ſame nature in theſe *acts* that there is in *words* of *different ſignifications*; which being taken in *general* are of an *equivocal ſenſe*, but being conſidered with all their particular *circumſtances* they have their ſenſe ſo *reſtrained* and *limited*, that it is eaſie to diſcern the one from the other. That we call therefore *Religious adoration*, which is performed with all the *circumſtances* of *Religious worſhip*, as to *time*, *place*, *occaſion*, and ſuch like; as if men uſed *proſtration* to any thing within the *Courts* of the *Temple*, (wherein ſome of the *Jews* thought that *poſture* only *lawful*;) if it were done in the *time* of *Sacrifice*, or *devotion*; if the *occaſion* were ſuch as required no *reſpect* of any other kind, as when the *Devil* demanded of *Chriſt* to *fall down and worſhip him*; in theſe and ſuch like *circumſtances* we ſay *adoration* hath the determin'd *ſignification* of *Religious worſhip*, and is an *appropriate ſign* of it, by *God*'s own inſtitution. Thence the *Pſalmiſt* ſaith, *O come let us worſhip and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our Maker*; and God forbids *bowing down* to and *worſhipping any graven Image, or ſimilitude*; where the *bowing down* is one *act* of *worſhip*, and was ſo eſteemed by the common conſent of mankind, as might be eaſily made appear by the ſeveral *cuſtoms* of *external adoration*, that have been uſed in all parts of the world, and it might for the univerſality of the *practice* of it, vye with *Sacrifice*. So that on this account, as well as the proper *ſignification* of it, *adoration* ought to be eſteemed as *ſignificant* and *peculiar* a ſign of *abſolute worſhip* as *Sacrifice*. There are only two things that ſeem yet to make this *adoration* not *appropri-*

Pſal. 95. 6.

ate to God, (for the inſtances of *Balaam* and *Saul* are not worth mentioning) and thoſe are, *Joſhua's Religious adoration of the Angel that appeared to him*; *and the adoration that the Jews performed towards the Ark*; the latter is eaſily anſwered, the Ark being only a Symbol of the *divine preſence* of *God*'s own appointing, towards which they were to direct their *adoration*; (but of this at large, when I come to the *worſhip of Images*;) the other cannot be denied to be *Religious worſhip*, but we are to conſider, what *Aquinas* ſaith to this place, *that it may be underſtood of the abſolute worſhip of God, who did appear and ſpeak in the perſon of an Angel.* And St. *Athanaſius* expreſly ſaith, *that God did ſpeak in an Angel to* Moſes *at the burning Buſh, when* Moſes *was bid to put off his Shooes*; as *Joſhua* was now; and by the deſcription of him, *as Captain of the Hoſt of the Lord*; it is apparent *Joſhua* looked not on him as an ordinary Angel, but as the Angel of whom God ſaid, *that he ſhould go before them, and whom they were bound to obey*; and by comparing the places in *Exodus* together, where *God* afterwards threatens to ſend an Angel, and *Moſes* would not be ſatisfied till *God* ſaid *His Preſence ſhould go with them*; it is evident this Angel of His Preſence was more than a meer Angel; and therefore the Fathers generally ſuppoſe it was the *Eternal Son of God* who appeared in the Perſon of an Angel, as *Petavius* hath at large proved: and is ſufficiently manifeſt from hence, that they make uſe of *Adoration* as a certain argument to prove, *that Chriſt was not a creature*; which argument were of no force at all, if they did not believe, that *adoration* was an appropriate ſign of that abſolute worſhip which belongs only to God: and therefore they obſerve that when meer Angels appeared, they refuſed *adoration*, as the Angels that appeared to *Manoe* and St. *John*; but when *adoration* is allowed or commanded, it was the Divine Nature appearing in the perſon of an Angel.

Aq. 2. 2. q. 84. art. 1.

Athanaſ. orat. 4. c. Arrian. p. 467

Exod. 3. 5.

Joſh. 5. 14.

Exod. 23. 21, 22, 23.

33. 2, 14.

Petav. de Trinit. l. 8. c. 2.

§. 9. 3. The *erection of Temples and Altars*, is another *appropriate ſign of divine worſhip*, which I need not go about to prove from Scripture, ſince it is confeſſed by our Adverſaries. *Ad Latriam pertinent templa & altaria, ſacerdotia, ſacrificia, feſtivitates, ceremoniæ, & hujuſmodi quæ ſoli Deo ſunt exhibenda*; ſaith *Durandus Mimatenſis* from *Innocentius* 3. and the applying theſe things to any but *God*, he makes to be *Idolatry*. *Bellarmin* joyns Temples and Altars together with Sacrifice as peculiar to *God*; *Templum*, ſaith *Cardinal Bona*, *eſt domus Numini Sacra, a houſe Sacred to God*; and yet *Bellarmin* had the confidence to lay down this propoſition, *Sacræ domus non ſolum Deo, ſed etiam ſanctis recte ædificantur & dedicantur:* and he is not ſatisfied with the anſwer of ſome Moderns, that ſay, *The Temples cannot properly be erected to any, but God, any more than Sacrifice can be offered to any but him*; *but becauſe there are many Temples dedicated to God, that they may be diſtinguiſhed from each other, they have their denomination from particular Saints*, (which is an anſwer we find no fault with, if they do not proceed to the worſhip and invocation of thoſe Saints to whoſe memory the Churches are dedicated, as the particular *Patrons* of it,) but *Bellarmin* hath found out a ſubtilty beyond this; for he ſaw well enough this would not reach home to their caſe, and therefore he ſaith, *That ſacred places are truly and properly built to Saints*; but how? *not as they are Temples, but as they are* Baſilicæ; *For*, ſaith he, *Temples have a particular relation to ſacrifice, but* Baſilicæ *have not*: and *he confeſſes it*

Innocent 3. de Myſt. Miſſæ l. 3. c. 11.

Durand. Ration. divin. offic. l. 8. c. ult.

Bellarm. de ſanct. Beatit. l. 1. c. 12.

Bona de reb. Liturg. l. 1. c. 19.

Bellarm. de cultu Sanctorum l. 2. c. 4.

would be Idolatry to erect them as Temples to Saints, but not as they are Baſilicæ. This is a diſtinction without any difference; for *Iſidore*, who certainly well underſtood the ſignification of theſe words, as uſed among Chriſtians, ſaith, *Nunc autem ideo divina Templa Baſilicæ nominantur, quia ibi Regi omnium Deo cultus & ſacrificia offeruntur*: and that which we inſiſt upon, is not, the names that Churches are called by, nor the preſervation of the memories of Saints in them, but the erecting them to Saints as places for the worſhip and invocation of them. And the vanity of this diſtinction of Temples from *Baſilicæ, becauſe Temples relate only to ſacrifice*, will eaſily appear, if we conſider that the proper ſignification of *Templum* was *Domicilium*, as *Turnebus* obſerves, which is that which *Varro* calls *Templum naturâ*; and in this ſenſe, he ſaith, *Nævius called the Heaven, Templum magnum Jovis altitonantis*; and from thence it was applyed to any *place conſecrated by the Augurs*, and ſo by degrees, was taken for any ſacred place that was ſet apart for divine worſhip; for that was it which made them ſacred, *ſacra ſunt loca*, ſaith *Iſidore*, *divinis cultibus inſtituta*. Either therefore they muſt ſay, *there is no proper worſhip of God* but *Sacrifice*, or the notice of a Temple cannot be ſaid only to refer to Sacrifice. And among the *Jews*, our B. Saviour hath told us, that *the Temple had relation to prayer* as well as *Sacrifice*, *My Houſe ſhall be called a Houſe of Prayer.* Would it not have been a pleaſant diſtinction among the *Jews*, if any of them had dedicated a Temple to *Abraham*, with a deſign to invocate him there, and make him the Patron of it, for them to have ſaid, they built it as a Temple to *God*, but as a *Baſilica* to *Abraham*; for they ſacrificed there only to *God*, (or to *God* for the honour of *Abraham*) but they invocated *Abraham* as the particular Patron of it? This is that therefore we charge them with, upon their own principles, that when they dedicate Churches to particular Saints as the Patrons of them, and in order to the ſolemn invocation of them there, they do apply that which themſelves confeſs to be an appropriate ſign of divine worſhip to Creatures, and conſequently by their own confeſſion are guilty of Idolatry. Neither can it be pleaded by them, *that their Churches and Altars are only dedicated to the honour of God for the memory of a particular Saint*; for they confeſs, that it is for the ſolemn invocation of that Saint. And withal in the Form of dedication in the Pontifical, there is more implied, as appears by theſe two prayers at the Conſecration of the Altar; The firſt when the Biſhop ſtands before the Altar in theſe words,

Iſidor. Origin. l. 15. c. 4.

Turneb. Adverſ. l. 19. c. 5.

Varro de Ling. Lat. l. 6.

A. *Gall. l. 14. c. 7.*

Iſid. Orig. l. 15. c. 4.

Mat. 21. 13; Mark 11. 17. Luk. 19. 46.

> *Deus Omnipotens, in cujus honorem, ac Beatiſſimæ Virginis Mariæ & omnium Sanctorum, ac nomen & memoriam Sancti tui N. nos indigni altare hoc conſecramus,* &c.

The other, after the Biſhop hath with *his right thumb dipped in the Chriſm, made the ſign of a Croſs upon the Front of the Altar,*

> *Majeſtatem tuam, Domine, humiliter imploramus, ut altare hoc ſacræ unctionis libamine ad ſuſcipienda populi tui munera inunctam potenter benedicere, & ſanctificare digneris, ut quod nunc a nobis ſub tui nominis invocatione, in honorem* Beatiſſimæ *Virginis Mariæ, & omnium Sanctorum, atque in memoriam ſancti tui N.* &c.

Where we ſee, beſides the memory of the particular Saint to whom the Altar is dedicated; the honour of the B. *Virgin* and the Saints are joyned together with the Honour of God in the general dedication of it.

By the Pontifical, no Altar is to be conſecrated without Reliques, which the night before, the Biſhop is to be put into a clean veſſel for that purpoſe with three grains of Frankincenſe, and then to ſeal it up; which being conveniently placed before the Church door, the *Vigils* are to be celebrated that night before them, and the Nocturn and the Mattins, for *the honour of the Saints whoſe the Reliques are*; and when the Reliques are brought into the Church, this is one of the *Antiphona*'s,

> *Surgite Sancti Dei, de manſionibus veſtris, loca ſanctificate, plebem benedicite, & nos homines peccatores in pace cuſtodite.*

The form of conſecration of the Altar it ſelf, is this,

> *Sanctificetur hoc Altare in honorem Dei omnipotentis, & glorioſæ Virginis Mariæ atque omnium ſanctorum, & ad nomen ac memoriam Sancti N.*

Trigaut. Exped. Sin. l. 5. *c.* 15.

In *China*, *Trigautius* ſaith in the Chappel they had there, they had two Altars, one to our Saviour, the other dedicated to the *B. Virgin*, without any diſtinction at all. In the ſpeech the *Biſhop* makes to the people he utterly overthrows *Bellarmin's diſtinction* of *Templum* and *Baſilica*; for he ſaith, *nullibi enim quam in ſacris Baſilicis, Domino offerri ſacrificium debet.* It ſeems then *Baſilica* is taken with a reſpect to ſacrifice as well as *Templum*: and then he declares that he hath dedicated this *Baſilica in honorem omnipotentis Dei, Beatæ Mariæ ſemper virginis, & omnium Sactorum, ac memoriam Sancti N.* So that *Baſilica* is here taken with a reſpect to God, and not meerly to the Saints; although they joyn them together with God in the honour of Dedication.

*S. Baſil. ep. ad Cæſarienſ. ed. Baſil.p.*361

Let us now compare the practice of the Roman Church in this matter, with the argument which the Fathers made uſe of, to prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe *we are ſaid to be his Temple. If we are ſaid*, ſaith St. *Baſil*, *to be his Temple, becauſe he is worſhipped by us and dwells in us, then it follows that he is God, for we are commanded to worſhip and ſerve God alone.* Where it is plain St. *Baſil* takes a Temple with a reſpect to worſhip and not meerly to ſacrifice. *A Temple belongs only to God and not to a creature*, ſaith St. *Ambroſe*, therefore *the Holy Ghoſt is God, becauſe we are his Temple. This is peculiar to the Divine nature*, ſaith St. *Cyril*, *to have a Temple to dwell in. If we were to build a Temple*, ſaith S. *Auguſtin*, *to the Holy Ghoſt, in ſo doing, we ſhould give him the worſhip proper to God, and he muſt be God to whom we give divine worſhip, for we muſt worſhip the Lord our God, and him only muſt we ſerve*: the ſame argument he urges in ſeveral other places; *a Temple*, ſaith he, *was never erected but either to the true God, as* Solomon *did, or to falſe Gods as the Heathens*; and this Argument *from our being ſaid to be the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt*, he thinks is ſtronger, than if adoration had been ſaid to be given to it; *for this is ſo proper an act of divine worſhip to erect a Temple, that if we ſhould do it to the moſt excellent Angel, we ſhould be anathematized from the Church of God. Hoc nunc fit quibuſlibet Divis*, (ſaith *Eraſmus* there in the Margin.) *This is every where now done to Saints*, at which *Petavius* is very angry; and ſaith, *they do it not to the Saints per ſe & præcipue.* But what becomes then of the Argument of the Fathers, which ſuppoſes the erecting a Temple to be

Ambroſ. de Sp. ſancto. l. 3. *c.* 13.
S. *Cyril Theſaur. fid. l.* 34. *p.* 357
S. *Auguſt. ep.* 66. *c. Sermon. Arian. c.* 20. 29. *c. Maxim. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *l.* 2. *c.* 11. *l.* 3. *c.* 3.
Petav. de Trinit. l 2. *c.* 16 *n* 11.

ſuch a peculiar act of Adoration, that it cannot be applied to any creature, no not ſecondarily? For then the oppoſers of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt might have eaſily anſwered S. *Auguſtins* argument after the ſame faſhion, *viz.* that we were ſaid *to be the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt*, not *per ſe & præcipue*, but only ſecondarily, as it was the divine inſtrument of purifying the Souls of men. From hence we ſee, how unanimouſly the Fathers looked on the *dedication of Temples and Altars*, as an *appropriate ſign of that abſolute worſhip we owe to* God; and that not meerly as an Appendix to ſacrifice, but as it contains in it ſuch an act of adoration as is peculiar to God.

§. 10.

4. *The burning of Incenſe as a token of Religious worſhip.* For otherwiſe, it is of the nature of the outward act of adoration, and may be done on meerly civil accounts; and ſo far *T. G.* was in the right when he ſaid, *that burning incenſe is a ceremony of the like nature with bowing, i. e.* it may be accommodated to ſeveral uſes; but as I have proved that Religious adoration is a peculiar act of divine worſhip, ſo I ſhall now do, concerning the burning of incenſe when it is uſed as a token of Religious worſhip. If there were any difference under the Law between the Altar of burnt offerings, and the Altar of incenſe, this latter ſeems to be more particularly *appropriated to the worſhip of God.* For the High Prieſt is not only commanded to burn upon it *perpetual incenſe before the Lord*; but it is ſaid, *to be moſt holy to the Lord*; and it ſtood in a *more holy place*. And we ſee by our Saviour's interpretation of the precept of worſhip, although the reſtrictive particle were not in the words of the Law, yet he ſhews us that it was in the ſenſe of it; and that certainly is to be underſtood, where a thing is ſaid *to be moſt holy to God*, i. e. *appropriated to himſelf* after a peculiar manner: and we have ſeen by *Maimonides that incenſe is joyned with ſacrifice*; ſo that a perſon is made by their Law as guilty of Idolatry, *if he burns incenſe to an Idol*, as if he offered Sacrifice. But we need not depend on the *Jews* teſtimony in this matter; for the Scripture is expreſs in it, where it ſpeaks of *Hezekiah*'s breaking in pieces the Brazen Serpent that *Moſes* had made, *for in thoſe days the Children of Iſrael did burn incenſe to it. Bellarmine* cannot deny, *that burning of incenſe was a ſacrifice among the Jews, and that was the reaſon that* Hezekiah *brake the brazen Serpent in pieces*; *but*, he ſaith, *it is not a ſacrifice now.* But how comes it to change its nature? hath it loſt any part of its definition? if not, hath the Church power to make that which was a ſacrifice to become none? *i. e.* to take away an *appropriate ſign of God's abſolute worſhip?* for ſo they acknowledge ſacrifice to be. *Paulus Maria Quarti* in his late *Commentaries* on the *Rubricks of the Miſſal* confeſſes that all the material parts of the definition of a ſacrifice agree to the burning of Incenſe in the *Roman* Church, for it is an *oblation made to God for his honour by the change of a ſenſible thing, but*, he ſaith, *from* Suarez *that it is not a ſacrifice among them, but only an accidental appendix to a ſacrifice*: and might not the ſame have been ſaid among the *Jews*? and yet himſelf afterwards grants, *that it is a part of Religious worſhip as honour is thereby given to thoſe that are incenſed; and is to be determined according to the nature of the object; if it be given to God, it is* Latria, *if to Saints, it is* Dulia, *&c.* It ſeems now, it is become more than

T.G. p.90.

Exod. 30. 8. 10.

2*King.* 18. 4.

Bellarm. de imag. ſanct. l. 2. c. 17.

Paul. Maria Quarti Comment. in Rubric. Miſſal. part. 2. *tit.* 4. *ſect.* 1. *dub.* 2.

than an appendix, being a proper act of worſhip; but all their care is to avoid its being a ſacrifice, becauſe they give it to Saints and Images, and when they are off from that difficulty they think they can diſpoſe of it as they pleaſe. *Catharinus* grants, that *burning of incenſe had the proper nature of a ſacrifice among the Jews; and that the reaſon why* Hezekiah *brake in pieces the brazen Serpent was becauſe they did not direct their incenſe to the thing repreſented by it, but terminated their worſhip on the ſign*: but (1.) it ſeems then, the Scripture gives a very lame account of the reaſon of it, for that mentions no more but *their burning incenſe before it*, which was no *fault of it ſelf*; but only that they did not direct their intention far enough. (2.) It ſeems, that ſacrifice it ſelf may be offered to an Image; for *Catharinus* grants, that this had the nature of ſacrifice, and there was no harm in the meer oblation, but only in the ſhortneſs of the intention. *Sanders* ſaith, *that God commanded the Jews to give Religious worſhip to the brazen Serpent; for*, he ſaith, *their very looking upon it was ſuch; and from thence he proves it lawful to worſhip Images*; but *Cope* (or rather *Harpsfield*) *will not allow it to be of the ſame nature with Images*, eaſily diſcerning, that the breaking of it down would make more againſt the worſhip of Images, than the ſetting of it up ever made for them. For *Vaſquez* ſaith, the *peoples looking upon it in order to their being healed, was no part of worſhip, being no token of ſubmiſſion; and that* God *intended no worſhip ſhould be given to it*. And he ingenuouſly confeſſes, that when *Hezekiah brake it in pieces, it was not becauſe it was worſhipped for a God among them, or had the worſhip terminated upon it, but becauſe the People gave the ſame kind of worſhip to it which in the Roman Church they give to their Images: but he thinks that worſhip was unlawful to the Jews, which is lawful to Chriſtians*. And then why not the offering ſacrifice to Images, as well as burning of Incenſe? But T. G. thinks, *that perhaps the ſmoke of the incenſe (when uſed as a ſign of Religious worſhip) troubles my eyes ſo that I cannot diſtinguiſh between the uſe of it, as applied to God, and as applied to his ſervants, or other things relating to him*. It is pity *T. G.* had not been *Hezekiah*'s Confeſſor, to have better informed him about the *Jews* burning of Incenſe before the brazen Serpent; for he would in all probability have done his endeavour to have preſerved it; and if *Hezekiah* had pleaded the Law that *appropriated incenſe to the worſhip of God*, "he would "have deſired him *to clear his eyes a little better*; for then he might "diſcern that burning incenſe was an indifferent ceremony, and may "be applied either to God or the creature; and that the difference "of theſe depends on *the intention of the perſons* who do them; now "how could any man tell by the outward act what the intention of "theſe perſons was? For all that appeared, they intended only to "honour God by it in *memory of the great miracles he had wrought by* "*means of it*; and then it was ſo far from being evil, that it was "an act of *Latria* to God. And why ſhould *Hezekiah* deſtroy the "brazen Serpent, for being an occaſion of God's honour? This were "fitter for *Senacherib*, or *Rabſhakeh* to do, than one that profeſſed to "worſhip the true God: Is not incenſe uſed daily in the Temple, are "not the Altar and the veſſels of the Temple perfumed by it? Why "then ſhould the brazen Serpent be profaned by that, which ſanctifies "other things? Therefore only adviſe them to *direct their intention* "*aright*, and there can be no harm in the uſe of ſuch an indifferent

Catharin. de cultu & adorat. imaginum. p. 126.

Sander. de honorat. imaginum adorat. l. 2. *p.* 138.

Alan. Copi Dialog. 5. *p.* 662.

Vaſquez in 3. *p. diſp.* 104. *art* 3. *c.* 5.

T. G. p. 428.

‘ ceremony; and let the Brazen Serpent ſtand, to excite the devoti-
“ on of the people towards God in remembrance of what he did
“ to the people of old by the means of it. But it ſeems *Hezekiah* had not looked over *Ariſtotle*'s *Threſhold* ſo far as to know, *that acts go whither they are intended*; and therefore he took the giving of that part of worſhip which God had appropriated to himſelf, to the Brazen Serpent, to be ſufficient ground for the demoliſhing of it, without particular enquiry into the intentions of the perſons. Yet I muſt ſay for *T. G.* that he doth not ſeem ſo confident of the indifferency of this ceremony under the Law; for he ſaith, *That it is not appropriated, at leaſt in the new Law, to the worſhip of God, and therefore it is in the freedom of the Church to determine how and when it ſhall be uſed.* If he means by the new Law, the Rubricks or practiſe of their Church, he ſaith true; for incenſe is appointed to be burnt to Images and Crucifixes, and Reliques out of Religious honour to them: but if by the new Law he means the Law of Chriſt, that doth not, that I can find, make any thing that God had appropriated to himſelf, as a ſign of his own worſhip, to be common to any creature with him; but I am ſure before, that *burning of Incenſe before Images*, was accounted one of the abominations of Iſrael.

Bellarm. de ſanct. beat. l. 1. c. 13.

Ezek. 8. 9. 10, 11.

5. *Solemn Invocation was an external act of worſhip appropriated to God himſelf. My Houſe is the Houſe of Prayer*, ſaith our Saviour of the Temple; by which it appears that ſolemn Invocation was then looked on as a peculiar part of divine worſhip. But I need not prove this, ſince it is granted by our *Adverſaries*, that one ſort of *Invocation is ſo proper to God, that to give it to any beſides him were Idolatry*; which is, as *T. G.* expreſſeth it, *the Prayer we make to God as the Author and Giver of all Good*; *but a lower ſort of Invocation*, he contends, *may be given to Saints and Angels.* My buſineſs here, is not to diſcuſs the point of Invocation, (which is to be handled at large in its proper place) but to ſhew, in what ſenſe it was underſtood among thoſe to whom God gave the *Laws of his worſhip*, and whether this inferiour ſort of Invocation were thought conſiſtent with the *true worſhip of God*. We will then ſuppoſe that in the Temple of *Hieruſalem*, at the hours of prayer, the *Jews* at the ſame time, and with the ſame outward ſolemnity of worſhip, ſhould make their prayers firſt to God, *to have mercy upon them*; and then immediately to make their addreſſes to *Abraham* and *Sarah*, *Iſaac* and *Rebecca*, *Jacob* and *Joſeph*, and *Moſes*, and the *Prophets to pray for them*; whether would this have been thought agreeable to the command of worſhipping God alone? eſpecially, if theſe prayers were ſaid before the Images of thoſe perſons ſet up in the Temple: for if the Law did only forbid the worſhip of Heathen Idols, there would be no repugnancy to the Law in all this. What courſe can we now take to reſolve this Queſtion? I know but three ways of doing it. 1. By comparing this practice with the precept of worſhip. For God being to appoint the Laws and Rules of it, we are to enquire in the firſt place, what his will and pleaſure was, as to this matter; for he beſt knew what worſhip was pleaſing to him. If he hath therefore appropriated all acts of Religious worſhip to himſelf, as it is plain he hath done by that Law, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, then it is unlawful to give it to any other. If it be ſaid,

§. 11.

Luk. 19.48

T. G. p. 288

they do not give the *worſhip proper to God*; I deſire to know who ſhall judge what is the *worſhip proper to God*, He by his Law, or we by diſtinctions of our own making? Hath God himſelf made any ſuch diſtinction as this is? Hath He bid men to pray to Him *as the Author and Giver of all Good, but to Angels or Saints as Mediatours and Interceſſors to Him?* Nay, hath He not forbid it, when he commands that all Religious worſhip without diſtinction, be given to himſelf? And where the Law doth not diſtinguiſh, what preſumption is it in us to do it? 2. By the practice of the *Jewiſh* Church; and it is granted by our Adverſaries, that *there was no Invocation of Saints then uſed, becauſe,* ſay they, *the Saints were then only in Limbo, and not in their perfect happineſs, nor placed over the Church as they are now*; but the *Jews* knew of no ſuch reaſon as this to hinder them; for they believed thoſe great Saints to be in a ſtate of perfect Felicity, therefore this could be no ground to hinder them; and withal they had ſo mighty a veneration for the Patriarchs, and ſo great a dread of his Divine Majeſty, that if it had been lawful, none would have been more ready to have made uſe of them as Mediators than they; for we ſee how ready they were to entreat *Moſes* to be a Mediator between God and them; why ſhould not they have continued this after his death, if they had believed one to be as lawful as the other? But *although they did not Invocate Saints, they might do Angels*; and ſome have attempted to prove they did, although the *Jews* know of no ſuch practice among them, albeit they attribute ſo much to the Power of Angels, that nothing but the fear of Idolatry could reſtrain them; for *they believe one to be a Spirit ſet over Fire, and another over Water, another over Clouds,* &c. *as the Eaſtern Idolaters did.*

Bellarm. *de* Sanct. Beatit. *l.* 1. *c.* 19, 20. *Perron* Replic. l. 5. *p.* 981. *Suarez in* 3. *p. Th. ſo.* 2. *diſp.* 42. *ſect.* 1 *de orat.* l. 1. *c.* 10.

Deut. 5. 27.

Reuchlin. *de arte Cabaliſt.* l. 3. *Vorſtius in Maim. de Fund. legis p.* 16. 17.

But did not Jacob *pray to the Angel,* Gen. 48. 16. *the Angel that redeemed me from all evil, bleſs the lads?* No ſaith *Abarbinel, it was only a prayer to God, that had made uſe of his Angel*; for, he ſaith, *God before whom my Fathers did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me,* &c. if this were an invocation of the Angel, it was an invocation of him *as the Author and Giver of all Good*; which *T. G.* confeſſes to be Idolatry: but *Abravanel* parallels it with that ſaying of *Abraham, The Lord God of Heaven which took me from my Fathers Houſe, He ſhall ſend his Angel before thee.* But we need not run to the *Jews* to clear this place, for St. *Athanaſius* ſuppoſing it to be an Invocation, from thence proves, that it muſt be *underſtood of the Eternal Son of* God, *for,* ſaith he, Jacob *would never have joyned a Creature together with God in his prayers*: and S. *Cyrill,* more generally; *who would ever pray in the name of Angels?* And S. *Hierome* in terms as large and expreſs as may be, *Nullum invocare,* i. e. *in nos orando vocare niſi Deum debemus*; we ought *to invocate none by praying to them but God himſelf*: and from thence he proves the Wiſdom there ſpoken of could be no created Wiſdom. So that neither *Jews* nor Chriſtians did believe the Invocation of Angels to have been practiſed in the Church of *Iſrael.*

Abarb. de capite fidei c. 12. *ad dub.* 2.

Gen. 24. 7.

Athanaſ. c. Arrian Orat. 4. *p.* 464.

Cyrill. theſaur. aſſert. 20. *p.* 209.

S. Hier. in Proverb. 2.

3. In this caſe it is reaſonable to appeal to the ſenſe of *Jewiſh* Writers, who muſt be preſumed to underſtand their own cuſtoms beſt; eſpecially in reſpect to Idolatry, which they have ſuffered ſo much for; and they unanimouſly declare it to be againſt the ſenſe of the

Law, to make Saints or Angels to be Mediators between God and them. *Maimonides* makes this to be conſequent upon the precept againſt Idolatry; and makes it the fifth Fundamental of the Law; *That we ought to worſhip God alone, and to make no Mediators between God and us; neither Angels, nor Stars, nor Elements, nor any ſuch things, becauſe we ought to direct all our thoughts to God alone.* And *Abravanel* in his *Commentaries* upon the *Fundamentals* of the *Law*, ſaith, *their wiſe men interpreted that verſe,* the Lord our God is nigh unto us in all that we call upon him for, *that they ſhould only invocate God, and not* Michael *or* Gabriel, *&c.* and ſaith preſently after, *That this ſort of worſhip belongs only to God, and to none elſe, according to the ſenſe of their Wiſe-men.* *Maimonides* ſaith, *That none of the Idolaters were ever ſo mad to think there was no God beſides the Idol they worſhipped; or that the Figure they worſhipped made and governed the World; but they worſhip them as Mediators between the great God and them,* and ſo he interprets that place, *Mal.* 1. 11. *Incenſe ſhall be offered* לשמי not *Nomini meo*, but *propter me:* as *though the Incenſe they offered to their Idols were for his ſake,* and ſo it is a meer *relative Latria*: and he adds, *That the Idolaters did believe one God, but offended againſt the precept which commands Him alone to be worſhipped.* The Paraphraſe of *Jonathan* upon 1 *Kings* 18. 21. *If the Lord be God, follow Him;* renders it thus, *Is not God thy Lord? therefore ſerve Him alone: and why do ye wander after* Baalim *in which there is no profit.* But I need mention no more, ſince a Learned perſon of our Church hath proved in a ſet Diſcourſe from the ſeveral Teſtimonies of *Aben-Ezra*, *Kimchi*, *Jarchi*, *Moſes bar-Nachman*, *R. Bechai*, *Alſchech*, and others of greateſt reputation among the *Jews*, that they were guilty of Idolatry by their Law, *who believed one true God, but gave Religious worſhip to other things, as Mediators between God and them.*

Maim n. ap. Abrav. p. 7.

Abrav. de *capite fidei* **c. 12. p. 43.**

Maim. More *Nevoch.* **l. 1 c. 36.**

Veri Cultûs unitas, &c. **Auct. L. S.** *Lond.* **1643.**

6. The laſt I ſhall mention as an *appropriate act* of *divine worſhip*, is, *making Vows to God*; which the Scripture hath ſo fully declared to belong to God, as a part of divine worſhip, that our Adverſaries do not offer to deny it. For Vows are not only ſaid *to be made to God*, Numb. 30. 2. Deut. 23. 21, 23. but they are joyned with *Sacrifice* and *Oblations*, Iſa. 19. 21. And therefore *Aquinas* makes vowing one of the *proper acts of Latria*; and *Bellarmin* confeſſes, *That it an act of Religion due only to God.* Who could now have imagined, after ſuch confeſſions to have found them in the Church of *Rome* making vows to Saints as ſolemnly as to God himſelf; ſo that if ever men did condemn themſelves for Idolatry, they ſeem to do it by ſuch plain confeſſions of both parts, *viz.* that Vows are a part of the *worſhip due only to God*; and that they give *this worſhip to Creatures.* Here one would think we had them faſt; yet if we do not look to our ſelves, they will ſlip through our fingers, and eſcape. Is not, ſay I, *a Vow a part of Latria that is due only to God?* Yes, ſay our *Adverſaries, it is ſo. Do not you make Vows to Saints as formally and ſolemnly as to God himſelf*; as the *Dominicans* vow at entrance into their *Order*, as *Cajetan* ſaith, is made *Deo, Beatæ Mariæ, Beato Dominico & omnibus ſanctis? True,* ſay they, this cannot be denied. *Do not you then give to the creature the worſhip proper to God, which you confeſs to be Idolatry?* Hold, ſay they, we diſtinguiſh: *but about what?* about *making Vows to Saints together with God*; for may not we make

§. 12.

Aq. 2. 2. q. 88. 5.

Bellarm. de *cultu ſanct.* *l.* **2.** *c.* **9.**

Cajet. in Aq. ib.

a Vow to men and to God too, and who will ſay that is Idolatry? as for inſtance, may not a man Vow to *A.* and *B.* that he will give a hundred pound to an Hoſpital? here the Vow is made both to God, and to *A.* and *B.* *But here* A. *and* B. *are only witneſſes* to the Vow, but the formality of the Vow lies in the *promiſe made to God to do ſuch things for his ſervice and honour*; *and* A. *and* B.. *have no concernment in this.* But may not men *Vow obedience to Superiours*, and that is more than making them witneſſes? Very true, but then this obedience is the matter of the Vow, or the thing that is vowed; and in all Vows of obedience, there are many limitations implyed, but there are none in the Vows made to God or the Saints; but withal *they Vow to God and the Saints that they will obey their Superiours.* So that their obedience to Superiours is but the matter of the Vow made to God and the Saints. *Well then*, ſay they, *ſuppoſe we do make the Saints the object* of our *Vows* as well as *God*; yet we do not conſider the *Saints* as *rational creatures*; but as they are *Dii participativi*, as *Cajetan* and *Bellarmin* both ſay. And is not this the very anſwer of the Heathens, that they gave divine woſhip to creatures, not as creatures, but as Gods by way of participation? Is it indeed come out at laſt, that we are to look on the Saints as inferiour Deities, and on that account may give to them the *worſhip proper to God? Votum non convenit ſanctis*, ſaith *Bellarmin*, *niſi quatenus ſunt Dii per participationem.* I ſee truth may be ſmothered a long time, and kept under by violence, but it will break out at laſt, one way or other. I began to ſuſpect ſomething, when I found the Maſter of Controverſies ſpeak of the Saints being *præpoſiti Eccleſiæ* ſet *over the Church*, but I could hardly have expected to have found them owned for inferiour Deities, for what are Gods by participation but ſuch *as derive their power from God, and are employ'd by Him to take care of theſe lower things?* So he ſaith, *the Saints* do *curam gerere rerum noſtrarum*, take *care of our affairs*: and now I do not wonder to ſee them make Vows to them, or perform any other act of Religious worſhip to them as well as to God. *But after all this ado, may we not Vow to God upon a higher account, and to the Saints upon a lower?* Yes, no doubt; juſt as a man may ſwear Allegiance to his Prince upon the account of his Sovereign Authority; and to one of his Subjects, as a leſs ſovereign. For if Allegiance be peculiar to Sovereign Authority, how can it be given to any one that hath it not? And in this caſe, it is confeſſed that *Vows are a part of that worſhip which is proper only to God*; and how then can they be given to any elſe beſides Him? And *Bellarmin* confeſſeth, *That Vows in the Scriptures are alwaies taken for promiſes made to God*; *for when they were written, there was no ſuch cuſtom of vowing to Saints.* A very fair confeſſion! But how then comes that, which all the time when the Scripture was written was peculiar to God, to become common to Him and His Creatures? why may not ſacrifice be made common as well as Vows? if it be in their power to change thoſe things which God by the acknowledgement of our Adverſaries hath throughout the Scripture made peculiar to himſelf.

De ſanct. beat. l. 1. *c.* 20.

§. 13. 2. This therefore will require a farther debate, *viz. how far God's appropriating theſe Acts of worſhip to himſelf doth concern us?* For which we are to conſider.

1. That it is granted by *T. G.* to be reaſonable, that there ſhould be ſome *external acts* of *worſhip peculiar* to God; becauſe the reaſon of his worſhip is peculiar, as he is the ſupreme Lord and Governour of the world.

2. That acts of worſhip being deſigned to honour and pleaſe God, he is the fitteſt to determine what thoſe peculiar acts of worſhip ſhall be. For S. *Auguſtin* mentions that ſaying of *Socrates* as a principle of *natural reaſon*; *Unumquemque Deum ſic coli oportere, quo modo ſe ipſe colendum eſſe præceperit*; that God ought to be worſhipped according to His *own appointment*. To which himſelf adds, *That if men worſhip God againſt His Will, they do not worſhip Him, but their own imagination: and therefore they are to examine what worſhip this God doth reſerve to himſelf, and what He will allow to any other.* *Origen* embraces that ſaying of *Celſus*, *That no inferior Being ought to receive any Honour againſt the Will of the Supream: and therefore he deſires* Celſus *to prove, that thoſe Dæmons and Heroes, which had divine worſhip given them among them, ever had the conſent of the Supreme God for it; but it rather came from the ignorance and barbariſm of mankind, which by degrees fell off from the true worſhip of God.* And he inſiſts upon the demonſtration of this, as to all their *Deities*, how they can ſhew that ever God gave way they ſhould be worſhipped. Ἀπαιτοῦντες ἀπόδειξιν περὶ τοῦ δεδόσθαι αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεοῦ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι; *but we can prove*, ſaith he, *by evident arguments that it was the Will of God that all men ſhould honour the Son, as they do the Father.* *Dei honorem per Deum docemur*, ſaith *Hilary*; we underſtand how to *worſhip God by himſelf*. S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, *Let us learn to honour Chriſt as he would have us, for that is the moſt pleaſing honour, which he would have, and not that which we would give.* *S.* Peter *thought to honour Chriſt by refuſing to be waſhed, but this was not honour, but directly contrary.* Which I deſire *T. G.* to take notice of, that he may better underſtand, that *God cannot be honoured by prohibited acts of worſhip, whatever the intention of the perſon be.* But one would think this were a principle ſo reaſonable in it ſelf, that I need not vouch Authorities for it; yet we ſhall ſoon find that all theſe Authorities are no more than neceſſary.

Auguſt. de conſenſ. Evangel. l. 1. c. 18.

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 8. p. 384.

Hilar. de Trinit. l. 5. p. 54.

Chryſoſt. hom. 60. ad pop. Antioch.

3. *Acts appropriated* to the *worſhip of God* by his own *appointment*, muſt *continue ſo*, till himſelf hath *otherwiſe declared*. For who dares alter what God hath appointed? Indeed if the *peculiar acts of worſhip* had depended only on the conſent of mankind, there might have been ſome reaſon for men by common conſent to have changed the nature and ſignification of them. But ſince God by a Law hath appropriated ſome parts of worſhip to himſelf, we ought in manners to know his mind, before we give away any part of that which was once peculiar to himſelf, to any of his creatures.

4. Chriſt hath no where made it lawful to give any Acts that were before appropriate to the worſhip of God to any creature. We do acknowledge that Chriſt did take away by the deſign of his doctrine, that *external ceremonial worſhip* that was among the *Jews*; but he no where gives the leaſt intimation, that any acts which before were peculiar to God, might now be given to any elſe beſides him. Nay, inſtead of this, he lays down the ſame *Fundamental precept* of *worſhip* which was in the Law, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*; and he explains it more clearly to avoid all ambiguity in it, by expreſſing that reſtrictive particle only, which

was implyed before: His Apoſtles utterly refuſed any thing like divine honour being given to them, and when one of them after an ecſtatical manner fell down before an Angel, he was ſeverely rebuked for it, and bidden to worſhip God. So that our Adverſaries grant, that ſince the incarnation the Angels would not receive any adoration from men; it ſeems then the Goſpel is ſo far from giving any countenance to it, that it ſuggeſts a new argument againſt it.

5. The notion of Idolatry under the Goſpel, doth remain the ſame that it was before. For we find ſuch a ſin often expreſſed, and condemned, and cautions given againſt it, *Neither be ye Idolaters, as were ſome of them: wherefore my dearly beloved, flee from Idolatry*; *Little Children keep your ſelves from Idols.* What notion of Idolatry could they have, but what was the ſame, which the *Jews* had from the Law of *Moſes?* The notion of Idolatry was a new thing among the *Gentiles* who knew no harm at all in giving divine worſhip to creatures; from whence ſhould they underſtand the ſinfulneſs and the nature of it, if not from the *Law of God?* the Apoſtles pretended to give no new Law about it, and never corrected any miſtake among the *Jews* concerning it, as they did in other things; therefore the notion of Idolatry did continue the ſame, that it was before. 1 Cor. 10. 7. 14. 1 S. John 5. 21.

6. It was Idolatry among the *Jews* to give the *appropriate acts of divine worſhip* to any thing but God: which I have already proved from the words of the Law, and the concurrent Teſtimony of the *Jewiſh Writers*; and from theſe things laid together, it follows, that it is Idolatry for men now to give any of the fore-mentioned *appropriate ſigns of divine worſhip* to any thing but God: whether it be ſacrifice, or adoration, or building Temples and Altars, or burning incenſe, or invocation, or making Vows; for if all theſe were things appropriated to the worſhip of God by his Law, the uſing of theſe to any creature, *is not meer diſobedience to his Law*, but a giving to the *creature the worſhip proper to God*; which on all ſides is confeſſed to be Idolatry.

§. 14. T.G. p. 28 29. *No*, ſaith *T. G. this proves only an extrinſecal denomination of Idolatry; for if, for inſtance, God hath forbidden external adoration to be given to an Image, his prohibition of ſuch worſhip may make it indeed to be unlawful, but hinders not the Act from paſſing whither it was intended; and conſequently if it be intended or directed by the underſtanding and will to God, though after an unlawful manner, it will not fail to be terminated upon God; and the act is an act of diſobedience, or of ſome other ſin, and called Idolatry only by a Metaphorical denomination, as Idolatry is called Adultery, and the Fields are ſaid to be joyful and ſing.* For, as he ſaith elſewhere, *as no command of God can make that to be not Idolatry, which is ſo in the nature of the thing; ſo no prohibition (if there were any) could make that to be Idolatry, which hath not in it the true and real nature of Idolatry.* p. 203.

To make this matter the more clear, I ſhall here take away this cavil of *T. G.* becauſe it relates to the right ſtating of the Nature of Idolatry; which is agreed on both ſides to be, *giving to the creature the worſhip due only to God*; and the controverſie between us is this, whether on ſuppoſition that God hath prohibited the act of adoration to an Image under the notion of Idolatry; that act be real Idolatry or no? The only pretence on their ſide that it was not, was

this, *that the intention of the Perſon being to terminate his worſhip on God, and not barely on the Image, it could not be real Idolatry*; my buſineſs was to remove this pretence; which I did by this argument, *becauſe God himſelf denyes to receive it, and therefore it muſt be terminated on the creature:* the conſequence of this *T. G.* rejects *as utterly falſe, becauſe humane acts go whither they are intended, and that the prohibition of God only makes the act unlawful, and doth not hinder its going to its object.* To take off this, I undertook to ſhew, that where God hath prohibited any acts of worſhip, that worſhip ſo given cannot be ſaid *to be terminated upon him:* becauſe worſhip being as here underſtood, *an outward ſignification of honour and reſpect*, God making a rule for his own worſhip, whatever hath *diſobedience* in it, muſt *diſhonour God*; and that were a contradiction to *honour God by diſhonouring him*; and therefore God giving it the *denomination of Idolatry, mens intentions* could not excuſe them from the guilt of it. For I ſaid, whitherſoever men directed their *intention*, it is plain from *Scripture*, that *God doth interpret this kind of worſhip* to be *terminated* on the *Image*; and therefore the *Iſraelites* are ſaid *to worſhip the molten Image*, although the directed their intention to God by it. This is the ſhort and true account of the force and deſign of that diſcourſe, upon which *T. G.* makes ſuch *clamours of vanity, impertinency, changing the Queſtion, contradiction, downright Sophiſtry*, and what not? ſave only anſwering the argument contained in it. But I beſeech *T. G.* to let T. G. p. 24. &c.
me underſtand the *Sophiſtry* of this argument: for he hath not yet diſcovered any thing like it, but only that he did not, or would not *underſtand* the ſtrength and deſign of it. I will therefore do him the kindneſs to make it plainer to him.

In all *Acts* of *worſhip* there are three things to be explained. 1. The *inward intention* of the *mind.* 2. The *outward act* of *worſhip.* 3. The *paſſing* of that *outward act* according to the *inward intention*; or the *terminating* of it.

1. The *inward intention* of the mind, is either (1.) *Actual cogitation* of the *object intended*, or (2.) *Directing* the *outward act* to ſome *particular end.* As when I ſee a *picture* that puts me in mind of a Friend, the *inward intention* of the mind in the act of ſeeing is carried to the object repreſented, which is no more than *ſimple cogitation*, or *apprehenſion* of the Perſon by an *Idea* of him in my mind; but when I *kiſs* that *picture* out of the *eſteem* I have for him, the *intention of the mind* is by that outward act to ſhew the *reſpect* I have for *his* Perſon.

2. The *outward act* of *worſhip* may be conſidered two wayes. 1. *Phyſically*, and *abſtractly* from any *Law*, and ſo it depends upon the *nature* of the *intention.* 2. *Morally*, as *good* or *evil*, and ſo it receives its *denomination* from the *Law*, and not from the bare *intention* of the *Perſon*; as if a man ſteals with an *intention* of charity, the *goodneſs* of his *intention* doth not hinder the *act* from falling under the *denomination* of theft.

3. The *paſſing* of the *outward act* according to the *inward intention*, or the *terminating* of it, ſignifies no more out of theſe terms, than that it was the *intention* of the perſon who did it to *honour* God by doing it; but whether this be *really* an act of *honour* to *God* or no, is not to be judged by the *ſimple intention* of the *Doer*, but by the *Law* and *Rule* of *worſhip* which God hath given. And how can God

be *honoured* by a palpable act of *diſobedience*? and how can that *worſhip* be *terminated* as *worſhip* upon him, who hath utterly *refuſed* it? And ſuppoſing that God hath *appropriated* that *outward act* of *worſhip* to himſelf, which is given to an *Image*, this is giving the *worſhip* to a *creature*, which is proper to *God*; which T. G. cannot deny to be the *definition* of real *Idolatry*. This was the meaning and intention of my former *diſcourſe*, however *T. G.* lamentably miſtakes and perverts it.

1. *He* ſaith, *this is changing the State of the Queſtion*; how ſo? *Why*, forſooth, *my charge was of real Idolatry, and my proof is only of Metaphorical Idolatry, and by extrinſecal denomination.* What need is there that men have a care of their *words* that have to do with ſuch *Sophiſters!* All that I ſaid of *denomination*, was no more than this, *The Divine Law being the rule of worſhip, all prohibited ways of worſhip muſt receive that denomination which God himſelf gives them:* what is this to *Metaphorical Idolatry?* If I ſay that unjuſt reproaching ones neighbour, or taking away his Goods, or lying with his wife, muſt receive that *denomination* which the *Law* gives them, doth this imply that it is only *Metaphorical Theſt and Adultery, and falſe Witneſs?* I do aſſure him, I meant very *real Idolatry*, under that *denomination*; and that upon this reaſon, which I have now more largely inſiſted upon, *viz.* that it belongs to God to *appropriate acts of worſhip* to himſelf, that God having appropriated them, they become due only to him; and therefore they who do theſe acts to any beſides himſelf, do give to the *creature* the worſhip *due to God alone*, which is the very definition of *real Idolatry T. G.* contends for. But the *real Idolatry I meant*, he ſaith, *was that which was ſo antecedently to any prohibition, as appears by my contending that the Church of* Rome *doth require the giving the creature the honour due only to God.* What ſtrange arguing is this, for ſo ſubtile a Sophiſter! Would not any one that *had looked over* Ariſtotle*'s threſhold* (to uſe his own phraſe) diſcern, that if *Idolatry* doth conſiſt *in giving the creature the worſhip due only to* God, as many ways as worſhip may become due, *Idolatry* may be committed? Cannot God make any of the former *appropriate acts of worſhip* to become due only to himſelf? cannot he tye us to perform them to him? and then they become due to him: and cannot he reſtrain us from doing them to any other? and then they become due only to him: and is not then the doing of any of theſe *prohibited acts* to a *creature*, the giving to them *the worſhip due only to God?* Is the *outward act* of *ſacrifice due only to* God antecedently to a *prohibition* or no? If it be due *due* only to God *antecedently to his will*, it is always and neceſſarily *due* to him, and *to him alone*: and let *T. G.* at his leiſure prove, that *antecedently to any Law of* God, *it was neceſſary to worſhip* God *by ſacrifice, and unlawful ſo to worſhip any elſe beſides him.* If it depends on the will of God, then either it is no *Idolatry* to offer *ſacrifice* to a *creature*; and then the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs* may be offered to *Saints* or *Images*: or if it be, then *real Idolatry* may be conſequent to a *prohibition.* But he thinks he hath a greater advantage againſt me by *p. 24, 25, 26.* my ſaying, *that any Image being made ſo far the object of divine worſhip, that men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in the ſecond Commandment.* This is downright trifling; for if I ſhould ſay, that taking away a man's goods againſt his conſent is *Theft*, and *on that account* is forbidden in the *eighth*

Commandment, would any man imagine, that I muſt ſpeak of Theſt antecedent to the Command? for it implyes no more, than that it is contrary to the Command. But as it is in the caſe of Theſt, that is always a ſin, although the particular ſpecies of it, and the *denomination* of particular acts doth ſuppoſe *poſitive Laws* about *Dominion* and *Property*; ſo it is in the caſe of *Idolatry*, the general *nature* of it is always the ſame, *viz. the giving the worſhip to a creature, which is due only to God*, although the *denomination* of particular acts may depend upon poſitive *Laws*, becauſe God may *appropriate* peculiar acts of *worſhip* to himſelf, which being done by him, thoſe acts being given to a creature, receive the *denomination* of *Idolatry*, which, without thoſe *Laws* they would not have done. So that ſtill the general notion of *Idolatry*, is antecedent to poſitive *Laws*, but yet the *determination* of particular *acts*, whether they are *Idolatry* or no, do depend on the poſitive *Laws* which God hath given about his *worſhip*. And if *T. G.* had underſtood the *nature* of *human acts*, as he pretends, he would never have made ſuch trifling objections as theſe: For is it not thus, in the nature of the other ſins forbidden in the *Commandments* as well as *Idolatry*, that are ſuppoſed to be the moſt *morally evil*, antecedent to any prohibition? Suppoſe it be murder, adultery, or diſobedience to Parents; although I grant theſe things to have a general *notion* antecedently to any *Laws*; yet when we come to enquire into particular *acts*, whether they do receive thoſe *denominations* or no, we muſt then judge by particular *Laws*, which determine what acts are to be accounted *Murder*, *Adultery*, or *Diſobedience*; as whether *execution* of *malefactors* be *prohibited Murder*, whether *marrying* many *Wives* be *Adultery*, whether not complying with the *Religion* of ones *Parents* be *diſobedience*. Theſe things I mention, to make *T. G.* underſtand a little better, the *nature* of *Moral Acts*, and that a general *notion* of *Idolatry* being *antecedent* to a *prohibition*, is very conſiſtent with the determining any particular acts, (as the *worſhip* of *Images*, to be *Idolatry*) to be conſequent on that *prohibition*.

But I perceive a particular pleaſure theſe men take, to make me ſeem *to contradict my ſelf*; and here *T. G.* is at it, as wiſely as the reſt; thus blind men apprehend nothing but contradictions in the diverſity of colours by the different reflections of light; but the comfort is, that others know that it is only their want of ſight, that makes them cry out, *contradictions*. But wherein lyes this horrible *ſelf-contradiction*? Why truly it ſeems I had ſaid, *that an Image being made ſo far the object of divine worſhip that men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in the ſecond Commandment*. Well! and what then? where lyes the *contradiction*? Hold a little, it will come preſently: in the mean time *mark thoſe words, on that Account*: but I ſay, *that the worſhip which God denyes to receive, cannot be terminated on him but on the Image*. Is this the *contradiction* then? *No, not yet neither*. The conceit had need be good, it is ſo long in delivering; but at laſt it comes like a thunder-ſhower, full of *ſulphur* and *darkneſs*, with a terrible *crack*: *either I mean that this worſhip cannot be terminated on God antecedently to the Prohibition, becauſe on that account the worſhip of an Image is forbidden in the ſecond Commandment; or if it cannot be terminated on the account of the Prohibition, then it is not on that account forbidden.* What a needleſs invention was that of *Gunpowder*! *T. G.* can *blow* a man up with a *train* of conſequences from his own words, let him but have the *laying* of it. Could I ever have thought, that ſuch innocent words, as *on that account*, ſhould have had ſo much *Nitre* and *Sulphur* in them? For let any man read over thoſe words, and ſee if he can find any thing antececedent to the *prohibition* in them. For having in that place ſhewed that the words *Idolum*, *ſculptile*, *imago* are *promiſcuouſly uſed in Scripture*, I preſently add, *By which it appears, that any Image being made ſo far the object of divine worſhip that men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in this Commandment. By which it appears* (mark that) this T. G. pares off, as not fit for his purpoſe; *i. e.* from the *ſenſe* of the *word* in *Scripture that any Image being made ſo far the object of divine worſhip that men do bow down before it*; *i. e.* if men do perform that act of worſhip to an *Image* which *God* hath forbidden the doing towards it, what then? then ſay I, *it becomes an Idol*, for whatever hath divine worſhip given to it, is ſo; *and on that account*, *i. e.* of its having that *act of divine worſhip* done to it, *by bowing before it*, *it is forbidden in this Commandment*, *i. e.* it comes within the reach of that *prohibition*; the meaning of all which is no more than to ſhew, that *adoration* of *Images* is *Idolatry* by vertue of that *Commandment*. But, thus are we put to conſtrue and paraphraſe our own words, to free our ſelves either from the ignorance, or malice of our Adverſaries. But with this fetch *T. G.* ſtands and laughs through his fingers, at the trick he hath plaid me; and bids me, with a ſecret pleaſure at his notable invention, *to extricate my ſelf out of this Labyrinth*. But doth not *T. G.* remember the old woman in *Seneca*, that *thought the Room was dark*, *when ſhe loſt her ſight*, and no doubt would have pleaſed her ſelf to think ſhe left *Children* in the *dark*, when the *Sun* ſhined? I would deſire *T. G.* to look for the *Labyrinth* nearer home; for I cannot diſcern any, unleſs it ſhould be in the perplexity of his own thoughts; for I am unwilling to believe that he doth this with a deſign to *play tricks*; and to *fly-blow* my words on purpoſe to make others *diſtaſte them*. But what if after all this *Sophiſtry*, *T. G.* very mercifully yields me the thing I pleaded for, *viz. that the worſhip which God hath forbidden, cannot be* P. 29. *terminated upon himſelf*? For, he ſaith, *that if God have forbidden himſelf to be worſhipped after ſuch a manner, the giving him ſuch worſhip will be a diſhonouring of him, though the Giver intend it never ſo much for his Honour*. I ſee *T. G.* after all is a good natured man, and although he will ſhew a thouſand tricks, rather than be thought to have it forced from him, yet let him alone, and he will give as much as a man would deſire. For what could I wiſh for more, than he here grants? *Prohibited worſhip*, he grants, *is diſhonouring God, though a man intend it never ſo much for his honour: and worſhip*, he yields, *to be an external ſignification of honour*; then God is *honoured* when he is *worſhipped*; how then can he be *worſhipped* by the ſame act by which he is *diſhonoured*; for ſo he would be *honoured* by that by which he is *diſhonoured*; which comes much nearer to a *contradiction*, than any thing he charges me with. But all this while he cannot underſtand, *that this is terminating the honour due to God on the Image*: I ask him then, where that *honour* reſts? it muſt be ſome where; not on God, for he confeſſes God *is diſhonoured*, and therefore it can be no where elſe, but on the *Image*, and conſequently it is *real Idolatry*, and not meerly *Metaphorical*, or by *extrinſecal denomination*.

3. I now proceed to shew, that the *Christian Church* hath condemned those for *Idolatry* who have been guilty only of applying some *external appropriate Acts of Divine Worship* to other things besides God. §. 5. What made the *Church* of *Alexandria* be so severe with *Origen* for but holding the *Incense* in his Hands, which those about him cast from thence upon the *Altar*? yet for this he was cast out of the Church, saith *Epiphanius*. In the *Acts* of *Marcellinus*, which *Baronius* produces, he is condemned for *offering Incense* in the *Temple* of *Vesta*, out of [illegible] with *Dioclesian*; yet he was only guilty of the *external Act* of *Idolatry*, saith *Bellarmine*, having no *Infidelity* in his mind; and this was the common case of the *Thurificati*, &c. of those who *offered Incense* only out of *Fear*; and not with an *intention* to *honour* the *Idol* by it; yet these were looked on as *lapsed Persons*, and great *severities* of *Penance* were prescribed them, as appears by the *Canons* of *Ancyra*, and many others. But if there be no *external appropriate Acts of Divine Worship*; if burning *Incense* be *an indifferent Thing*, and may be used to God or the *Creature*; if *Idolatry* depends on the *intention* of the *Mind*; I desire to know, what the fault of the *Thurificati* was? For if it were lawful *to burn Incense* to a *Creature*, what harm was there in the doing it by *Marcellinus*, at the Request of the *Emperor*, if he intended it for no more than a *civil Respect* to him? *But it was in the Temple of Vesta, and therefore was Divine Worship.* Then, say I, an *Action* in it self *indifferent*, becomes *appropriate to Divine Worship*, being performed with the *Circumstances* of *Religion*; which is that I have been hitherto proving. But if *external Acts* receive their *Denomination* from the *inward intention* of the Mind, no doubt the *Jesuits* in *China* were far more in the *Right* than the *Primitive Church*; and by this Doctrine of *directing the Intention in outward Acts of Worship*, the Lives of many thousand *Martyrs* might have been sav'd. For in the *Roman Martyrology*, Decemb. 25. we find in *Nicomedia* at one time, many *thousand Martyrs* destroyed by *Dioclesian*, being met together in a *Church*, rather than they would escape by offering *a little Incense at their coming out*. The *Greek Menologie* saith, *they were twenty thousand*; too great a Number to lose their Lives for so *indifferent a Ceremony*, as T. G. accounts it; might not they, when they were bid to *offer Incense* to *Jove*, direct *their Intention* to the [illegible]; and then T. G. would assure them, *the Act must pass whither it was directed*, and it was meer Ignorance of the *nature* of *Human Acts* for Men to imagine otherwise. What great pity it is, *so saving a Doctrine* (to the *Lives* of Men, though not to the *Souls* of *Christians*) had not been known in that Age, when so many poor *Christians* suffered *Martyrdom* for the want of it. How admirably would T. G. upon his Principles have perswaded those *Christians* of *Nicomedia* to Resolution and Confidence in suffering? [illegible] "it the *Emperor* requires of you to save your Lives? [*O Sir, saith he, it is to burn Incense.*] "To burn Incense! is that a thing for you to venture your Lives for? I am ashamed of your Ignorance; what do not you know, that burning Incense at least now in the new Law *is an indifferent Ceremony, and may be used to God or the Creature?* [*O but we are required to burn Incense to Jove.*] "What, have none of you *looked over* Aristotle's *Threshold*, that you do not know, *that Actions go whither they are intended?* Well, let me give you this Advice; when you burn the Incense, direct your Intention aright to God, and my Life for yours, the Act will pass to him, and not to *Jove*, as surely as an Arrow well levell'd hits the Mark that is aimed at. I see plainly,

Epiphan. hær. 64.

Baron. A. 302. n. 90.

Bellar. de R. Pont. l. 4. c. 8.

Baron. not. in Martyrol. Rom. Decemb. 25.

T. G. p. 420.

with a *train* of conſequences from his own words, let him but have the *laying* of it. Could I ever have thought, that ſuch innocent words, as *on that account*, ſhould have had ſo much *Nitre* and *Sulphur* in them? For let any man read over thoſe words, and ſee if he can find any thing antececedent to the *prohibition* in them. For having in that place ſhewed that the words *Idolum*, *ſculptile*, *imago* are *promiſcuouſly uſed in Scripture*, I preſently add, *By which it appears, that any Image being made ſo far the object of divine worſhip that men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in this Commandment. By which it appears* (mark that) this T. G. pares off, as not fit for his purpoſe; *i. e.* from the *ſenſe* of the *word* in *Scripture that any Image being made ſo far the object of divine worſhip that men do bow down before it*; *i. e.* if men do perform that act of worſhip to an *Image* which *God* hath forbidden the doing towards it, what then? then ſay I, *it becomes an Idol*, for whatever hath divine worſhip given to it, is ſo; *and on that account*, *i. e.* of its having that *act of divine worſhip* done to it, *by bowing before it*, *it is forbidden in this Commandment*, *i. e.* it comes within the reach of that *prohibition*; the meaning of all which is no more than to ſhew, that *adoration* of *Images* is *Idolatry* by vertue of that *Commandment*. But, thus are we put to conſtrue and paraphraſe our own words, to free our ſelves either from the ignorance, or malice of our Adverſaries. But with this fetch *T. G.* ſtands and laughs through his fingers, at the trick he hath plaid me; and bids me, with a ſecret pleaſure at his notable invention, *to extricate my ſelf out of this Labyrinth*. But doth not *T. G.* remember the old woman in *Seneca*, that *thought the Room was dark*, *when ſhe loſt her ſight*, and no doubt would have pleaſed her ſelf to think ſhe left *Children* in the *dark*, when the *Sun* ſhined? I would deſire *T. G.* to look for the *Labyrinth* nearer home; for I cannot diſcern any, unleſs it ſhould be in the perplexity of his own thoughts; for I am unwilling to believe that he doth this with a deſign to *play tricks*; and to *fly-blow* my words on purpoſe to make others *diſtaſte them*. But what if after all this *Sophiſtry*, *T. G.* very mercifully yields me the thing I pleaded for, *viz. that the worſhip which God hath forbidden, cannot be*
P. 29. *terminated upon himſelf?* For, he ſaith, *that if God have forbidden himſelf to be worſhipped after ſuch a manner, the giving him ſuch worſhip will be a diſhonouring of him, though the Giver intend it never ſo much for his Honour*. I ſee *T. G.* after all is a good natured man, and although he will ſhew a thouſand tricks, rather than be thought to have it forced from him, yet let him alone, and he will give as much as a man would deſire. For what could I wiſh for more, than he here grants? *Prohibited worſhip*, he grants, *is diſhonouring God*, *though a man intend it never ſo much for his honour: and worſhip*, he yields, *to be an external ſignification of honour*; then God is *honoured* when he is *worſhipped*; how then can he be *worſhipped* by the ſame act by which he is *diſhonoured*; for ſo he would be *honoured* by that by which he is *diſhonoured*; which comes much nearer to a *contradiction*, than any thing he charges me with. But all this while he cannot underſtand, *that this is terminating the honour due to God on the Image*: I ask him then, where that *honour* reſts? it muſt be ſome where; not on God, for he confeſſes God *is diſhonoured*, and therefore it can be no where elſe, but on the *Image*, and conſequently it is *real Idolatry*, and not meerly *Metaphorical*, or by *extrinſecal denomination*.

3. I

§. 15.

3. I now proceed to ſhew, that the *Chriſtian Church* hath condemned thoſe for *Idolatry* who have been guilty only of applying ſome *external appropriate Acts* of *Divine Worſhip* to other things beſides *God.* What made the *Church* of *Alexandria* be ſo ſevere with *Origen* for but holding the *Incenſe* in his Hands, which thoſe about him caſt from thence upon the *Altar*? yet for this he was caſt out of the *Church*, ſaith *Epiphanius.* In the *Acts* of *Marcellinus*, which *Baronius* produces, he is condemned for *offering Incenſe* in the *Temple* of *Veſta*, out of *complianc* with *Diocleſian*; yet he was only guilty of the *external Act* of *Idolatry*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, having no *Infidelity* in his Mind; and this was the common caſe of the *Thurificati, viz.* of thoſe who *offered Incenſe* only out of *Fear*; and not with an *intention* to *honour* the *Idol* by it; yet theſe were looked on as *lapſed Perſons*, and great *ſeverities* of *Penance* were preſcribed them, as appears by the *Canons* of *Ancyra*, and many others. But if there be no *external appropriate Acts of Divine Worſhip*; if *burning Incenſe* be *an indifferent Thing*, and may be uſed *to God*, or the *Creature*; if *Idolatry* depends on the *intention* of the *Mind*; I deſire to know, what the fault of the *Thurificati* was? For if it were lawful *to burn Incenſe* to a *Creature*, what harm was there in the doing it by *Marcellinus*, at the Requeſt of the *Emperor*, if he intended it for no more than a *civil Reſpect* to him? *But it was in the Temple of* Veſta, *and therefore was Divine Worſhip.* Then, ſay I, an *Act* in it ſelf *Equivocal*, becomes *appropriate to Divine Worſhip*, being performed with the *Circumſtances* of *Religion*; which is that I have been hitherto proving. But if *external Acts* receive their *Denomination* from the *inward intention* of the Mind, no doubt the *Jeſuits* in *China* were far more in the *Right* than the *Primitive Church*; and by this Doctrine of *directing the Intention in outward Acts of Worſhip*, the Lives of many thouſand *Martyrs* might have been ſav'd. For in the *Roman Martyrology, Decemb.* 25. we find in *Nicomedia* at one time, many *thouſand Martyrs* deſtroyed by *Diocleſian*, being met together in a *Church*, rather than they would eſcape by offering a *little Incenſe at their coming out*: The *Greek Menology* ſaith, *they were twenty thouſand*; too great a Number to loſe their Lives for ſo *indifferent a Ceremony*, as *T. G.* accounts it; might not they, when they were bid to *offer Incenſe* to *Jove*, direct *their Intention to the Supream God*? and then T. G. would aſſure them, *the Act muſt paſs whither it was directed*; and it was meer Ignorance of the *nature of Humane Acts* for Men to imagine otherwiſe. What great pity it is, *ſo ſaving a Doctrine* (to the *Lives* at leaſt, though not to the *Souls* of *Chriſtians*) had not been known in that Age, when ſo many poor *Chriſtians* ſuffered *Martyrdom* for the want of it! How admirably would *T. G.* upon his Principles have perſwaded thoſe *Chriſtians* of *Nicomedia* to Reſolution and Conſtancy in Suffering! “What is “ it the *Emperor* requires of you to ſave your Lives? [*O Sir, ſay they, it is to burn Incenſe.*] “ To burn Incenſe! is that a thing for you to venture your Lives for? I am aſhamed of your Ignorance; what do not “ you know, that burning Incenſe at leaſt now in the new Law *is an* “ *indifferent Ceremony, and may be uſed to God or to Men*? [*O but we are* “ *required to burn Incenſe to* Jove.] “ What, have none of you *looked* “ *over* Ariſtotle's *Threſhold*, that you do not know, *that Actions go whither they are intended?* Well, let me give you this Advice; when you “ burn the Incenſe, direct your Intention aright to God, and my Life “ for yours, the Act will paſs to him, and not to *Jove*, as ſurely as an “ Arrow well levell'd hits the Mark that is aimed at. I ſee plainly,

Epiphan. hær. 64.

Baron. A. 302. n. 90.

Bellar. de R. Pont. l. 4. c. 8.

Baron. not. in Martyrol. Rom. Decemb. 25.

T. G. p. 420.

this Threſhold of Ariſtotle would have done more Service to have ſaved the *Chriſtians Lives*, than all the *Precepts* of *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*. But I find none of the *Primitive Chriſtians* had peeped through *Ariſtotle*'s *Key-hole*, much leſs had they *ſtept over his Threſhold*, unleſs they were thoſe *Philoſophical Chriſtians*, the *Gnoſticks*; for they perfectly underſtood this Principle, and ordered their *Actions* accordingly; for they had a mighty *care* of their *Intention*, and kept a good *ſound Faith* within, and for all the *outward Acts of Worſhip* among the *Gentiles*, they could do them with the *beſt* of them, and only they did by them, as they do with *Pigeons* in the *Eaſt*, they *bound* their *Intention* faſt about them, and with them then they were ſure they would *fly* to the Place they *intended* them. But why doth St. *Auguſtine* find ſuch fault with *Seneca* for complying with the *outward Acts of Worſhip* among the *Heathen Idolaters*? and with the reſt of the *Philoſophers* for the ſame things? Why doth *Aquinas* quote theſe Paſſages with *Approbation*? Did they know the *Intention* of *Seneca*, or the *Philoſophers*? Why doth *Cajetan* ſay, *That a Man that commits only the external Act of Idolatry, is as guilty as he that commits the external Act of Theft? To both which*, he ſays, *no more is neceſſary than a voluntary Inclination to do that Act*; not any *Apprehenſion* in the Mind that what he *worſhips* is *God*, nor any *Intention* to direct that *Act* only to the *Image*. Nay, why doth *Gregory de Valentia* himſelf ſay, that *outward Acts of Worſhip may be ſo proper to God, either from their own Nature, or the Conſent of Mankind, that whoſoever doth them, whatever his inward Intention be, ought to be underſtood to give the Honour proper to God to that for whoſe ſake he doth them*? And this he calls an *implicit*, *Tannerus* an *indirect Intention*, but neither of them ſuppoſe it to be either an *actual*, or *virtual Intention* of the *Mind*, but only that which may be gathered from the *outward Acts*. Nay, *T. G.* himſelf ſaith, *That on Suppoſition the Philoſophers did believe one God, and yet joined with the People in the Practice of their Idolatry, they were worthily Condemned by the Apoſtle, though but for the external profeſſion of Praying, and offering Sacrifice to their Images.* Say you ſo? and yet do *outward Acts* certainly *go whither they are intended*? Suppoſe then theſe *Philoſophers* intended to *worſhip the true God* by thoſe *Images*? were this *Idolatry* or no? if not, why were they ſo much to blame, for giving *worſhip* to the *true God* by an *Image*? which T. G. commends, *as a very good thing*. Was it the Figure of their *Images* diſpleaſed him? that could not be, for the Statue of *Jupiter Capitolinus* might as fitly repreſent *God* to them as that of an *Old Man in their Churches*; and young *Jupiter* in the *Lap of Fortune*, (an *Image Cicero* mentions) might put him in Mind of one of the moſt common *Images* in their *Church*; and by the help of a *good Intention* might be carried to a *right Object*. And why might not *Intention* do that, which their *Church* afterwards did, when it changed the *Temple* of *Hercules* to S. *Alexius*, becauſe he was called Αλεξίκακος; and that of the two *Brothers Romulus* and *Remus*, or, as *Bellarmine* ſaith, *Caſtor* and *Pollux*, to *Coſmas* and *Damianus*; and the *Pantheon* to *Omnium Sanctorum*? If there be no harm in the Thing, there could be none in the *Intention*. Or was it the *Scandal* of their *Practice*? but to whom was the *Scandal* given? it would have been rather *Scandal* among them not to have done it. So that if *a ſecret Intention doth carry the Act whither it is intended*, and it be *lawful to worſhip God by Images*, I do not ſee wherein the *Philoſophers* were to blame in complying with thoſe *outward Acts*, whoſe *Good* or *Evil*, according to *T. G.* depends upon the *Intention* of the *doers* of them.

De Civit. Dei, l. 6. *c.* 20.

De Vera Relig. c. 5.

Aq. 2. 2. *q.* 94. *art.* 2.

Greg. de Valent. de Idolol. l. 1. *c.* 1.

Tanner. to. 3. *diſp.* 5. *q.* 7. *dub.* 1.

T. G. p. 99.

Cicero de Divin. l. 2. *c.* 41.

Bellarm. de Sanct. Beat. l. 1. *c.* 20.

But if they were really to blame, it was for doing thoſe *external Acts of Worſhip* to *Creatures*, which belong only to the *worſhip* of *God*, and ſo the *Apoſtle* by condemning them, doth prove that which I intended, *viz.* that there are ſuch *peculiar external Acts* of *Divine Worſhip, that the doing of them* for the *worſhip* of a *Creature* is *Idolatry.*

§. 16. But my *Adverſary* thinks to clear the *Church* of *Rome* from the charge of *Idolatry*, by two general *Anſwers* which ſerve him and his *Brethren* on all *Occaſions*, viz. 1. *That there are two ſorts of Worſhip, one called* Latria, *or Sovereign Worſhip, which is proper to God, and another called* Doulia, *or Inferior Worſhip, that may be given to Creatures on the account of Excellencies communicated to them from God.* 2. *That the Worſhip they give to any inanimate Creatures, that have no proper Excellencies of their own is not abſolute, but a relative* Latria, *they intending thereby only to worſhip God.*

In the examining of theſe two, I ſhall clear the *laſt part* of this *Diſcourſe*, viz. 3. *How the applying the Acts of Religious Worſhip to a Creature doth make that Worſhip Idolatry.*

1. I ſhall conſider *the different ſorts of Worſhip* which *T. G.* inſiſts upon, to clear the *Church* of *Rome* from the *Practice* of *Idolatry.* T.G.p.353 *The Queſtion at preſent,* ſaith T. G. *between Dr. St. and the Church of* Rome *is not, whether Divine Worſhip be to be given to Saints (for this is abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians) but whether an Inferior Worſhip of like kind with that which is given to Holy Men upon Earth for their Holineſs, and near Relation to God, may not be lawfully given to them, now they are in Heaven? Again,* P. 355. he ſaith, *if by Religious Worſhip, I mean that Honour which is due to God alone, it is true what the Fathers ſay, that it is not to be given to the moſt excellent created Beings, but nothing at all to the Point in debate between us; if I mean that Honour of which a Creature is capable for Religion's ſake, and that Relation which it ſettleth, he will,* he ſaith, *ſhew it to be falſe, that the Fathers deny any ſuch Honour to be given to the Holy Angels or Saints: And if I prove that this Worſhip ought not to be called Religious,* he tells me from St. *Auſtin*, that *it is but a meer wrangling about Words, becauſe Religion may be uſed in other Senſes beſides that of the Worſhip due to God.* And by the help of this *diſtinction* between the *Religious Worſhip due to God*, and that of which *a Creature is capable for Religion's ſake*, he ſaith *he can clearly diſpel the Miſt I have raiſed from the Teſtimony of the Fathers, and let the Reader ſee that I have perverted their Meaning, and yet ſaid nothing to the Purpoſe.* Thus he anſwers the Teſtimonies of *Juſtin Martyr, Theophilus, Origen,* St. *Ambroſe*, (or the *Writer under his Name*) *Theodoret*, St. *Auſtin*; and if they had been a hundred more, it had been all one; they had been all ſent packing with the ſame Anſwer; let them ſay what they would, they muſt be all underſtood of *Divine Worſhip proper to God*, and not of the *Inferior Worſhip which Creatures are capable of*, which from St. *Auſtin* he calls *Doulia*; as the *former Latria.* P. 386. The whole ſtrength of *T. G.*'s Defence, as to the *Worſhip* of *Saints* and *Angels*, lies in this *ſingle diſtinction*; which I ſhall therefore the more carefully conſider, becauſe it tends to clear the *nature* of *Divine Worſhip*, which is my preſent Subject.

To proceed with all poſſible *clearneſs* in this Debate, which *T. G.* hath endeavoured to *perplex*, I ſhall, 1. Give a *true Account* of the *State* of the *Controverſie.* 2. Enquire into the Senſe of the *Fathers* about this *diſtinction* about *Sovereign and Inferior Worſhip*, whether thoſe *Acts* of *Worſhip* which are practiſed in the *Roman Church*, be only ſuch as the *Fathers* allowed.

1. For the true *State* of the *Controverſie*; which was never more neceſſary to be given, than in this Place. For, any one that only reads *T. G.* and doth not underſtand the *Practice* of the *Roman Church*, would imagine all the Diſpute between him and me were, *Whether the Saints in Heaven be capable of receiving any Honour from Men; and whether that Honour being given upon the Account of Religion, might be called Religious Honour or no?* This were indeed *to wrangle about Words*, which I perfectly hate. I will therefore freely tell him how far I yield in this Matter, that he may better underſtand where the difficulty lies.

1. I yield, that the *Saints* in Heaven do deſerve *real Honour* and *Eſteem* from us; and I do agree with Mr. *Thorndike*, whoſe Words he cites therein, *That to diſpute whether we are bound to Honour the Saints, were to diſpute whether we are to be Chriſtians, or whether we believe them to be Saints in Heaven.* For on ſuppoſition that we believe, that the greateſt *Excellencies* of Mens Minds come from the *Grace* of *God*, communicated to Men thro' *Jeſus Chriſt*; and we are aſſured that ſuch *Perſons* now in Heaven were poſſeſſed of thoſe *Excellencies*, it is impoſſible we ſhould do otherwiſe than *Eſteem* and *Honour* them. For *Honour* in this Senſe, is nothing elſe but the *due Apprehenſion* of another's *Excellency*; and therefore it muſt be greater, or leſſer, according to the nature and degree of thoſe *Excellencies*. Since therefore we believe the *Saints* in Heaven are poſſeſſed of them in a higher degree than they were on Earth, our Eſteem of them muſt increaſe according to the meaſure of their *Perfections*.

2. That the *Honour* we have for them may be called *Religious Honour*, becauſe it is upon the account of thoſe we may call *Religious Excellencies*, as they are diſtinguiſhed from meer *Natural Endowments* and *Civil Accompliſhments*. On which Account I will grant, that is not properly *civil Honour*, becauſe the *Motive* or *Reaſon* of the *one* is really different from the *other*. And although the whole *Church* of Chriſt in Heaven and Earth make up one *Body*, yet the Nature of that *Society* is ſo different from a *Civil Society*, that a different *Title* and *Denomination* ought to be given to the *Honour* which belongs to either of them; and the *Honour* of thoſe of the Triumphant Church may the better be called *Religious*, becauſe it is an *Honour* which particularly deſcends from the *object* of Religion, *viz. God* himſelf as the *Fountain* of it; as *Civil Honour* doth from the *Head* of a *Civil Society*.

3. That this *Honour* may be expreſſed in ſuch *outward Acts* as are moſt agreeable to the *Nature* of it. And herein lies a conſiderable difference, between the *Honour* of Men for *natural* and *acquired Excellencies*, and *Divine Graces*, that thoſe having more of *Humane Nature* in them, the *Honour* doth more directly redound to the *Poſſeſſor* of them; but in *Divine Graces* which are more immediately conveyed into the Souls of Men, through a *ſupernatural Aſſiſtance*, the *Honour* doth properly belong to the *Giver* of them. Therefore the moſt agreeable Expreſſion of the *Honour* of *Saints* is ſolemn *Thankſgiving to God* for them: For thereby we acknowledge the true *Fountain* of all the *Good* they did or received. However, for the Incouragement of Men to follow their Examples, and to perpetuate their Memories, the Primitive *Chriſtians* thought it very fitting to meet at the *Places* of their *Martyrdom*, there to *praiſe God* for them, and to perform other *Offices*

of *Religious Worſhip to God*, and to obſerve the *Anniverſary* of their *Sufferings*, and to have *Panegyricks* made to ſet forth their *Vertues*, to excite others the more to their *Imitation*. Thus far I freely yield to *T.G.* to let him ſee what pitiful Cavils thoſe are, *That if Men deſerve Honour for natural or ſupernatural Endowments, ſurely the Saints in Heaven much more do ſo*: Who denies it? We give the *Saints* in *Heaven* the *utmoſt Honour* we dare give, without robbing *God* of that which belongs only to him.

Which is that of *Religious Worſhip*, and conſiſts in the *Acknowledgments* we make of *God's Supream Excellency* together with his *Power* and *Dominion* over us: And ſo *Religious Worſhip* conſiſts in two Things. 1. Such external *Acts* of *Religion* which *God* hath *appropriated* to himſelf. 2. Such an *inward Submiſſion* of our *Souls*, as implys his *Superiority* over them: And that lies, as to *Worſhip*, 1. In *Prayer* to him for what we want. 2. In *dependance* upon him for *Help* and *Aſſiſtance*. 3. In *Thankfulneſs* to him for what we receive.

Prayer is a *ſignification of Want, and the expreſſion of our Deſire of obtaining that which we need*: And whoſoever *begs* any thing of *another*, doth in ſo doing, not only acknowledge his own *Indigency*, but the other's *Power* to *ſupply* him: Therefore *Suarez* truly obſerves from *Aquinas*, *That as Command is towards Inferiors, ſo is Prayer towards Superiors: Now to this*, ſaith he, *two Things are requiſite*, 1. *That a Man apprehends it is in the Power of the Superior to give what we ask*. 2. *That he is willing to give it, if it be asked of him*. The *expectation* of the *Performance* of our *Deſire* is that we call *Dependance* upon him for *Help* and *Aſſiſtance*; and our Acknowledgment of his doing it, is *Thankfulneſs*.

Suarez de Virtut. Relig. To. 2. l. 1. c. 3.

Now if we conſider *Prayer* as a part of *Religious Worſhip*, we are to enquire on what Account it comes to *be ſo*; not as tho' thereby we did *diſcover* any thing to God which he did not know before, nor as tho' we hoped to *change his Will* upon our *Prayer*; but that thereby we profeſs our *Subjection* to him, and our *dependance* on him for the *ſupply* of our *Neceſſities*. For although *Prayer* be looked on by us as the *Means* to obtain our *Requeſts*, yet the *Conſideration* upon which that becomes a *Means*, is, that thereby we *expreſs* our moſt *humble dependance* upon *God*. It being the *difference* obſerved by Gul. *Pariſienſis* between *Humane* and *Divine Prayer*; that *Prayer among Men is ſuppoſed a Means to change the Perſon to whom we pray; but Prayer to God doth not change him, but fits us for receiving the things prayed for*. This one Conſideration is of greater importance towards the Reſolution of our preſent Queſtion than hath been hitherto imagined: For the Queſtion of *Invocation*, doth not depend ſo much upon the *Manner* of obtaining the thing we deſire, *i. e. whether we pray to the Saints to obtain things by their Merits and Interceſſions*, which is allowed and contended for by all in the *Roman Church*; or *whether it be, that they do beſtow the things themſelves upon us*, which they deny: But the true State of the Queſtion is this, *whether by the manner of Invocation of Saints which is allowed and practiſed in the* Roman *Church, they do not give that Worſhip to Saints, which is only peculiar to God*? Now we are farther to conſider, wherein that *Act* of *Worſhip* towards *God* doth lie; which is not in an *Act* of the *Mind* whereby we apprehend *God* to be the *firſt and independant Cauſe of all Good*; but in an Act of *dependance* upon him for the *obtaining* that Good we ſtand in need of. For a Man may *apprehend God* to be the *firſt Author of all Good*, and yet make no *Prayer* to him, nor uſe the *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip*;

Gul. Pariſ. Rhet. Div. c. 2.

Worſhip; becauſe he may ſuppoſe that *God* may have committed the Care of Humane Affairs to *Inferior Deities*, and therefore all our *Addreſſes* and *Acts* of *Worſhip* are to be performed to them: On this Account the *Worſhip* proper to *God* muſt lie in *dependence* upon him as the *ſole Author* of all *Good* to us; and this to be expreſſed by our *ſolemn Invocation* of him. For although the *internal Deſire* be ſufficiently known to *God*; yet the *neceſſity* of *external Religious Worſhip*, and owning this *dependance* upon *God* to the World, doth require the Expreſſion of it, by *outward Duties* and *Offices of Religion*, in ſuch a Manner, that our ſole *Dependance* upon *God* be underſtood thereby.

§. 17. Now the Queſtion between T. G. and me is this, whether the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the *Roman Church* in the *Invocation* of *Saints* and *Angels* be conſiſtent with the *Acknowledgement* of our *ſole dependence upon God for all our Bleſſings?* The *Doctrine* of their *Church* is thus delivered by himſelf, in the Words of the *Council* of *Trent*, *It* T.G.p.334 *is good and profitable for Chriſtians humbly to invocate the Saints, and to have recourſe to their Prayers, Aid, and Aſſiſtance, whereby to obtain Benefits of God, by his Son our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.* Where we take notice of the Phraſe *ſuppliciter invocare*, to *invocate* them after the manner of *Suppliants*, and that not only *voce*, but *mente*, with *Words*, but *mental Prayers* as the *Council* adds, which Words ſeem to be put on purpoſe to diſtinguiſh it from that Office of *Kindneſs* in one Man to *another*, when he deſires him to *pray for him*; for this is as much as they would uſe concerning the *Saints* in Heaven *praying to God*, that they do *ſuppliciter invocare*; this *Phraſe* then doth not limit the *ſignification* of this *Invocation* to be no more than *praying to the Saints to pray for us.* For a Man doth, I ſuppoſe, anſwer the *ſignification* of that *Phraſe* by *praying to them to give*, rather than by *praying to them to pray*; for the *one* imports more the *humility of a Suppliant* than the *other* doth. And if there had been apprehended any danger of *praying to them as the givers of Bleſſings*, it is not to be imagined, but ſo *wary* a *Council* would have expreſſed it, as it was moſt eaſie to have done; and moſt neceſſary to avoid that danger, if they had had any regard to the good of Mens Souls? And that Man muſt have an Underſtanding indeed of a very common Size, than can apprehend that the *Council* of *Trent* diſallowed the *praying to Saints as the givers of Bleſſings*, which was known to be practiſed in their *Church*, when they commend the *humble Invocation of Saints*, without the leaſt Cenſure of that *manner* of *praying to them.* Nay farther, which puts the Matter out of diſpute, with all who do not wilfully blind themſelves, the *Council* of *Trent* commends *the making recourſe*, not only *to the Prayers of the Saints*, but *to their Aid and Aſſiſtance*: What doth this *Aid* and *Aſſiſtance* ſignifie, as diſtinct from *Prayers*, and expreſſing ſomewhat beyond them? (or elſe thoſe Words were very weakly inſerted in ſuch a Place, where they are ſo liable to Miſconſtruction) unleſs it be that which they *pray* for to them, *viz. That they would Help, Comfort, Strengthen and Protect them.* Of which ſort of *Prayers* I produced ſeveral Inſtances in their moſt *Authentick Offices.* And T.G.p.399 what ſaith T. G. to this? Why truly, *Theſe Forms of Prayer to Saints cannot be denied to be in uſe among them, but yet the Senſe of them is no more than praying to them to pray for them, and this is only varying the*

the Phraſe, to ſay to the Bleſſed Virgin pray for me, or help me, and comfort me, and ſtrenghthen me O bleſſed Virgin. But I asked him, whence muſt People take the Senſe of theſe Prayers, if not from the *ſignification of the Words*? He anſwers, *Not meerly from* Lily's *Grammar Rules, but from the Doctrine of the Church delivered in her Councils and Catechiſms, and from the common uſe of ſuch Words and Expreſſions among Chriſtians.* P. 407. I am content with this way of interpreting the *Senſe* of theſe *Prayers*, provided that a *generally received Practice*, never condemned by their *Councils*, but rather *juſtified* by them, and a *Doctrine* agreeable to that *Practice*, *allowed* and *countenanced* in that *Church*, be thought a ſufficient *Means* to interpret the *Senſe* of theſe *Prayers.* And to make the Matter more plain, beſides the *Prayers* already mentioned, I ſhall give only a *Taſte* of ſome few of thoſe which are recommended to the *Uſe* of the *devout Perſons* of their *Church*, in the *Manuals* and *Offices* which are now allowed them in our own Language: In which we may be ſure, they would be careful to have nothing they thought *ſcandalous*, or *repugnant* to the *Doctrine* or *Practice* of their *Church*. In the *Manual* of *Godly Prayers*, which hath been often printed, (and once very lately) I find theſe Words under the Title of *A Moſt Devout Commendation to our Moſt Bleſſed Lady.*

> O *moſt Singular, moſt Excellent, moſt Beautiful, moſt Glorious, and moſt Worthy Mother of God, moſt Noble Queen of Heaven, and moſt entirely Beloved, and moſt Sweet Lady, and Virgin* Mary; *ſo often from the bottom of my Heart I do ſalute thee, as there be in Number Angels in Heaven, drops of Water in the Sea, Stars in the Firmament, Leaves on the Trees, and Graſs on the Earth. I do ſalute thee in the Union of Love, and by the Bleſſed and moſt ſweet Heart of thy moſt dear Son, and of all that Love thee, I do Commend and Aſſign my ſelf unto thee, as to my dear Patroneſs, to be thy proper and loving Child. And farther, I humbly beſeech thee, O Bleſſed Lady, that thou wilt vouchſafe to entertain and receive me, and obtain of thy dear Son, that I may be wholly thine, and thou, next unto God, may be wholly mine, that is, my Lady, my Joy, my Crown, and my moſt Sweet and Faithful Mother.* Amen.

Lily's Grammar, I confeſs, will not help us out here; nor the *Conſtruing Book* neither: I do not think any *Rules* will do it. It muſt be a *ſpecial Gift of Interpreting*, that can make any one think, that no more is meant by all this, but to *pray to the Bleſſed Virgin to pray for them.* In the ſame *Manual* I find another *Recommendation* to the *Virgin Mary*, in theſe Words,

> O *my Lady, Holy* Mary, *I recommend my ſelf into thy bleſſed Truſt, and ſingular Cuſtody, and into the Boſom of thy Mercy, this Night and Evermore, and in the hour of my Death, as alſo my Soul and my Body; and I yield unto thee all my Hope and Conſolation, all my Diſtreſs and Miſeries, my Life and the End thereof; that by thy moſt holy Interceſſion, and by thy Mercies, all my Works may be directed and diſpoſed, according to thine, and thy Son's Will.* Amen.

I confeſs, *Interceſſion* is here mentioned; but withal it is plain that is not the only thing relied upon, for *her Merits* are immediately added; and whatever Ground it be upon, it ſeems, it is not only *lawful*, but a *devout thing* to *commit Soul and Body to her Truſt and Cuſtody, both in Life and Death.* What could have been ſaid more to the *Eternal Son of God,* than is contained in this *Commendation* to the *Bleſſed Virgin* in all the Expreſſions of it? In another *Prayer* to her, which is not only in the *Manual*, but in the *Primer*, or *Office of the Bleſſed Virgin*, and is too long to repeat, we have this beginning.

> *I beſeech thee, O holy Lady* Mary, *Mother of God, moſt full of Pity, the Daughter of the Higheſt King, Mother moſt Glorious, Mother of Orphans, the Conſolation of the Deſolate, the way of them that go aſtray, the ſafety of all that truſt in thee, a Virgin before Child-bearing, a Virgin in Child-bearing, and a Virgin after Child-bearing, the fountain of Mercy, the fountain of Health and Grace, the fountain of Conſolation and Pardon, the fountain of Piety and Gladneſs, the fountain of Life and Forgiveneſs.*

I am now got from *Lily*'s *Grammar* to *Ariſtotle*'s *Threſhold*: And I deſire to know of *T. G.* whether theſe *Expreſſions* are true or falſe? Is the *Bleſſed Virgin* all theſe things, or not? If they be not true, they are *horrible Blaſphemies*: If they be true, to what Purpoſe is it to talk of *praying to her to pray for us*? for why may not I go directly to the *fountain of Mercy, Grace* and *Pardon*? what needleſs trouble were it to pray her, to pray for that which is in her own Hands to beſtow? In another *Prayer* following that, are theſe Expreſſions to the *Bleſſed Virgin.*

> *Bow down thine Ears, O Mother of Pity and Mercy, unto my poor Prayers, and be to me, wretched Sinner, a piteous helper in all things.*

And preſently after to our *Lady* and St. *John* together.

> *O ye two Heavenly Gems,* Mary *and* John*! O two Divine Lamps ever ſhining before God! drive away, with your bleſſed Beams, the dark Clouds of my Sins.*———*To you, I moſt wretched Sinner, commend this Day, my Body and Soul, that in every hour and moment inwardly and outwardly, ye would vouchſafe to be my ſure Keepers and pitiful Interceſſors to God for me.*

Here we have *Interceſſion* again, but that is not all, nor the main thing; for *Cuſtody* is more than *Interceſſion*; and that is firſt *begged*, and then *Interceſſion*. So that if ever any *Prayers* were made to *Creatures* for thoſe *things*, which *God* alone can *give*, theſe were; and ſo as to imply our *dependance* on them for the *obtaining* of them. Theſe may ſuffice for a *taſte* of their preſent and allowed *Devotions* among them here at home, in *Books* of *daily uſe*.

And now I beſeech *T. G.* to tell me, what there is in the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome*, which makes it neceſſary for me to put ſo forced a *Senſe* upon all theſe Expreſſions, that they do mean no more *than praying to the Bleſſed Virgin to pray for them!* As *Lily*'s *Grammar* will not explain the *Senſe*, ſo no *Rhetorick* I ever ſaw, will make me underſtand the *Figure*.

How often have we been railed at, for underſtanding Words in a *figurative Senſe*, which cannot be *literally* underſtood, without overthrowing the plaineſt evidence of *Senſe* and *Reaſon*; and which by the cuſtomary *modes* of *Speaking* among all Nations, attributing the thing ſignified to the Sign, and by other Places of *Scripture* and *Fathers*, we prove ought to be no otherwiſe underſtood? But here is a *ſtrange Figure* invented againſt the plain and natural *Senſe* of the *Words*, for by *praying to beſtow muſt be underſtood only praying to pray*: And that when thoſe *Titles* are at the ſame time given, which ſuppoſe it *in their power to give*; and when there is no imaginable *neceſſity* from any *Doctrine* of their *Church* to put this *Senſe* upon thoſe Words. For what *Article* of their *Creed*, what *Decree* of their *Church*, what *Doctrine* of their *Divines* doth it contradict, for any Man *to pray directly to the Virgin* Mary, *for the deſtruction of Heresies, ſupport under Troubles, Grace to withſtand Temptations, and reception to Glory*? And what can we beg for more from *God* himſelf? Yet I challenge *T. G.* to ſhew, which of all theſe, ſuch *Prayers* are *repugnant* to? And if to none of them, why ſhould not the *Words* be underſtood as they properly ſignifie? Nay, it were eaſie to ſhew, that ſuch Prayers are very agreeable not only to the *Doctrine* of the *Council* of *Trent*, but of their moſt *Eminent Divines*, both before and after it. But this were to go beyond the Bounds of this *General Diſcourſe*; which is deſigned only to *ſtate* the *Nature* of *Divine Worſhip* between us and them. Yet I cannot but take notice of the *Way*, T. G. ſaith, *the People are inſtructed by, to make this to be the Senſe of Praying to Give*, i. e. *Praying to Pray.* 1. He ſaith, the *common Doctrine of Chriſtianity, by which they are taught that God alone is the giver of all good things*: And doth not the ſame common Doctrine of *Chriſtianity* teach Men *to pray to him* alone, for what *he only can give*? and not to uſe ſuch *bold* and *abſurd Figures* in *Prayer*, whoſe plain ſenſe is contrary to this *common Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity*. But I wonder that *T. G.* ſhould think this an *effectual Way* to make them underſtand the *Prayers* in this ſenſe, when himſelf hath ſhewed them the Way to reconcile this *common Doctrine* to their *Practice*; and the *form* of the *Words*. For may not *Giving* be *diſtinguiſhed* as well as *Worſhip*? It is true, *God* alone is the *Original Giver of all good Things*, and this is *a Sovereign way of Giving, peculiar to God*; but there is *an inferior and ſubordinate way of Giving by a Power derived from God, and this is all*, ſay they, *we attribute to the Saints*; and how now doth the *common Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity* teach People more effectually, that *God alone is the Giver of all things*, than that *God alone is to be worſhipped*? I am ſure the *Scripture* ſaith one as often, and in as plain terms as it can do the other. *But*, 2. He ſaith, *their Sermons, Catechiſms and Explications both by word and writing do it*; ſuppoſe ſome Perſons do it, I ask, *by what Authority*? their *Church* having never declared againſt *an inferior way of giving in the Saints*, and having expreſly owned the *making recourſe to them for their Help and Aſſiſtance*, as well *as their Prayers*. I deſire *T. G.* in good earneſt to tell me, what makes him ſo concerned, to have all the *Prayers* underſtood in that Senſe, *of praying to the Saints to pray for them* againſt the *expreſs Senſe* of the Words? Is there any *harm* in the other *Senſe* or not? If there be no *harm*, why may they not be ſo *underſtood*, without ſo much Force and Violence offered to them? If there be any *harm*, what is it? *Idolatry* or not; if only *Scandal*, why were they not put in other Words? If *Idolatry*, then *T. G.* himſelf charges them

T.G.*p*.407

with *Idolatry* that underſtand their *Prayers* by *Lily*'s *Grammar*, unleſs he thinks it much better for them not *to underſtand them* at all. But I ſhall beg the *Favour* of one of their *Church-Dictionaries* to interpret this late *Ode* of *Rapin* to the *Lady* of *Loretto*, ſo as to make me conſtrue it to be only *praying to her to pray for them.*

Renat. Rapini Odarum liber p. 46. Pariſ. 1670.

Ad Divam Virginem Lauretanam.

Diva, quam rebus trepidis benignam
Rure Piceno veneratur Orbis,
Cui ſuos ſternit facilis moveri
Adria fluctus:
Si qua Paſtoris tibi Vaticani
Cura, vel Sacri ſupereſt Ovilis,
Italis Thracem procul inquietum
Finibus arce.
Si faves totis trepidabit undis
Boſphorus, rupes Scytica pavebunt,
Turca pallebit, timidumque cornu
Luna recondet.
Namque te dudum pelagi potentem
Non ſemel verſo tremuere ponto
Merſa Threiſſi, rate diſſipata
Arma Tyranni.
Ne tibi fidem pavor ille gentem
Angat, aut ſævis male turbet armis
Quos tuis læti meditamur aris,
Ponere honores.

If this be not making a *Goddeſs* of her, ſurely the *Heathen Poets* never made one of *Minerva*; and yet I hope *Rapin*, a *Jeſuit* and a *Scholar*, did well enough *underſtand* what was agreeable to the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the *Church* of *Rome.*

§. 18. Yet ſuppoſing *T. G*'s *Senſe* were all that were underſtood by the *Church* of *Rome* in this Matter, it doth not acquit them from giving *Religious Worſhip*, which *Invocation* imports to ſomething elſe beſides *God*. For let us ſuppoſe that the *Arrians* only looked on *Chriſt* as *a powerful Interceſſor with God*, and on that Account did in their publick *Offices of Religion* make their ſolemn *Addreſſes* to him *to intercede and pray for them to God*; were this giving him any part of *Divine Worſhip* or no? Eſpecially when performed with all the *external Acts of Adoration* which are proper to *God*. If this were not any part of *Divine Worſhip*, the *Fathers* were extreamly out in their Proofs, *That Chriſt could be no Creature, becauſe the external Act of Adoration was given to him*; if it were a part of *Divine Worſhip*, then thoſe in the *Church* of *Rome* do give it to a *Creature*, when with all the ſolemn *Acts* of *Devotion* they pray to *Saints*, which they uſe to *God* himſelf, although it be only to be *Interceſſors* with *God* for them, eſpecially when they do not only *pray thus to them*, but *rely upon them* for their *Help* and *Aſſiſtance*, and *return Thanks* to them when they receive the *Bleſſings* they prayed for. Would not the *Fathers* have called this *bringing in Polytheiſm*, and *reviving the ancient Idolatry of the Heathens*? Since the great *Principle of*

Chriſtianity they ſaid was, *the reſerving all parts of Religious Worſhip to God alone.* Nay, ſome of the *Writers* of the *Roman Church* have been ſo ingenuous in this Matter to confeſs, *That if the modern Practice of Invocation of Saints had been introduced in the Apoſtolical Times, it would have looked too like the introducing of Gentiliſm again. Franciſcus Horantius* in his *Anſwer* to *Calvin*'s *Inſtitutions*, confeſſes, *That Invocation of Saints was not expreſly commanded under the Goſpel*, nè gentiles converſi crederent ſe iterum ad cultum terrigenarum trahi, *leſt the Gentile Converts ſhould believe that they were again drawn to the Worſhip of Creatures:* which Words he had borrowed from *Eccius*, and the ſame are repeated by *Harpſfield. Martinus Pereſius Ayala*, a learned *Spaniſh Biſhop*, aſſigns this for the Reaſon, *Why he could meet with no Footſteps either of the Invocation, or Interceſſion of Saints, before the Time of* Cornelius *Biſhop of* Rome, viz. *That the Apoſtles would have been thought to have made themſelves Gods, if they had delivered the Doctrine of Invocation and Interceſſion of Saints.* By which we ſee, theſe Perſons did truly apprehend a great affinity between their Practice of *Invocation* of *Saints*, and the *Heathen Idolatry*; or elſe there was no danger one ſhould be miſtaken for the other. And although *T. G.* tells us, *He never met with any Catholick ſo ignorant, as not to underſtand the Senſe of their Prayers to be to deſire the Saints to help them with their Prayers*; yet I meet with ſome Men who underſtood *Catholicks* as well as *T. G.* and yet do give a quite different Account of them. For the ſame *Spaniſh Biſhop* thinks *the People had great need to be better inſtructed in this Matter of Worſhip, leſt*, ſaith he, *they make Gods of the Saints*, nam multos inveni in hac parte, non ſatis Chriſtianè inſtitutos; *I have found many not well inſtructed in this Matter:* It ſeems not only the People committed *Idolatry*, but their *Teachers* did not inſtruct them well enough to avoid it. And *Ludov. Vives* was not ſo lucky a Man as *T. G.* for he ſaith, *That many Chriſtians do moſt times offend in a Good Thing* (i. e. *giving Honour to Saints) for*, he ſaith, *they Worſhip them no otherwiſe than they do God; neither do I find in many Things any difference between their Opinion of the Saints, and the Heathens of their Gods.* T. G. takes notice of this Paſſage of *Vives*, and blames me for leaving out *in re bona, in a Thing good in it ſelf*; let him make as much of this as he pleaſe, for it only ſhews that he was a *through Papiſt*, although he charged the People with the *downright Practice of Idolatry*: And if it only implies an *Error* and *Abuſe in Practice*, yet he ſhews both theſe were too common among them, and that the *Catholicks* in his Time were not *ſo wiſe* as thoſe *T. G.* hath met with. But it may be he means no more than that *if they be asked the Queſtion in their Catechiſm, they anſwer it as he ſaith*; which is as good a way to free them from the Practice of *Idolatry*, as if a Man ſhould be ſuſpected of *Adultery*, and *T. G.* ſhould anſwer for him, that cannot be, for he underſtands better than ſo, for when I asked him the *Commandments*, he ſaid, *he ought not to commit Adultery. Polydore Virgil*, was not ſo happy as *T. G.* for ſpeaking of the *ſolemn Rite of Supplication* when the *Images of Saints are carried in Proceſſion*, he ſaith, *I fear, I fear we rather pleaſe the Heathen Gods than Chriſt by ſuch Practices; which without all queſtion*, he ſaith, *was taken from the Heathen Cuſtoms.* And what he ſaith *of the Worſhip of Images*, is as true as that of *Saints*, *that the People were arrived to that degree of Madneſs, that their Worſhip differed very little from Idolatry. Caſſander* ſaith, *That the People truſted ſo much to the Patronage and Interceſſion of the Saints*, *whom*

Franc. Horant. Loc. Catholic. l. 3. p. 127. Ed. Ver.

Cop. Dialog. 3.

Martin. Pereſ. Ayal. de Tradit. part. 3. p. 105.

T. G. p. 399

Lud. Viv. in Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 8. c. 27.

T. G. p. 436

Polyd. Virg. de Invent. Rer. l. 6. c. 11.

c. 13.

Caſſand. conſult. art. 21.

whom they worſhipped with dull, not to ſay profane Ceremonies, that they hoped
for the pardon of their Sins, although they did not amend their Lives, on the
account of their Interceſſion for them; and that they truſted more to them,
eſpecially to the bleſſed Virgin, than to Chriſt himſelf. And *that what Interpretations*
ſoever ſome Men put upon thoſe Titles of the Queen of Heaven,
Mother of Mercy, &c. *the Common People did not underſtand them according*
Eraſm.Ec-cleſ. l. 2. *to their Senſe of them.* Nay, *Eraſmus* goes farther, ſaying, *That their*
very Preachers worſhipped the Bleſſed Virgin with more Religion, or Devotion,
than they did Chriſt himſelf, or his Holy Spirit, calling her the Mother
of Grace. By all which we ſee, that the *Doctrine* of *Divine*
Worſhip is not ſo clearly ſtated by them, but that the more Ingenious
Men, who have lived and died in the Communion of that *Church*,
have thought not only the *People*, but the *Teachers* very much to
blame in it.

§. 19. 2. My Buſineſs now is, to give an Account of the *Senſe* of the
Fathers in this Diſpute about the *Notion* of *Divine Worſhip*; not to
handle particularly the *Teſtimonies* of the *Fathers* in diſpute between
us, which belongs to the *Queſtion* of *Invocation* of *Saints*, but to ſhew,
that they went upon the ſame *Principles* I have here laid down, in
the *diſtinction* between the *Honour* and the *Worſhip* of them; and while
they ſpeak moſt for the *Honour of the Saints*, they deny any *Religious*
Worſhip to be performed to them.

Origen, in the beginning of his Book againſt *Celſus*, makes that to
Orig. c. Celſ. l. 1. p. 10. be *the Property of the Doctrine of Chriſt, that God only was to be worſhipped,*
but that other might be τιμῆς ἄξια, ȣ̓ μὲν ϗ προσκυνήσεως ϗ σεβασμȣ͂, *worthy of*
Honour, but not of Worſhip. And in another Place he ſpeaks as plainly
as Words can expreſs his Meaning; *Although,* ſaith he, *we ſhould*
L. 8. p. 416. *believe that Angels were ſet over theſe Things below, yet we only Praiſe and*
Magnifie them; but all our Prayers are only to be made to God, and not
to any Angel; and only Jeſus Chriſt is to offer up our Prayers to God;
L. 5. p. 233 and leſt any ſhould imagine he meant only ſome kind of Prayers,
he ſaith expreſly πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν, ϗ προσευχὴν ϗ ἔντευξιν, *all Prayer, and Sup-*
P. 238. *plication, and Interceſſion*; And ſaith, *That we ought not to pray to them*
who pray for us. But now what ſaith *T. G.* to theſe Places, which
(excepting the firſt) I had objected againſt the *Practice* of *Invocation*
of Saints and Angels in my former Diſcourſe? Why, truly he
T. G. p. 361 ſaith, *That* Origen*'s meaning is partly, that we are not to pray to them in*
the ſame manner that we do to God: But we may pray to them after another
manner. But is that *inferior ſort of Prayer, Prayer* or not? When we
deſire them *to pray for us,* is not that deſiring their *Interceſſion* for us?
But *Origen* denies, that *any Prayer* is to be made to them, or any one
to *be prayed to,* although it be only *to intercede with God for us,* but only
the *Son of God.* I remember an anſwer of a devout *Servant* of the
Bleſſed Virgin much like this of *T. G.* For when it was objected,
That ſhe could not be the Mother of Redemption for mankind, becauſe it is
ſaid, Iſa. 63. 3. *I have trodden the Wine-preſs alone, and of the People*
there was no Man with me. True, ſaith he, there is *no Man* with thee,
Ricard. de Laud. Mariæ l. 2. p. 2. but there might be *a Woman* for all that. So doth *T. G.* deal with
the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, let them be never ſo expreſs againſt
all ſorts of Prayers and Invocations, they hold only of *ſuch a ſort* of *Prayer,*
but there may be *another* and *inferior ſort notwithſtanding.* But is
there *any ſort* that is not Comprehended under *all*? And that *Ori-*
gen

gen cannot be underſtood in theſe Paſſages of ſuch *Prayer* only as ſuppoſeth the *Supream Excellency in God*, moſt evidently appears by the Diſpute between *Celſus* and him, which was not about the *Worſhip* of the *Supream God*, but of *Inferior Spirits* and *Miniſters* to him, as hath been fully proved already.

The *Church* of *Philomelium* in that noble *Teſtimony* concerning the *Martyrdom* of *Polycarp*, makes the ſame *diſtinction* between *Honour* and *Worſhip*; for they utterly deny giving any *Worſhip* to a *Creature*, as inconſiſtent with *Chriſtianity*; but at the ſame time, they confeſs *the Honour and Eſteem they had for the Martyrs*, which they expreſſed by *meeting at the Places of their Martyrdom, keeping their Anniverſary Days*, and *recommending their Examples to the Imitation of others*. *Euſeb.hiſt. Eccleſ.l.4. c.15.*

In the former *Diſcourſe* I produced the *Teſtimonies* of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*, and mention'd many others to the ſame Purpoſe, *viz. That all Religious Worſhip was due only to God*; and with this double Caution, to prevent Cavils, 1. That it was without making any *diſtinctions* of *Abſolute* and *Relative Worſhip*, which they muſt have been driven to, in caſe they had given *Religious Worſhip* to any beſides. 2. That when the *Chriſtians* refuſed to give *Adoration* to the *Emperor*, it could not be underſtood of the *Adoration* proper to the *Supream God*, for none can be ſo ſenſleſs to imagine they required that, but ſuch kind of *Religious Worſhip* as they gave to the *Images* of their *Gods*. To all this *T. G.* replies, (1.) *That theſe Teſtimonies are impertinent, becauſe they are to be underſtood only of that Divine Worſhip which is due to God alone; and not of the Inferior Worſhip which belongs to Saints or Angels.* T.G.p.340 Might he not as well have ſaid, That they prove that *no Man* might be worſhipped, but *a Woman* might? For the force of the *Teſtimonies* did not lie meerly in this, that they attributed *Divine Worſhip* only to God, but that they made uſe of the moſt *general Terms* which ſignified *Worſhip* without any *diſtinction* of the *nature* and *kind* of that *Worſhip*, ſuppoſing it to be on a *Religious Account*. For no Men of common Senſe would have written as they did, if they had believ'd that ſome ſort of *Religious Worſhip* were lawful to be given, and another not. Doth T. G. think that he ſhould ever eſcape Cenſure in his *Church*, if he ſhould ſay peremptorily, *That it is unlawful to give any kind of Religious Worſhip to a Creature*; when the very *Indices* of the *Fathers* cannot eſcape the *Index Expurgatorius* for *blabbing* ſo great a Truth? No; we ſhould have *T. G.* preſently out with his *diſtinctions*; *Worſhip* is of *two ſorts*, *Supream* called *Latria*, *inferior* called *Doulia*: *Religious* may be taken in *two ſenſes*, 1. *That which proceeds from the Vertue of Religion, and that is proper to God.* 2. *That which tends to the Honour of Religion, and that may be given to Creatures.* And thus would the *Fathers* have written, if they had ever *looked over* Ariſtotle's *Threſhold*, and been of T. G.'s Mind; and therefore my Argument which proceeded upon the *general Terms* of the *Fathers*, without intimating any ſuch *diſtinction*, doth hold good, that either they did not write like *Underſtanding Men*, or they knew no ſuch *diſtinctions* as theſe. 2. *That although* Juſtin Martyr *and* Theophilus *deny Divine Worſhip to be given to Emperors, yet they both imply, that lawful Worſhip and Honour is to be given to them*; T.G.p.341 342. *and therefore he cannot but wonder what I meant by alledging thoſe Teſtimonies, unleſs I intend not any Worſhip at all to be due to any beſides God; or that I think it not poſſible to Worſhip a Good Man.* *And afterwards* he ſaith, p.347.

he would willingly underſtand yet farther, whether I allow any Honour at all to be due to Princes as God's Vicegerents; for he doth not remember hitherto any Paſſage in my Book, from whence he could gather that I hold it lawful to give any Worſhip either to Princes Statues, or to themſelves. Which Words have ſuch a venomous Inſinuation in them, that I could hardly believe they could come from a Man of the leaſt common Ingenuity. *Becauſe I deny Religious Worſhip to be given to any beſides God himſelf*; muſt I therefore be repreſented as a Man that denies *Civil Worſhip to be given to Princes*? I cannot tell, whether the *Folly* or *Malice* of ſuch an *Inſinuation* be the greater. I pray *God* help his *Underſtanding*, and forgive his *ill Will.* I hope *all Acts do not go whither they are intended*; but that which he deſigns for my *diſhonour*, may, *notwithſtanding his Intention*, terminate in his own. I do aſſure him, I am ſo much for the *utmoſt Civil Worſhip* to be given to *Princes*, as *God's Vicegerents*, as not to think it *in the power of any Biſhop in the World to depoſe them*, or *abſolve their Subjects from Obedience to them*; and I hope *T. G.* thinks ſo too, although he may not think it ſo fit to declare his Mind. But what is all this to our preſent Buſineſs? The force of my Argument lay in this, *the Chriſtians denied giving Religious Worſhip to Princes, although it were an Inferior kind of Religious Worſhip*, therefore they did not think an *Inferior kind of Religious Worſhip lawful.* Was this Argument too hot for his Fingers, ſo that as ſoon as he touched it, he runs away, and frets and fumes, and vents his Spight againſt me for it? However, I will urge it again and again, till I receive a better Anſwer. *T. G.* ſaith, *the Fathers ſpeak only of the Sovereign Worſhip that is due only to God; and that is the Worſhip that they think unlawful to give to any Creature.* I ſay it is impoſſible that ſhould be their Senſe, for they deny it to be lawful to give *Religious Worſhip to Princes*, when they were required to do it; but no Men ever took *Princes* for the *Supream God*. *T. G.* tells me, *that* Tertullian *explains* Theophilus *and* Juſtin, *ſaying, that the King is then to be honour'd when he keeps himſelf within his own Sphere, and abſtains from Divine Honours.* Very well! this is that I aim at: And he need not wonder *what I brought theſe Teſtimonies for*; for it was for this very thing which *Tertullian* ſaith, *That the Chriſtians did refuſe to give Divine Honours to Princes:* And therefore they thought *Divine Worſhip* comprehended under it all ſorts of *Religious Worſhip*. But ſaith *T. G. it is a thing notoriouſly known, that many of the Heathen Emperors exacted to be worſhipped as Gods, that is, with Divine Worſhip.* I grant all this, and ſay, that it ſtill proves what I intend. For did they mean by *worſhipping them* as *Gods*, that they would have the People believe them to be the *Supream God*? that is *madneſs* and *folly* to ſuppoſe, for the utmoſt they required, was to be *worſhipped* with the ſame *Worſhip* that *deified Men* were; or to have the ſame *Worſhip* living, which the *Senate* was wont to decree to them when they were dead. And can *T. G.* poſſibly believe, *That this was to ſuppoſe them to be the ſole Authors of all Good to Mankind*, which is that kind of *Divine Worſhip*, he ſaith, the *Fathers* only condemned. I deſire *T. G.* to think again of this Matter, and I dare ſay he will ſee more cauſe to *wonder at his own Anſwer*, than *at my Argument*, which ſo evidently overthrows all that he brings to evade the *Teſtimonies* of the *Fathers*. *But*, ſaith *T. G. if Kings may be honoured as God's Vicegerents, why may not Saints as the adopted Children of God?* Who denies this, for God's ſake? but I deny, that either *Kings* or *Saints* are to have *Divine Worſhip* given to them. And ſince *T. G.* is in the humour of asking me *Queſtions*, let me propoſe one to him; if Kings may be honoured as *God's Vicegerents*, why not with *Divine Honour* upon his Principles; *i. e.* with a *relative Latria*, though not *abſolute*? And if that be *lawful*, what he thinks of the *Primitive Chriſtians*, who choſe to die rather than to give *Divine Worſhip* to them upon any Account? By this time I hope *T. G.* is aſhamed of what he adds, *That on the ſame Principles that I deny any Worſhip to be due to Saints, a Quaker would prove, that it muſt be denied to Princes.* The *Worſhip* I deny to *Saints*, is that which *God* hath denied to them, *viz. Divine Worſhip*; the *Worſhip* I ſay is *due to Princes*, is that which *God* hath required to be given them, *viz. Civil Worſhip.* And they that cannot find out a difference between theſe two, are a fit Match for the *Quakers.* I know not what a *Quaker* might do in this Matter; I am ſure *T. G.* doth nothing but *trifle* in it. Was there ever a meaner Argument came out of the Mouth of a *Quaker*, than what he urges againſt me, *viz, That in ſuch a Book, printed in ſuch a Place, and* T.G.p.341 *juſt in ſuch a Page*, I call a *Divine* of our *Nation Reverend and Learned*: And what then? Therefore Saints are to be *worſhipped*: Very extraordinary, I confeſs; and one of *T. G's. noſtrums!* if he pleaſe, let it be writ upon his *Monument*, *Hic jacet auctor hujus Argumenti*, for I dare ſay, no Body ever uſed it before him. If we give Men *Titles* of *Reſpect*, according to their *Age* and *Calling*, or *real Worth*, therefore we are to give *Religious Worſhip to Saints*: And why not as well to *Princes*, becauſe we call the *Judges* appointed by them, *the Reverend Judges*? but ſurely this will prove not only a *Doulia*, but an *Hyperdoulia*: Becauſe we not only call the *Clergy Reverend*, but the *Biſhops Right Reverend*, and *Archbiſhops Moſt Reverend.* I am ſorry *T. G.* did not ſo well conſider the force of his Argument, to have preſſed it home upon me, for he now ſees how much more Advantage might have been made by it: But it is an eaſie thing to add to *rare Inventions.* But certainly *T. G.* (to uſe his own Words) *muſt believe his Readers to be all ſtark blind*, who cannot diſtinguiſh *Titles of Reſpect* from *Religious Worſhip.* *But is there not a Reverence due to Perſons for their Piety, as well as for their Age and Dignity?* Who doubts it? But that *Reverence* lies in the *due* Expreſſions of *Honour* and *Eſteem* towards them, which I hope may be done without incroaching upon the *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip*; and I think I have told him plainly enough, what I mean by them, in the foregoing Diſcourſe. But *T. G.* ſeems to underſtand no difference between *Titles of Reſpect*, and Acts of *Worſhip*, between *Expreſſions* of *Eſteem* and *Devotion*; between *Religious* and *Civil Worſhip*; for he blunders and confounds all theſe together, and whatever proves one, he thinks proves all the reſt: Theſe are not the beſt ways of *Reaſoning*, but they are the beſt the Cauſe would bear. *Well, but yet the Matter ſeems not altogether ſo clear, for the Worſhip we are to give to Princes is as they are God's Vicegerents, and this is given on a Religious Account, becauſe God commands us to give Honour to whom Honour is due*; the place urged by *T. G. Rom.* 13: 7. To this T.G p. 342 a very eaſie Anſwer will ſerve. *Worſhip* may be ſaid to be *Religious* two Ways, 1. As it is required by the *Rule* of *Religion*: And ſo the Worſhip given to *Magiſtrates* is *Religious.* 2. In its *Nature* and *Circumſtances*; as it conſiſts of thoſe *Acts* which God hath *appropriated* to his Worſhip; or is attended with thoſe *Circumſtances* which make it a

Religious Performance, and then it is not to be given to *Princes*, or any *Creatures*, but only to *God* himſelf. This will be made plain by a Remarkable Inſtance among the ancient Chriſtians; while *Divine Honours* were challeng'd by the *Emperors* to themſelves, *i.e.* the Honours belonging to *Conſecrated Men* (for they meant no other) the Chriſtians refuſed giving to them thoſe *external Acts of Reverence* which might be ſuppoſed to have any *Religious Worſhip* in them; although they expreſſed the greateſt readineſs at the ſame time to obey their *Laws*, that did not require any thing againſt *Chriſtianity*; and to pray for their *Safety* and *Proſperity*. This being known to be the general practice of *Chriſtians*, *Pliny* in his *Epiſtle* to *Trajan* mentions this as one of the ways of trying *Chriſtians*, *viz.* whether they would *Imagini Cæſaris thure & vino ſupplicare*, give *Religious worſhip to* Cæſar's *Image, by burning Incenſe, and pouring out Wine before it*; which were the *Divine Honours required*. This, *Pliny* ſaith, *all that were true Chriſtians refuſed to do; and thoſe who did it preſently renounced Chriſt*. Thus this Matter ſtood as long as the *Emperors* continued *Gentiles*, who were preſumed to affect *Divine Honours*; but when *Conſtantine* had own'd *Chriſtianity*, and thereby declared, *That no Religious Worſhip was to be given to him*, the *Chriſtians* not only erected publick *Statues* to *Emperors*, but were ready to expreſs before them the higheſt degrees of *Civil Worſhip* and *Reſpect*. This *Julian* thought to make his advantage of, and therefore placed the *Images* of the *Gods* among thoſe of the *Emperors*, that either they might worſhip the *Gods*, or by denying *Civil Worſhip* to the *Emperors Statues*, which the *Cuſtom* was then to give, they might be proceeded againſt, as diſaffected to the *Emperor*. And when he ſate on the Throne diſtributing *New years gifts*, he had his *Altar* of *Incenſe* by him, that before they received Gifts, they might caſt a little *Incenſe* into the *Fire*; which all good *Chriſtians* refuſed to do, becauſe as *Gothofred* obſerves, *the burning of Incenſe was the ſame Trial of Chriſtians, that eating of Swines fleſh was of Jews.* But after the *ſuſpicion* of *Religious Worſhip* was removed in the ſucceeding *Emperors*, the former Cuſtoms of *Civil Worſhip* obtained again; till *Theodoſius* obſerving how theſe Cuſtoms of *Civil Adoration* began to extend too far, and border too much upon *Divine Honours*, did wholly forbid it in a *Conſtitution* extant to that purpoſe, and that for this Reaſon, *That all Worſhip which did exceed the Dignity of Men, ſhould be entirely reſerved to God.* By this true Account of the behaviour of *Chriſtians* in this Matter, T. G. may a little better underſtand what that *worſhip* was, which the *Primitive Chriſtians* refuſed to give to *Emperors*, and what difference they made between the ſame *external Acts*, when they were to be done on a *Civil*, and on a *Religious Account*; which are eaſily diſcerned either by the *Nature* of the *Acts* themſelves, as the *burning Incenſe*, or the *Circumſtances* that attend them, as in *Adoration*.

Plin. l. 10. *ep.* 97.

Greg. Naz. orat. 1. *in Jul.*

Jac. Gothofred. Julian orat. p. 66.

Cod. Theodoſ. 15. *tit.* 4. *l.* 1.

§. 20. It were needleſs to produce any more *Teſtimonies* of *Antiquity* to prove, That *Divine Worſhip is proper only to God*, ſince *T. G.* confeſſes it; but gives quite another Senſe of *Divine Worſhip* than they did, for under this, they comprehended all Acts of *Religious Worſhip*, as appears by the *worſhip* they denied to *Emperors*. It remains therefore to ſhew, that thoſe who ſpake moſt for the *Honour* of the *Saints*, did not by that mean any *Religious Acts* of *Worſhip*, but *Expreſſions* barely of *Honour* and *Eſteem*.

Julian objected this againſt the *Chriſtians* (as it was common with the *Heathens* to object many falſe and unreaſonable things) *That inſtead of the Heathen Gods, they worſhipped not one but many miſerable Men.* To this St. *Cyril* anſwers, *that as to Chriſt, he confeſſes they worſhipped him, but they did not make a God of a Man in him, but he was eſſentially God, and therefore fit to be worſhipped; but for the Martyrs, they neither believed them to be Gods, nor gave them the Worſhip which belongs to Gods.* Which is unqueſtionably St. *Cyril's* meaning, or he doth not anſwer to the purpoſe: For *Julian* never charged the *Chriſtians* with giving that worſhip to *Martyrs*, which is proper to the *Supream God* conſidered as ſuch, but that they gave to them that *Religious Worſhip* which *Julian* pleaded to be *due to the Inferior Gods*, as appears by the *State* of the *Queſtion* between them. This therefore St. *Cyril* denies that they gave to *Saints and Martyrs*, which he calls προσκυνεῖν λατρευτικῶς, *i. e. to give them the Worſhip which the Heathens gave to their Inferior Deities*; what they gave to the *Martyrs* was upon another Account, it was only σχετικῶς καὶ τιμητικῶς, *reſpectively and by way of Honour.* And leſt any ſhould ſuſpect he meant any kind of *Religious Worſhip* by this, he preſently explains himſelf, *That what he ſaid was only to be underſtood of thoſe Honours they gave to them for their generous Suffering for the Faith, deſpiſing all Dangers, and thereby making themſelves great Examples to other Chriſtians*; and after he lets us underſtand what theſe *Honours* were, when he brings the Inſtance of the *Athenians meeting together at the Sepulchres of thoſe who were ſlain at the Battel of* Marathon *for the Liberty of* Greece, *and there making Panegyricks upon them, and therefore he wonders why* Julian *ſhould exclaim ſo much againſt theſe Honours done to the Martyrs, ſince this was all the Reward they could give them.* And elſewhere he ſaith, *theſe Honours conſiſted in preſerving their Memories, and praiſing their Vertues*; and brings the very ſame Inſtance of the *Athenians* again; but for any matter of *Worſhip* towards them, he utterly denies it; *becauſe they were bound to give it to none but God.* And that we might fully underſtand what he means when he ſaith, *That Chriſtians do not give to Saints the Worſhip the Heathens gave to their Inferior Gods.* In another Place he tells us, what that *Worſhip* did conſiſt in, which he there calls λατρείας (by which we are certain what he meant by λατρευτικῶς before) and ſo he reckons up τὰς ὑπὲρ πάντων λιτὰς in the firſt place, *their Prayers*, or *Supplications*, and then *Vows*, *Hymns*, *Oblations* and *Sacrifices*: The giving of any of theſe to *Saints* were to *Worſhip them* λατρευτικῶς; and not as the *Ignorant* or wilfully *Blind* Writers of the *Roman Church* when they meet with this Word, they cry out preſently, *mark that, not with Latria*, and preſently imagine, that what Senſe a Word hath obtained among them, if they meet with it in the *Fathers*, it muſt needs ſignifie the *ſame thing*; when the *Senſe* of *Words* hath been ſo ſtrangely *perverted* by them; as will more particularly appear by this very diſtinction of *Latria* and *Doulia*, which they make St. *Auguſtine* the *Author* of, but have carried it far beyond his meaning.

S. Cyril. c. Julian. l. 6. p. 203.

c. Jul. l. 10.

p. 336.

p. 338.

L. 4. p. 124.

§. 21. I come therefore to conſider St. *Auſtin's* Mind in this Matter, which I am the more obligd to do, ſince T.G. *ſo unreaſonably Triumphs in St.* Auſtin's *Opinion in this Matter*; and is not only content to drag me at his Chariot Wheels, but he makes a ſhew of me, and calls People to ſee by my Example, to *what miſerable Shifts and diſingenuous Arts they are put, who will ſhut their Eyes, and fight againſt the Light of a Noon-day Truth:* When I firſt read

T.G. p. 431

theſe Words, I began to *rub my Eyes*, and to look about me, and to wonder what the Matter was; and I find my ſelf as willing to *ſee light* as another, and my *Conſcience* never yet accuſed me of uſing *diſingenuous Arts* in dealing with them; if *T. G.* can clear himſelf as well, it is the better for him; I am ſure *by-ſtanders* have not thought ſo, as appears at large by Dr. *Whitby*, eſpecially in his *laſt Chapter* againſt him. But it is not my Buſineſs to *recriminate*; hoping ſufficiently to clear my ſelf in this Matter. It ſeems, I had ſaid that St. *Auguſtine* denies, that any *Religious Worſhip* was performed to the *Martyrs*; this *T. G.* again ſaith, *I could not affirm without ſhutting my Eyes*: And yet I thank God, by the help of *my Eyes*, I find St. *Auguſtine* ſaying the ſame thing ſtill. *Aug. de ver. Rel. c. 55.* For it is not St. *Auguſtine* that ſaith, *non ſit nobis Religio cultus hominum mortuorum, Let not the Worſhip of dead Men be any part of our Religion: For if they have lived piouſly, they do not deſire ſuch Honours from us; but they would have us to Worſhip him, by whom we may become partakers of their Happineſs: Honorandi ergo ſunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter Religionem.* Is it poſſible for any Man to ſpeak plainer than St. *Auſtin* doth, *That they are not to have Religious Worſhip given to them, but ſuch Honour as may excite us to an Imitation of them?* And this not by *Chance*, or in ſome *incoherent Paſſage*, but in a *ſet Diſcourſe* on purpoſe, where he argues with ſtrong Reaſon againſt the *Religious Worſhip of Angels*, as well as *Saints*, to the end of that Book. And ſaith, *The utmoſt they expect from us, is the Honour of our Love, and not of our Service*; (and therefore St. *Auguſtine* did not by δουλεία underſtand the *Service of Saints and Angels*) which he there diſputes againſt, *from our happineſs coming only from God, our being the Temples of God, the Angels prohibiting St.* John *to worſhip him, and bidding him to worſhip God*; *and that the very Name of Religion is from tying our Souls to God alone. Whoſoever of the Angels loves God*, ſaith he, *loves me for worſhipping him, and he that hath God's Favour, hath the Favour of all that are Good. Therefore let our Religion bind us faſter to one Omnipotent God, between whom and us there is no Creature interpoſed*: With much more to the ſame Purpoſe. *Tract. 23. in Evang. Joh.* Is it not the ſame St. *Auſtin* that ſaith, *Hæc eſt Religio Chriſtiana ut colatur unus Deus*; *this is the Chriſtian Religion, to Worſhip one God*; and for this Reaſon, *becauſe God only can make the Soul happy: For*, ſaith he, *it is made happy only by the participation of God, and not of a Bleſſed Soul or Angel.* Not as though this were intended only againſt the *Expectation* of our *Bleſſedneſs* wholly from *Saints* or *Angels*; but he makes uſe of this as an Argument to prove, That we ought to *Worſhip God* alone, *who only is able to make us happy.* *De quantit. an. c. 34.* Is it not the ſame St. *Auſtin*, that ſaith, *This is the Character of the true Religion, that it unites us only to one God, without giving Worſhip to any other Being, how Excellent ſoever?* and he looks on this as a *Divine* and *Singular* part of the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, *nullam creaturam colendam eſſe animæ*, that *no Creature have the Worſhip of our Soul*, what did he then think of *praying to Creatures not only with our Voice, but our Mind too*, as the *Council* of *Trent* ſaith, *it is profitable for us to do, and not only for their Prayers, but for their Help and Aſſiſtance*; But, ſaith good St. *Auſtin*, *the moſt Wiſe and Perfect Man, the moſt Accompliſh'd and Happy Soul is only to be loved and imitated, and Honour given to it, according to its deſert and order: For thou ſhalt Worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Could any Man ſpeak more plainly and fully againſt giving any *Religious Worſhip* to Creatures, than he doth? Is it not *Aug. ep. 45* the ſame St. *Auſtin* that tells *Maximus Madaurenſis*, *that in the Chriſtian*

Church, none that were dead were worſhipped, and nothing adored as God, that is made by God; but only one God, who created all things? Here *T. G.* ſmiles, and thinks to avoid this preſently; for St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of any thing being adored *as God*; which they abhor to do: But his ſmiling will be ſoon over, if he conſiders what *being adored as God* there means: For no one ever ſuſpected, that the Chriſtians believed the *Martyrs* to be the *Supream God*; but only that they *worſhipped them as Gods of a lower rank by participation* from the *Supream*. And is not the very ſame thing ſaid and defended in the *Roman Church*, that the *Saints* are *Gods by participation*, and they have *the Care and Government of the Church committed to them*; and on that Account are *worſhipped*? and if this be not being *adored as Gods* in St. *Auſtin*'s Senſe, I know not what is. Is it not the ſame St. *Auſtin* that undertakes to prove againſt the *Platoniſts, that good Spirits are not to be worſhipped, per tale Religionis obſequium, by ſuch Religious Worſhip?* very right, ſaith *T. G. not by the Worſhip of Sacrifices*; but St. *Auſtin* ſaith, neither *Sacris*, nor *Sacrificiis*, which two comprehend *all the Rites of Religious Worſhip* which were then uſed. For he makes uſe of ſeveral Phraſes to expreſs the *Acts of Religious Worſhip*, ſometimes by joining thoſe two together, *Sacris & Sacrificiis*; ſometimes *Religione & Sacris*; ſometimes *Religionis Ritibus*; ſometimes *Religionis Obſequio*; by all which he underſtands the ſame thing, *viz. the Acts of Religious Worſhip*, which, for *diſtinction* ſake, he calls *Latria*; as that *Service* or *Worſhip* that Men owe to one another, he ſaith is called by another Name: And I confeſs, I cannot find St. *Auſtin* applying the term of *Doulia* to any *Service* we owe to *Saints or Angels* in Heaven; but he avoids the term of *Service*, and denies it to be due to them, and only calls it by the name of *Love and Fellowſhip with them*; and therefore *Martinus Pereſius* had good reaſon to quarrel with the uſe of the word *Doulia*, becauſe we are only *Fellow-ſervants* with them; and *Bellarmine* gives him no ſufficient Anſwer, by bringing that Place, Gal. 5. *Serving one another in Love*, for that only relates to *Perſons* in *equal Conditions*, where the *mutual Offices* may be alike, which cannot be ſuppoſed in this Caſe. And therefore I had reaſon to ſay, *That* Doulia *is uſed by St.* Auſtin, *as a term expreſſing the Service we owe to God as our Lord*; but T. G. thinks he hath run me down, by producing the foregoing Place, *which*, he ſaith, *I purpoſely concealed from the Reader, for fear he might infer, that if ſome degree of the Service called* Doulia *might be given by Servants to their Maſters, ſurely a high degree of it may be given to Holy Angels*. Very finely argued! and as much againſt St. *Auſtin*'s Senſe as is poſſible. For, he ſaith, in plain terms, *Thoſe Angels that require Service from us are Devils*: For this he makes the Character of them, that they do invite us, *ut ſibi ſerviamus*; *But*, ſaith he, *we Honour good Angels by Love, and not by Service*. But *T. G.* is not more miſtaken in St. *Auſtin*'s Senſe of *Doulia* than he is about *Latria*: *For*, he ſaith, *that he underſtands it of Sacrifices, and that when he ſaith bleſſed Spirits are not willing we ſhould* ſacra facere, *it ought not to be rendered equivocally, as it is by me, to perform any ſacred Offices, but to Dedicate and Sacrifice to them, or conſecrate our ſelves, or any thing of ours, to them by the Rites of Religion*; *by which*, he ſaith, *it is evident, that he ſpeaks of the Worſhip which is due to God alone, that is, of ſuch Dedications and Conſecrations, as were performed by the Heathens to their Dæmons, as Gods*. To this I anſwer, that I grant that St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of the *Worſhip due to God alone*, and of thoſe *Rites of Religious Worſhip* which were performed by the *Heathens* to

De Civ. Dei, l. 9. *c.* 23.

L. 10. *c.* 1.

C. 4.

De ver. Rel. c. 55.

Mart. Pe
reſ. de trad. p. 3. *conſ.* 7.

Q. in Exod. 61.

T. G. p. 386

to their *Gods* : But the *Queſtion* is, what he underſtands by thoſe *Religious Rites*, whether only *Dedications*, and *Sacrifices*, and *Conſecrations*, or other *Acts of Religious Worſhip*? For *T. G.* cannot be ſo ignorant as not to know, that *Adorations* and *Prayers* were as conſtant, as ſolemn, as proper *Acts of Religious Worſhip* both by the *Law* of *God*, and the *Heathen Cuſtoms*, as thoſe he mentions; thence *orandi cauſa fanum adire*, in *Cicero*; *Deos immortales precari, venerari, atque implorare debetis, ut urbem defendant*; and ſcarce any *Greek* or *Latin Writer* that mentions their *Religious Rites*, but under them they take notice of *Adoration* and *Prayers*; and not only ſo, but ſome of them give an Account of the *Forms* of them, and the *Manner* and *Order* of *Invocation* in their *Litanies* (for the Word is as old as *Homer*) wherein they invocated their *Gods* in order, *that they would be favourable and propitious to them*; and *Pliny* ſaith in *general*, that no *Sacrifice was offered without Prayers*; and *Macrobius*, *Servius*, and *Arnobius* ſay, *they began their Invocations with* Janus, *not becauſe they looked on him as Chief*, but as a *Mediator*, *who was to carry up their Prayers to their Superior Powers*; and they ended in *Veſta* for the ſame Reaſon: And that theſe were comprehended under the *Sacra*, is not only manifeſt from their Conjunction with *Sacrifices*; but from the old form of *Obſecration*, in which they uſed *ob vos ſacro* for *obſecro*. I would now underſtand from *T. G.* why he thinks that St. *Auſtin* ſhould purpoſely leave out in theſe words *Adoration* and *Invocation*, which were by all *Nations* looked on as ſome of the proper *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip*, eſpecially when he mentions both theſe before and after? For the Occaſion of the Diſpute was about the *Interceſſion* of *Created Spirits*, and *Mens Addreſſes* to them; and afterwards he joyns *Adoration* together with *Sacrifice* as a thing *peculiar to God*: *putaverunt quidam deferendum Angelis honorem vel adorando vel ſacrificando, &c.* in a place already cited. If this be not *ſhutting ones Eyes againſt Noon-day light*, it is a *drawing* a *Curtain* before it, leſt it grow *too hot*.

Cicer. Ver. 6. In Catil.

Plin. hiſt. nat. l. 28. c. 2. Macrob. Saturn. l. 1. c. 9. Serv. in Æneid. 7. Arnob. c. gent. l. 3.

De Civ. Dei, l. 19.

But for all this *T. G.* is very confident, that St. *Auſtin was for performing Religious Worſhip to Martyrs, becauſe* he ſaith expreſly, *That it was the Cuſtom of the Chriſtian People in his time, to celebrate with Religious Solemnity the Memories of the Martyrs*; and very kindly after his Mode, he charges me *with corrupting the Words of St.* Auſtin, by tranſlating them thus, *That it was the Cuſtom of the Chriſtians in his Time to have their Religious Aſſemblies at the Sepulchres or Memories of the Martyrs*: I did not pretend to *tranſlate*, as *T. G.* knew well enough by the *Character*; but *ill Will never ſpeaks well*: But I ſtill ſay, and ſtand to it, that this is his *Senſe*, as will appear by conſidering the *deſign* of his Words. *Fauſtus* the *Manichean* had charged the *African Chriſtians with Idolatry* in the *Honour* they gave to the *Memories of the Martyrs*. St. *Auſtin* anſwers, *That they did ſo celebrate the Memories of the Martyrs; that they erected no Altars to any Martyr, but to the God of Martyrs, although it was for their Memories. For who of the Biſhops or Prieſts that officiates at the Altar, in the Places of their Sepulchres, ever ſaid, We offer to thee* Peter, *or* Paul, *or* Cyprian; *but that which is offered, is offered to God, who crowned the Martyrs, but it is done at their Sepulchres, whom he hath crowned, that by the very Places our Affections may be raiſed, and our Love quickned, both to thoſe whom we may imitate, and to him by whom we are enabled to do it.* Now I deſire to know what part of *Religious Worſhip* was here performed to the *Martyrs*? If the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*, that were *Idolatry* according

T.G. p. 431

C. Fauſt. Manich. l. 20. c. 21.

to *T. G.* and would have juſtified *Fauſtus* to purpoſe; but St. *Auſtin* utterly denies this to be performed to them. All that the *Martyrs* are concerned in as to the *Religious Solemnity*, was no more than that the *Offices of Religion were performed at their Sepulchres*: this was an *Honour* to them I grant, but no part of *Religious Worſhip*. And although the deſign of the *Worſhip* was only to *Honour God*, yet the Place of doing it was out of *Honour* to the *Martyrs*. But St. *Auſtin* ſaith afterwards, *We Worſhip therefore the Saints with that Worſhip of Love and Society*, &c. What means this *&c.* here? Let us have all or nothing: *With which Holy Men in this Life are Worſhipped, whoſe Heart is prepared to ſuffer as much for the Truth of the Goſpel: He that hath but an Eye open*, ſaith T. G. *muſt ſee that St.* Auſtin *ſpeaks here of the Worſhip which the Chriſtians of his Time gave to the Martyrs themſelves.* And he that hath but one corner open cannot but ſee, that he doth not ſpeak of *Religious Worſhip*, which *Fauſtus* objected; but having denied that to be given to *Martyrs*, he now ſhews what they did give them, *viz.* ſuch a kind of *Worſhip* as we give to *Holy Men* alive: And is that the *Religious Worſhip* either *Fauſtus* or St. *Auſtin* meant? St. *Auſtin* calls it *Worſhip*, but he means no more by it than when he ſaid before, that they are to be *loved for their Goodneſs, and honoured for their Examples*; but what is all this to *Religious Worſhip*, or *Invocation* of them, when St. *Auſtin* in another Place expreſly denies, *That the Saints are invocated by him that offers the Sacrifices at the Altar*: Nay, although that *Altar* were in the Place of their *Sufferings*? And here, ſaith *T. G. I think I have done their Work for them*; and he is not miſtaken: Whatever he cites from *Biſhop Forbs*, that St. *Auſtin was only to be underſtood of Invocation at the Altar*; I ſhall make it appear that the Argument holds good, and that thoſe who ſpeak againſt it, it is becauſe they do not underſtand the ſtrength of it. *Biſhop Forbs* in this Place, and ſeveral others, takes occaſion, without Reaſon, to find fault with *Biſhop Andrews*, a Man of far greater Learning than himſelf, and of better Judgment in theſe Matters: And it is he, and not *Biſhop Mountague* (as *T. G.* miſtakes) whom *Biſhop Forbs* introduces *John Barclay* charging *with leading King* James *aſide*. But I ſtill ſay the Argument clearly proves, *That St.* Auſtin *denied Invocation of Saints*; and I am ſorry to ſee *Biſhop Forbs* ſo weakly led aſide by Bellarmine and others, upon this ground, *becauſe in the Canon of the Maſs the Saints are not directly prayed to in the* Roman *Church; but they are in the* Miſſa Catechumenorum, *and in the Litanies*; therefore thus it was in the *African Church*, in St. *Auſtin*'s Time. Who knows not what great Alterations have been in the *Liturgies* of the *Church* ſince that Time? Yet thus wiſely doth *T. G.* ſpeak upon this Subject: *If I ſpeak of that part of the Maſs which was anciently called, the Maſs of the* Catechumeni, *the Prieſt indeed, before he aſcends to the Altar, deſires the Bleſſed Virgin, and the reſt of the Saints*, &c. *to pray for him: But in the* Miſſa Fidelium *there is no Invocation of them.* If there had been none any where elſe, there had been a far greater Conformity between the Church of *Rome*, and the Church in St. *Auſtin*'s time: We plainly prove, there was no *Invocation* at the *Altar*, let *T. G.* ſhew any other part of *Publick Worſhip* at that Time, wherein they were *invocated*. But all theſe Miſtakes ariſe from not conſidering the mighty difference of the *Liturgy* in St. *Auſtin*'s Time, in the *African Church*, from what hath ſince obtained in the *Roman Church*. But to give *T. G.* ſome better

De Civit. Dei, l. 22. *c.* 10.

Forb. conſiderat. Mod. p. 317.

T. G. p. 441.

light in this Matter, and, withal, to ſhew the *invincible ſtrength* of
this *Argument*, I ſhall prove theſe two Things, 1. That the *Prayers* of
the *Church* did not begin in St. *Auſtin*'s Time, till the *Catechumens* were
diſmiſſed: 2. That the *Prayers*, after their diſmiſſion, were perform'd
at the *Altar*.

1. That the *Prayers* of the *Church*, in St. *Auſtin*'s Time, did not begin
till the *Catechumens* were diſmiſſed. For which we have a plain
Aug. ſerm. de Temp. 237. Teſtimony from St. *Auſtin*, *Ecce poſt ſermonem fit Miſſa Catechumenis,*
manebunt fideles, venietur ad locum orationis, whereby he ſhews not
only that *Prayers* did not begin till the diſmiſſion of the *Catechumens*;
but that the *Altar* was then accounted the *proper Place of Prayer*:
De diverſ. ſerm. 48. And elſewhere he ſaith, *that Invocation did begin after the Creed, Ideo*
non accepiſtis prius orationem, poſtea ſymbolum; ſed prius ſymbolum, ubi ſciretis
quid crederetis; & poſtea orationem, ubi noſſetis quem invocaretis:
Which Words could have no Senſe, if any *ſolemn Invocation* were
then made before the *Creed*. So St. *Ambroſe* deſcribes the *Service* of
Ambr. l.5. epiſt. 33. the *Church* of *Milan* in his Time, *Poſt lectiones atque tractatum dimiſſis*
Catechumenis, Symbolum aliquibus Competentibus in baptiſteriis tradebam
Baſilicæ: By which it ſeems, the *Service* began with the *Leſſons*, then
followed the *Sermon*, after that the *Creed*, and then when the *Catechumens*
were diſmiſſed, the *Prayers* of the *Church* begun: So St. *Ambroſe*
preſently after ſaith, *When he had inſtructed the Competentes, Miſſam*
facere cœpi, i.e. the *Miſſa Fidelium*, or the *Prayers of the Church*, when
the *Miſſa Catechumenorum* was diſpatched, or they ſent out of the *Congregation*.
Juſt. Apol. 2. p. 98. So *Juſtin Martyr* deſcribes the *Service* of the firſt *Chriſtians*,
that it began with the *Leſſons* of the *Prophets and Apoſtles*, then followed
the *Sermon*; and after that the *Prayers began*; and then followed
the *Euchariſt*, which was then conſtantly received in the *Publick Service*.
Concil. Laodic. c.19. The *Council* of *Laodicea* mentions *Prayers* beginning after the
Sermon: (*i.e. the Publick Prayers of the Church*) of which that Council
mentions, *the Prayers for the Catechumens* before their diſmiſſion
(which in the *Greek Church* were performed by the Deacon in the
Ambo making the προσφωνήσεις to the *People*, to which they joined their
Κύριε ἐλέησον) after theſe, followed the *Prayers* for the *Penitents*, and then
the *Prayers* of the *Faithful*, or the proper *Liturgy* of the *Church* began.
Conſtit. Apoſt. l. 2. c. 57. The *Author* of the *Conſtitutions* called *Apoſtolical*, appoints the
Service to begin with the *Leſſons* of the *Old Teſtament*, the *Pſalms*, the
Epiſtles and *Goſpel*, after which the *Sermon* was to follow, then the
Catechumens and *Penitents* being diſmiſſed, they muſt all riſe and go
to their *Prayers* for the *Catholick Church*; as it is there deſcribed:
In the *Eighth Book* he mentions the *Occaſional Prayers* that were made
for the *Catechumens* and *Penitents*, before their diſmiſſion, and then
L. 8. c.6,7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. followed the forms of *Solemn Invocation*, which were not to be uſed
till the other were diſmiſſed the *Aſſembly*. To the ſame Purpoſe the
Counterfeit *Dionyſius* deſcribes the *Practice* of the *Church*, that the
Dionyſ. Hierarch. c.3. Sect.6. *Catechumens* and *Penitents* were admitted to the *Leſſons* and *Pſalms*,
and then were excluded the *Congregation*. And none were allowed to
be preſent at the *Prayers of the Faithful*, but ſuch as were allowed to
Concil. Nicæn. c. 11, 12,13. be preſent at the *Euchariſt*, as the fourth degree of *Penitents*, which
is called *Communicating in Prayers*, by the *Council* of *Nice*; by which
T.G. p.442 we may ſee *T. G.*'s ſkill in *Antiquity*, when he puts Forms of *Invocation*
uſed by thoſe who were to partake of the *Euchariſt*, into the *Miſſa*
Catechumenorum; whereas they were allowed to be preſent at no

Prayers of the *Church*, but only that which was made for them; and *Cardinal Bona* could inform him, that the *Catechumens* were not allowed to join ſo much as in the *Lord's Prayer*, nor in any *Solemn Invocation* of *God*, in behalf of others, as he proves from St. *Chryſoſtom*, and others.

Bona de rebus Liturg. l. 1. *c.* 16.
Chryſ. hom. 79. *ad pop. Antioch.*

2. That the *Prayers* that were made after the diſmiſſion of the *Catechumens* were ſaid at the *Altar*. For which we are to conſider that in S. *Auſtin*'s Time the Cuſtom of *Communicating every Day* was ſtill obſerved in the *African Church*; as is evident from his own expreſs Teſtimony, where he ſaith, that ſome underſtand *our daily Bread of the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body, quod quotidie ſumimus, which we receive every day*; and finds fault with thoſe in the *Greek Church*, who had begun to diſcontinue that Cuſtom; *accipe quotidie*, ſaith he, *quod quotidie tibi proſit*. So that as ſoon as the *Catechumens* were diſmiſſed, they immediately began the *Communion Service*, which was all the *Service* I can find in the Uſe of that *Church* in thoſe times. Nay, the very *Prayer* for the *Catechumens* was ſaid at the *Altar* in the *African Church*, which in the *Greek Church* was indicted by the *Deacon* in the *Ambo*, or *Pew* for that purpoſe in the Body of the Church: *Et quando audis ſacerdotem Dei ad altare exhortantem populum Dei, orare pro incredulis, ut eos Deus convertat ad Fidem, & pro Catechumenis ut eis deſiderium regenerationis inſpiret, & pro fidelibus ut in eo quod eſſe cœperunt ejus munere perſeverent.* Where we ſee the *Prayers* for the *Catechumens*, as well as the other Prayers of the *Church* were performed at the *Altar*. And it appears by a Paſſage in his *Retractations*, that the very *Hymns* out of the Pſalms which were ſung either before the *Oblation*, or in time of *Diſtribution* were ſung at the *Altar*; which Cuſtom being found fault with at *Carthage* by one *Hilarius*, it gave him an occaſion to write in Vindication of it. And in another place he reduces all the *Prayers* of the Church to the *Communion Service*; and interprets the *Apoſtles Words of Prayers, Supplications, Interceſſions and giving of Thanks*, of what was done at the Celebration of the *Euchariſt*. And that which very much confirms this, is, that when the *African Fathers* made a *Decree, That no Prayers ſhould be uſed in the Publick Service, but ſuch as were firſt ſeen and approved*; the Title of it is, *Of Prayers to be made at the Altar*. And the *African Writers* make *praying and going to the Altar* to have the ſame Senſe; ſo *Tertullian* calls it *aſcendere ad altare*; and *ad aram Dei ſtare*; and *orationem deducere ad altare*. All which put together, make it very clear, that if there was *no Invocation of Saints at the Altar* in St. *Auſtin*'s Time, there was none at all in the Service of the *Church*; which I have the more inſiſted upon, becauſe it is ſo pregnant a Teſtimony againſt *Invocation of Saints*, and the force of it hath not been *fully underſtood* by any I have ſeen, from the not conſidering the *Liturgy* of the *Church* in St. *Auſtin*'s Time. Which Men have fanſied to have been according to the *Practice of following Ages*, when the laying aſide the Diſcipline of the *Primitive Church*, made a great Alteration in the *Publick Offices*, (as might be eaſily diſcovered, were this a proper Place for it,) both in the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*. But that is not my preſent Buſineſs. But this ought farther to be conſidered, the moſt proper ſeaſon for *Invocation of Saints* was at the *Altar*, for then the *Commemoration of Saints* was made out of the *Diptychs* of the *Church*, as appears by *Multitudes* of *Places* in St. *Auſtin*; and the *Martyrs* were then put in a rank by themſelves; and where-

Aug. de ſer. Domini in Monte l. 2. *c.* 12.
De verb. Dom. in Evang. ſecundum Luc. ſer. 28.
Aug. ep. 107.
Aug. Retract. l. 2. *c.* 11.
Ep. 59.
Codex Eccleſ. Afric. c. 106.
Tertull. de orat. c. 10. *c.* 14. *de exhort. caſt, c.* 11.

as they prayed for all others, they did not for them; but they rather believed they received Benefit by their *Prayers* for them. For, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, *We do not Commemorate the Martyrs at the Holy Table as we do others, who reſt in Peace, ſo as to pray for them, but rather that they may pray for us*: And this was all the Office of the *Church* then towards *Martyrs*, viz. *Commemoration* of them at the *Altar*, although St. *Auſtin* believed that the *Martyrs* at ſuch Times, eſpecially when the *Commemorations* were made at their own *Sepulchres*, did join their *Prayers* together with the *Churches*, in behalf of thoſe who there put up their *Supplications to God, and not to them*. And this is the meaning of that Place which *T. G.* objects to *prove Invocation*, viz. *that when Chriſtians are met at the Religious Solemnity at their Sepulchres, they become partakers of their Merits, and obtain Help by their Prayers*: Yet he wonders I could not find *Invocation* here, and imagines I *ſhut my Eyes again*; but ſurely *T. G.* fanſies I play *at Blindman's Buff with him*, for he thinks I never *have my Eyes open*.

In Evang. Joh. tract. 84.

I ſhould now come to examine the diſtinction of an *abſolute* and *relative Latria*, but of that I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak ſo largely in the following *Diſpute* about the *Worſhip of Images*, that I here put an end to this *General Diſcourſe*.

THE

THE SECOND PART OF THE ANSWER TO T. G.

Being a particular Defence *of the* Charge *of* Idolatry *againſt the* Church *of* Rome *in the* Worſhip *of* Images.

CHAP. I.

The State of the Controverſie about the Worſhip of Images, between Christians and Heathens.

Having in the precedent *Diſcourſe* given a *general* account of the *Nature* of *Idolatry*, I come now to the *Particulars* in diſpute between us. The firſt whereof is, concerning *the Worſhip of Images*; in which nothing is more neceſſary, than to give a true Account of the *State* of the *Controverſie*; which that I may do with the greateſt clearneſs, §. 1.

1. I ſhall conſider wherein the *State* of this *Controverſie* lay, as it was managed between the *Chriſtians* and *Heathens*.

2. I ſhall give a juſt Account of the *Riſe* and *Progreſs* of this *Controverſie* in the *Chriſtian Church*. And when by this means, the *State* of the *Controverſie* is well underſtood, the difficulty will not be great in giving Anſwers to all the *Sophiſtical Cavils* of *T. G.*

1. For the *State* of the *Controverſie* about the *Worſhip of Images* between the *Chriſtians* and *Heathens*. To this Purpoſe I had uſed theſe
Diſc. of Idol. ch. 1. ſect 7. Expreſſions in my former Diſcourſe, “ That St. *Paul* dealing with the
“ *Athenians*, did prove the unreaſonableneſs of their Worſhipping
“ *God by Images, becauſe he was the God that made the World, and is Lord*
Acts 17. 24,25, 29. “ *of Heaven and Earth, and that we are his Off-ſpring, therefore we ought*
“ *not to think that the Godhead is like unto Gold or Silver, or Stone graven by Art, or Man's Device*; where I obſerved, that the *Apoſtle*
“ doth not ſpeak meerly againſt their other Objects of Worſhip,
“ beſides the true *God*, nor their ſuppoſing their *Gods* to be preſent in their *Images*, nor taking their *Images* for *Gods*, but againſt
“ their Suppoſition, that there was any reſemblance between *God*
“ and their *Images*, or that he was capable of receiving any Honour
Rom 1.19 “ by them. The ſame Argument, I added, St. *Paul* uſeth to
“ the *Romans*, ſpeaking of thoſe *in whom that which may be known of*
v. 21. “ *God is manifeſt, even his Eternal Power and Godhead*, yet theſe Perſons *who knew God, did not glorifie him as God, but changed the Glory*
“ *of the Incorruptible God into an Image made like to Corruptible Man*,
v. 23. “ &c. where *changing his Glory into Images*, is, I ſaid, immediately
“ oppoſed *to the glorifying him as God*, in reſpect of his *Eternal*
“ *Power and Godhead*, ſo that theſe two are inconſiſtent with each
“ other, *to glorifie God by an Image, and to glorifie him as God*. For here
“ the Apoſtle doth not diſcourſe againſt the moſt groſs and ſottiſh
“ *Idolaters* of the *Heathens*, but as St. *Chryſoſtom* well obſerves, againſt the *Philoſophers*, and the *Wiſeſt* among them, who, although
“ they differed in their Opinions of Religion extreamly from the
“ *Vulgar*, yet they concurred with them in all the external Practices
“ of *Idolatry*. And therefore the *Apoſtle* doth not charge them with
v. 18, 21. “ falſe Notions of a *Deity*, for he ſaith, *That they held the Truth in*
“ *Unrighteouſneſs, and that they did know God*: But they ſhewed their
“ Vanity and Folly in thinking they had found out ſubtiller ways
“ of defending the common *Idolatries* among them; and inſtead of
“ oppoſing them, made uſe of their Wits to excuſe them. To which
I added this material Obſervation, “ That the moſt intelligent *Heathens*
“ did never look on their *Images* as any other, than *Symbols*
“ or *Repreſentations* of that *Being* to which they gave Divine Worſhip;
“ for which purpoſe I produced ſeveral Teſtimonies of *Celſus*,
“ *Porphyry*, *Athanaſius*, *Arnobius*, St. *Auguſtin*, *Max. Tyrius*, *Julian*
“ and *Euſebius*, from whence I deſired to know whether theſe
“ Men, who worſhipped *Images* on thoſe Grounds, did amiſs or no
“ in it? I do not ask, *as my Words are expreſly*, whether they were
“ miſtaken as to the *Objects of their Worſhip*; but on Suppoſition
“ they were not, whether they were to blame in the *manner of ſerving God by Images*, in ſuch a way as they deſcribe? if not, wherefore
“ doth St. *Paul* pitch upon that, to condemn them for, which
“ they were not at all to blame in? He ought, I ſaid, to have done,
Trigaut. de Chriſt. Exped. apud Sinas l. 5. c. 16. p. 588. “ as the *Jeſuits* in *China* did, who never condemned the People for
“ *Worſhipping Images*, but for *Worſhipping falſe Gods* by them, and perſwaded
“ them not to lay them aſide, but to convert them to the
“ Honour of the true God; and ſo melted down their former Images,
“ and made new ones of them. Can we imagine St. *Paul*
“ meant the ſame thing, when he blames Men, not for believing
“ them to be *Gods*, but that *God* could be worſhipped *by the Work*

" *of Mens Hands*, and for changing thereby the *Glory* due to *God* in
" regard of his Infinite and Incorruptible Being, into mean and
" unworthy *Images*, thinking thereby to give Honour to him? And
" upon theſe Grounds, I there ſhew, that the *Primitive Fathers* diſputed *Ch.* 1. *Sect.* 8.
" againſt the *Heathen Idolatry*: *For the making uſe of Corporeal*
" *Repreſentations makes the Deity contemptible*, ſaith *Clemens* of *Alexandria*. *Clem.*
" *Origen* ſaith, *That Chriſtians have nothing to do with Images, be-* *Strom.* 5.
" *cauſe of the ſecond Commandment; and on that Account will rather die* p. 559. *Orig. c.*
" *than defile themſelves with them; and that it is impoſſible any one that* *Celſ. l.* 7.
" *knows God, ſhould pray to them: That it is no ſufficient excuſe to ſay,* p. 375.
" *they do not take them for Gods, but only for Symbols or Repreſentations of*
" *them, for they muſt be ignorant, mean, and unlearned Perſons, who can*
" *imagine the Work of an Artificer can be any Repreſentation of a Deity.*
" I ſhewed further, that many of the wiſer *Heathens* themſelves condemned *Ch.* 1. *Sect.* 6.
" the Worſhip of *God* by *Images*, as *incongruous to a Di-*
" *vine Nature*, and a Diſparagement to the *Deity*, as *Zeno*, *Xenophanes*,
" *Antiſthenes*, *Xenophon*, *Numa*, *Varro*, and many others.

§. 2. Having thus laid down ſo much of my former Diſcourſe together, as was neceſſary to underſtand the *State* of the *Controverſie*, I come now to conſider what *T. G.* doth anſwer to it.

T. G. p. 96. 1. To the Places of St. *Paul*, *Acts* 17. 24. and *Rom.* 1. 19. he ſaith, *That no one ever denied the unſuitableneſs of the Worſhip of ſuch Images to the Divine Nature, as are conceived to be proper likeneſſes, or Repreſentations of the Divinity, of which St.* Paul *ſpeaks in the firſt Place; or of the Images of the falſe Gods of the Heathens, of which he ſpeaks in the latter.*

In reply to this, I begin with the *firſt Place*, Acts 17. 24. *where*, he ſaith, *it is plain from St.* Paul's *Words, that they thought the Divinity to be like to the Images they made of Gold and Silver: And this was a mighty Argument from the Mouth of St.* Paul *to drive that erroneous conceit out of the Minds of the* Athenians, *who believed the Divinity to be like the Images they made; but none at all from my Pen againſt Catholicks, who deteſt the Thoughts of having or making any ſuch Image.* This then is the queſtion between us, whether St. *Paul*'s Diſcourſe againſt the *Athenians* did proceed only on that Suppoſition of the *Divinity being like to their Images*, or whether the diſſimilitude between them be not made uſe of by the *Apoſtle* as an Argument to ſhew that *Images* are not a proper ſuitable Means whereby to worſhip *God*? For which we are to conſider the *Apoſtle's Scope* and *Deſign*; which certainly was to convince them of their *Idolatry*. For it is ſaid, ver. 16. *That his Spirit was ſtirred within him, when he ſaw the City wholly given to Idolatry*; and in the beginning of his Speech he takes notice of their *Bigotry* in the *Heathen Worſhip*, ver. 22. & 23. *that among their* σεβάσματα, *i. e. Idols*, ſaith *Theophylact*, he had eſpied an *Altar with this Inſcription, To the unknown God*: And upon this he takes an occaſion more fully to *diſcover him whom they ignorantly worſhipped*, and, withal, to ſhew the *Unreaſonableneſs* of their *worſhipping God* at all by *Images*. If the *Apoſtle's* deſign had been, as *T. G.* imagines, *to drive that erroneous Conceit out of the Minds of the* Athenians, *that the Divinity was like to their Images; his Spirit ſhould not have been moved*, at the ſight of their *Images*, but at their Diſcourſes about them when he heard them own the *Divinity to be like them.*

For, in caſe they only looked on their *Images*, as helps to their *Devotion*; or as *Analogical Repreſentations* of ſome *Divine Perfections*, altho' they did Worſhip *God* by them, *T. G.* muſt think then St. *Paul* a little too haſty to be ſo ſoon angry at the *ſight* of them; for upon this Ground his *Spirit might be ſtirred within him*, at the ſight of the *Altars* and *Devotions* in *Rome* as well as *Athens*. But St. *Paul* did not wait for any Decree of the *Areopagus* in this Matter; he ſaw enough to inflame his Zeal in their *Practices* and *Publick Worſhip*, without looking after any *diſtinctions* of their *Sophiſters and School-Divines*; although there were many upon the Place ready to juſtifie every Rite of their Worſhip, and that would not let go one tittle of their groſſeſt *Superſtitions* for all the *Truth and Reaſon* in the World. They could find out as many *Analogies and Metaphorical Significations* as other Men; and thought it as little Diſparagement to the *Deity* to Worſhip him under the ſeveral Repreſentations of *Minerva*, *Ceres* or *Bacchus*, when by theſe they underſtood the ſeveral effects of *God's Wiſdom and Goodneſs* in giving the *Fruits* of the *Earth*, as others can in repreſenting him as an *Old Man* with a *Pope's Crown* on his Head; or with one *Head and three Faces*, as ſome that are no *Athenians* have done. For God's ſake, which of the two are more apt to beget in Mens Minds ſuch Apprehenſions of *God, that he is like to Men*; thoſe who make and expoſe ſuch *Images* of the *God* they Worſhip, or ſuch who made an *Inſcription* upon an *Altar* to the *Unknown to God?* And if he were *Unknown*, how came they to *know* him to be ſo *like themſelves?* What need St. *Paul* take ſuch pains to drive a *Conceit* out of their Heads, which for all that we ſee, never entered into them? If indeed St. *Paul* had ſeen over that *Altar* a grave *Image* of a Man in *Pontifical Robes*, with an *hoary Head*, a *long Beard*, and a *Triple Crown*; he would probably have asked them, how the *Athenians*, that were witty Men, could be guilty of ſuch an abſurdity, to call that an *Altar* to the *Unknown God*, when they were ſo familiarly acquainted with him as to know the very *cut of his Bread*, and *faſhion of his Crown?* But, as *Superſtitious* as the *Athenians* were, they were not ſo *ridiculous*; but yet becauſe they ſuppos'd this *God* might be pleas'd with the *Worſhip of the Idols*, that were not only in the *Temples*, but in the *Streets* and *Forum* of *Athens* (where *Thucydides* ſaith, there were *twelve Altars*) therefore St. *Paul* diſcourſeth of this *God* after ſuch a *manner*, as to ſhew how unſuitable ſuch a way of *Worſhip* was to his *Nature* and *Perfections*.

Thucydid. l. 6.

1. From his *Infinite Power*, v. 24, 25. *God that made the World and all things in it, ſeeing that he is Lord of Heaven and Earth, dwelleth not in Temples made with Hands, neither is worſhipped with Mens Hands.* Can any thing be plainer, than that here St. *Paul* diſputes againſt their *Worſhip*, and not their *Opinion?* He finds no fault with their *Opinion* about the true *God*, but only that it was not clear and diſtinct enough, in that he was too much the *Unknown God* among them; he takes it for granted, that one *Supream God*, Creator of the World was acknowledged by them; and from the Conſideration of that *Infinite Power* of his, he ſhews how unreaſonable it was for them to *Circumſcribe* him within their *Temples*, or to *Worſhip* him by their *Images*: "For what are all theſe Images of yours, "which you are ſo fond of, and ſo unwilling to part with? al-"though they were the *Statues* of *Phidias* or *Polycletus*, or the *Pi-*

"*ctures* of *Xeuxes*, or *Apelles*, yet ſtill they are but the *Work of Mens* "*Hands*: And what are theſe to the Heavens and the Earth, which "he hath made? If any *Image deſerve Worſhip*, it is one of *God*'s "making, and not of your own; but ſince no *Image* can repreſent "the infinite *Perfections* of the great *Creator*, never think to Honour "him by your fooliſh *Puppets* and *Babies* of *Dirt and Clay*. This is the deſign of the *Apoſtle*'s Argument; but what doth this ſignifie to their thinking the *Divinity to be like themſelves*? For whether *God were like*, or *unlike to their Images*, yet ſtill they were the *Work of Mens Hands*: As a *Picture* is ſtill the *Work of the Painter*, although never ſo *unlike* the Perſon for whom it is intended; but St. *Paul* condemns them for worſhipping *God* with the *Work of Mens Hands*, *i. e.* with *Images* and *Statues*; as being infinitely below the greatneſs of that *Divine Power*, for the ſake of which we give *Divine Worſhip* to him.

2. From his *Infinite Perfection*; manifeſted by his *Self-ſufficiency*, *Needing nothing*, v. 25. and from his communicating to his Creatures what is needful for them, *Seeing he giveth to all Life and Breath and all things*. Now what can there be more unſuitable to the *Honour of ſuch a Being*, than to be *worſhipped* by ſuch *dull*, *ſenſleſs*, *contemptible pieces of Earth*, which have not in them the *Perfection* of the meaneſt *Animal*, to whom *God* hath given *Life and Breath*; that are ſo far from repreſenting the *Perfection and Self-ſufficiency* of the *Divine Nature*, that they are not in the leaſt able to help themſelves? But when by the help of Wedges and Beetles an *Image* is cleft out of the *Trunk* of ſome well grown *Tree*, (that little dreamt of the Honour which was like to come to the dulleſt part about it, after it ſhould paſs through the ſeveral refinings of the *Carpenter's Ax*, whoſe blows it endured with admirable patience, and of the *Painter's Pencil*, whoſe *Miniature* adds much Beauty and Glory to it) yet after all the Skill of *Artificers* to ſet forth ſuch a *Divine Block*, it cannot one moment ſecure it ſelf from being eaten by Worms, or defiled by Birds, or cut in pieces by Axes; or, if any of theſe fail, from decaying through meer ſtanding. Or ſuppoſe this *Worſhipful Idol* be made of a harder Subſtance, and after its being digged out of the Earth, and ſawed, and carved, and poliſhed, and with much ado brought into the reſemblance of a Man, and a rude *Symbol* of the *Deity*, and ſet up for the *Adoration* of Mankind; yet ſtill it wants the things which are above the utmoſt Power of Man, but are given to the leaſt mite, *viz. Life*, and *Senſe* and *Motion*, and an admirable Contrivance of the *Inſtruments of theſe*; yet ſuch mean and pitiful things as theſe, will the folly of Mankind find out to repreſent the greateſt and the moſt perfect *Being* in the World. Judge now whether things that want *Life* and *Breath*, and *all things*, are fit means whereby to worſhip him *who giveth all theſe things to his Creatures*? or *whether thoſe things* which need the Art of Man to make them, and his continual Care to preſerve them, are fit to repreſent that *Being*, which *ſtands in need of nothing*?

3. From his *Infinite Preſence*, v. 27, 28. *That they ſhould ſeek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us: For in him we live and move and have our Being*. One of the moſt plauſible Arguments of *Idolaters* in all *Ages* was, that by the *help of Images* they did repreſent the *object of their Worſhip as preſent to them*,

ſo as thereby to be put more in mind of him, and to excite their *Reverence and Devotion*; but St. *Paul* tells the *Athenians*, there was no need of any ſuch *Repreſentations of God's Preſence, for he is not far from every one of us, for in him we live, and move, and have our Beings*: And that Man who will not find *God* in thoſe admirable *effects of his Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs* we carry continually about us, will hardly find him in the ſenſeleſs Repreſentations of *Wood* and *Stone*: And he that will not ſtand in *awe* of him, as he *governs* the World, will hardly fear him, when he is ſet forth in ſhape of a *Man*, although he have a *Thunderbolt* in his Hand.

4. From the *diſparity between God and Images*, v. 29. *For as much then as we are the Off-ſpring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like to Gold or Silver, or Stone graven by Art, or Man's Device.* Upon which Words, *Lorinus*, a Jeſuit, makes this *Paraphraſe*, *Foraſmuch as the* Athenians *following their own Poets, do confeſs, that we are the living Image of God, they ought to think that material Idols, made by the Art of Men, which fall far ſhort of the Perfection of Nature, are infinitely diſtant from the Divine Power, by which we obtain a Dignity far above theſe material Things; and ſince we cannot expreſs this Image of God in us by any Lines, much leſs can we the Divine Original, ſo that it is the groſſeſt Ignorance to affirm, that God can dwell, or be included or worſhipped in or by their Altars, or Images*, (for ſo *delubra* muſt be underſtood by him if he ſpeaks pertinently, for although ſometimes it ſignifies a *Temple* with *more Images than one*, yet *Servius* withal ſaith, it ſignifies a *wooden Image*, and ſo *Feſtus* underſtands it; which things I am forced to explain, to prevent Cavilling; for otherwiſe *T. G.* would have complained of *my perverting the Senſe of Authors*, as he hath done very unjuſtly, as will appear in this Chapter.) But *Lorinus*, after having brought the ſeveral Places of *Scripture* againſt making any *Image of God*, thinks to ſalve all by ſaying, *They are to be underſtood of ſuch Images as repreſent him to the Life*, (as though it were poſſible for any to do it) *or ſuch which they worſhipped for Gods*, which the *Heathens* utterly denied that they did. *Cornelius à Lapide*, after ſeveral vain Attempts, to make out the force of the *Apoſtle*'s Argument, at laſt concludes this to be it; *That ſince our Soul according to which we are the Off-ſpring of God, cannot be painted, or repreſented in Gold, Silver, or Stone, being Incorporeal and Spiritual; much leſs can the Divinity be painted or repreſented by them, being a pure Spirit, and the Fountain of Spirits.* *Eſtius* agrees, *That this is the force of the Apoſtle's Argument, from whence*, he ſaith, *he doth not infer, that we ought not to think Gold, Silver, or Stone, to be God: although he might have done it* (but to little purpoſe) *becauſe*, ſaith he, *he ſpake to the* Athenians, *among whom were many Philoſophers, Learned and Wiſe Men, who did not with the Vulgar, think their Images to be Gods, although they worſhipped them together with them; but they believed their Gods to be repreſented by them, as by their Images.* If he ſpeaks of the *Epicureans*, there is ſome Ground for it; for what *Deity* they acknowledged, they ſuppoſed to be *as-if-corporeal*, and of Humane Shape; but he is much miſtaken, that doth not account them rather *Atheiſts than Idolaters*; and as to the other *Athenian Philoſophers*, I ſhall make it appear to be a groſs Miſtake, to ſuppoſe that they thought their *Gods* to be *Humane Shape*; but of that hereafter.

Job. Lorin. in Act. Ap. c. 17. *v.* 29.

Serv in 4. *Æn.*

Corn. à Lap. in loc.

Eſt. in diffic. loc. ad loc.

Cicer. de Nat. Deor. l. 1. *Lactant. de Ira Dei, c.* 4.

The thing I now inſiſt upon is, that the *Apoſtle*'s ſhewing the *diſparity* between *God and Images*, is not meerly to drive out the *Opinion* of *Anthropomorphitiſm*, but from hence to ſhew farther the *folly of Idolatry*; for if *Images* fall ſo much ſhort of the Infinite Perfections of God, there can be but this plea left, that they are *like* to him, and therefore we may Worſhip God by them, for the ſake of their *reſemblance* of him; now this the *Apoſtle* ſhews to be as vain and idle a Pretence as any of the reſt, there being no *manner of reſemblance* between the *Workmanſhip of Gold*, *Silver* and *Stone*, and an *Infinite* and *Spiritual Being*.

5. From the *neceſſity of Repentance*, and the *Conſideration of a future Judgment*, v. 30, 31. If all the *Apoſtle* had aimed at, was only to rectifie an erroneous Conceit of the *Athenians* about the *Divinity being like to their Images*, he had taken away the force of his Exhortation to *Repentance*, from the *Conſideration of a Judgment to come*; becauſe ſuch an erroneous Conceit may poſſeſs Men of innocent Minds and free from *Idolatry*, as it was in the Caſe of the Monks in *Ægypt*, of whom *Epiphanius* and St. *Auſtin* ſpeak; and whom *Epiphanius* ſuppoſeth to have been *very harmleſs Men*, ſaving only their Separation from the Church: Nay, he doth not ſeem to apprehend any dangerous Conſequence of their Opinion: Which we need not wonder at, if that which *Nicephorus* ſaith be true, *viz.* that *Epiphanius* was an *Anthropomorphite* himſelf. And yet *Epiphanius* is well known to have been as great an Enemy to *Image Worſhip*, and all kind of *Idolatry*, as any Perſon that lived in his Age. The ſame is obſervable of *Tertullian* and *Lactantius*, whereof the one attributed *Corporeity* to *God*, and the other *Shape* and *Figure*, as our *Adverſaries* confeſs; and yet both theſe were vehement diſputers againſt the *Heathen Idolatry*. From whence we ſee, that there is no neceſſary Connexion between this Opinion, and the Practice of *Idolatry*, or the *Worſhip of Images*: And yet there is altogether as good reaſon why *God* ſhould be worſhipped by an *Image*, on that Suppoſition, as why *Chriſt* ſhould be by a *Crucifix* ſince his *Incarnation*; which is *T. G.*'s great Argument on all Occaſions. But thoſe who ſuppoſed *God* to be like to Men, might yet think it unreaſonable to Worſhip *God* by the *Work of Mens Hands*; and if *Arbitrary Repreſentation* be a ſufficient ground of Worſhip, then *Natural* would be much more ſo, and conſequently it would be much more reaſonable for Men to Worſhip one another, than to Worſhip *Images*: And all the ſame Diſtinctions and pleaſant Evaſions would ſerve for one, as well as they do for the other.

Epiph. hær. 70. *Aug. de hær. c.* 50.

Niceph. hiſt. l. 13. *c.* 12.

Pamel. de Paradox. Tertull. c. 15. *Petav. dogm. Theol. To.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 1. *ſect.* 7.

§. 3. I deſire now to know of *T. G.* whether the *Athenians* were to blame only for *this erroneous Conceit of theirs, in thinking the Divinity to be like their Images*? If this were all their fault, (1.) I dare undertake to prove, that many among them were wholly Innocent, *viz.* thoſe who followed the Schools of *Plato* and *Zeno*, beſides thoſe of the People who took their *Images* for *Symbols* of the *Divinity*. (2.) St. *Paul* takes very needleſs Pains to make uſe of ſuch Arguments againſt *Image-worſhip*, which do not ſuppoſe any Opinion of Similitude between *God* and the *Image*; as the *incongruity* of *Images* to the *Divine Power*, *Perfection* and *Preſence*. (3.) Why doth he call upon them ſo *earneſtly to repent*? Was it only of an *erroneous Conceit*? And that of ſuch a Nature, that the Argument made uſe of by him, to move them to *Repentance*, was rather apt to confirm them in that Opinion, *viz. That God would judge the World by that Man whom he hath appointed.* If a *Man* be appointed to judge the World, the Management of which muſt imply *Infinite Wiſdom and Power*, *what abſurdity*, might they ſay, *is it in us to ſuppoſe the Images of Men to repreſent God, as he is the Object of Worſhip?* For if the *Humane Nature* be capable of *Union* to the *Divinity*, why might it not be ſo united always, as well as at the end of the World? And if it be united, then that Humane Nature might be repreſented in an *Image*, and the *Divine Nature* honoured by worſhipping that Repreſentation. Which being ſuppoſed to be lawful, the *Apoſtle*'s Argument loſes its force; for the ſubtile *Athenians* might eaſily have anſwered St. *Paul*, that there was no more repugnancy in ſuppoſing God to have aſſumed a *Humane Body* from *Eternity*, than that he ſhould do it ſo lately in *Judæa*; which being ſuppoſed, their Defence naturally follows, for they could not be ſo fooliſh to imagine their *Images* to be like the *Divine Nature* in it ſelf, but to that *Humane Body* which was *aſſumed* by the *Divine Nature*. And that this is no extravagant Suppoſition, will appear by this, that ſeveral of the ancient *Chriſtian* Writers had an Opinion very like this, *viz.* that when *God is ſaid to have made Man after his own Image*, it is to be underſtood of that *Humane Figure* and *Shape*, which *God* had then *aſſumed*, which was the *Exemplar*, according to which *Man was created*: Thus *Prudentius* and the *Audiandi* are underſtood by *Petavius*; and ſome *Paſſages* of *Tertullian* look much this way: And *Auguſtinus Steuchus Eugubinus*, a Learned, but Zealous *Papiſt*, contends for the neceſſity of this Opinion, becauſe *Man ſaw God walking, and heard him ſpeaking in Paradiſe*, and becauſe of the frequent *appearances of God in Humane Shape*, mentioned in the *Old Teſtament*. And to confirm this, he brings that Verſe of *Ovid*,

Petav. ib. ſect. 9. Tertul. de roſar. car. c. 6. Aug. Steuc. Eugub. Coſmop. p. 46.

Et Deus humana luſtro ſub imagine terras.

and thoſe of *Catullus*,

Præſentes namque ante, domos inviſere caſtas
Sæpius & ſeſe mortali oſtendere cœtu,
Cœlicolæ, nondum ſpreta pietate ſolebant.

and he ſhews that the *Fictions* of *Homer*, and the reſt of the *Poets*, as to the *Appearances* of the *Gods* in *Humane Shape*, had their true *Original* from hence, that *God* did at firſt aſſume the *Nature* of *Man*, according to which *Man* was ſaid to be framed after the *Image and Similitude of God*. But St. *Paul*, although he aſſerts the *Incarnation of Chriſt*, yet deriving the Argument againſt the *Worſhip of God* by *Images*, from the Conſideration proper to the *Divinity*, *we ought not to think, that the Godhead is like to Gold, &c.* doth thereby teach us, that *that* which is diſagreeing to the *Divine Nature*, which is the proper *Object of Worſhip*, cannot be a proper means for us to Worſhip *God* by; So that although the *Images* made by Men only repreſent the Humane Nature aſſumed by the *Divine*, yet becauſe the *Godhead is not like unto them*, we ought not to Worſhip *God* by them. For otherwiſe the *Athenians* were meer *Blockheads* (if it were lawful to worſhip the *Divine Nature* of *Chriſt* before an *Image* of his *Humane*, and to give the ſame worſhip to one which belongs to the other) that they did not deny St. *Paul*'s Conſequence; “ For “ what if the *Godhead* be not like to our *Images*, it doth not follow, that we “ may not give them *Divine Worſhip* as long as *God* hath often appeared in Humane Shape among us, and we may give Worſhip to the

“ Repreſentation of that Nature wherein he appeared, and the ſame “ that belongs to the Divine Nature, which did aſſume it. And I confeſs, I cannot ſee how *T. G.* could have defended St. *Paul* upon his Suppoſition; for, according to *T. G.*'s Principles, *although before the Incarnation of Chriſt, the Worſhip which People gave to the Images of Gold, was incongruous to the Divine Nature, and a Diſparagement to the Deity; yet to thoſe to whom the Myſtery of God made Man is revealed, it is no Diſparagement to him to be repreſented in the likeneſs of Man, and to be Worſhipped by ſuch an Image.* Very well; ſay the *Athenians*, and ſo ſay we too. To Worſhip *God* by any *Image*, as *repreſenting* his *Infinite and Inviſible Nature* is folly and madneſs; but to make *Images* of him according to his ſeveral *appearances* for the *Good of Mankind* in the *likeneſs* of Men, is no *Diſparagement* to the *Deity*; nor to be worſhipped by ſuch an *Image*. Let *T. G.* therefore either ſay, that St. *Paul* argues inconſequently, or acknowledge that the force of his Argument doth hold againſt the Worſhip of any *Repreſentations* of God. For it is plain to any Man that hath any uſe of his Senſes, that St. *Paul* doth not argue againſt any meer *erroneous Conceit of the Athenians*, but againſt their *Idolatrous Worſhip*; which he firſt ſhews to be *unreaſonable* by many Arguments, and then tells them, *God* now commanded them to *repent*, and adds the moſt forcible Motive to perſwade them to it, from the Proceedings of the future Judgment.

T. G. p. 75.

But I have not yet done with *T. G.* about this Place. Is it not *T. G. that when he fixed his Foot*, as he ſaith, *and deliberately enquired what the Supream God of the Heathens was, tells us in plain terms it was the Devil, and an Arch-devil; and this he doth*, he ſaith, *for God's ſake*? ſaith he ſo indeed? And was this *unknown God at* Athens *whom they ignorantly worſhepped*, and St. *Paul declared*, the *Devil* and an *Arch-devil*? No: For here he grants, *That the* Athenians *thought the Divinity to be like their Images*; what *Divinity* doth he mean? Surely not the *Divinity* of an *Arch-devil.* But I ſee, thoſe that believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, are capable of ſpeaking as well as believing Contradictions. Yet, it is poſſible *T. G.* may imagine that the *Athenians* meant one *Divinity*, and St. *Paul* another. So ſome ſay St. *Paul* plaid the *Sophiſter* with the *Athenians*, and when the true Inſcription was *to the Unknown Gods*; he, becauſe it ſerved better to his purpoſe, reads it in the ſingular Number, *to the Unknown God.* But as *Cajetan* wiſely anſwers, *the Authority of St.* Paul *affirming there was ſuch an Inſcription ought to be valued above thoſe who deny it*; and ſaith he, *if there had not been any ſuch, the* Athenians, *who were by, might preſently have charged St.* Paul *with falſhood, in ſaying he met with an Inſcription to the Unknown God, when there was none ſuch among them.* *Lorinus* ſhews from ſeveral *Teſtimonies* of St. *Auſtin*, that the *Athenians* did Worſhip the *true God*: And that in Caſe the *Inſcription* had run only in the *plural Number* St. *Paul* had drawn a Concluſion out of *falſe Premiſes*, whereas *Iſidore Peluſiota* admires the irreſiſtible force of St. *Paul*'s Reaſoning, being built upon *Premiſes*, which are confeſſed by the *Adverſaries*; as he diſputed with the *Jews* out of the *Scriptures*, ſo he did with the Men of *Athens* from the *Inſcription* on one of their own *Altars.* This being then taken for granted by St. *Paul*, that the *Athenians* did Acknowledge and Worſhip the true *God*, how come they to be charged with *Idolatry* in worſhipping *Images*, if it be lawful to Worſhip the *true God* by an *Image*? eſpecially ſince their Intention was, as *Ferus* ſaith expreſly, *by their Idols to Worſhip the true God.* I beſeech

T. G. p. 348

P. 350.

Cajet. in loc.

Lorin. in loc.

Aug. l. c. Creſc. c. 29. in ep. ad Rom. c. 1. Iſid. Peluſ. l. 3. ep. 346.

Joh. Ferus in Act. 17. p. 203.

ſeech *T. G.* to reconcile this, if he can, with making *Idolatry* to conſiſt *in taking Images for Gods, or for the Repreſentations of falſe Gods*; for here was neither, and yet the *Athenians* were condemned for *Idolatry*; and *Ferus* confeſſes, *that thoſe were Idols, whereby they deſigned to worſhip the true God*; how can that be, *if Actions paſs whither they are intended*; *for how can that Worſhip be terminated on an Image*, according to *T. G.*'s *Divinity, which is deſign'd to paſs through it to God*? *And that the true God was meant by the* Athenians, Corn. à Lapide ſaith, *is manifeſt from hence, that St.* Paul *was otherwiſe bound to ſhew, that it was not the true God which they worſhipped, and to tell them who was the true*; *whereas here St.* Paul *ſaith, he declared to them the ſame God whom they ignorantly worſhipped*; *which had been very unbecoming the ſincerity and faithfulneſs of ſo great an Apoſtle, in caſe he knew, they did not Worſhip the true God, when he told them they did*: For this was at once to deceive, to flatter, to betray them; and that in a matter upon which the *Salvation* of their *Souls* did depend: Which of all Perſons was moſt unworthy of the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, whoſe Buſineſs it was *to turn Men from Idols to God, to ſerve the true and living God*.

Corn. à Lap. in Act. 17.23.

1 Theſſ. 1. 9.

T.G. *p.*97. But *T. G.* asks, *To what Purpoſe this Place was brought by me?* (if he did not underſtand it before, I hope he will do it now:) *Except I intended*, he ſaith, *the Reader to believe the Papiſts to be no wiſer than the* Athenians. I wiſh in this Matter they were as *Wiſe*; for it were better for them to erect *Altars* to an *Unknown God*, than to make thoſe abſurd, ſcandalous, and horrible Repreſentations of the *Myſtery* of the *Trinity*: From whence ſome of the *Antitrinitarians* have taken occaſion to expoſe that ſacred *Myſtery* to Scorn and Contempt, and have publiſhed a *Book* on purpoſe to ſet forth the *Images* of the *Trinity*, which are publickly ſeen and allowed in the *Roman Church*. *But the* Athenians, he tells us *from St.* Chryſoſtom, *were ſo poſſeſſed with a wrong Apprehenſion of the Nature of God, that when they heard St.* Paul *ſpeak of* Anaſtaſis, *they thought her to be ſome new Goddeſs.* If they had gone much farther, and worſhipped this *Anaſtaſis*, I think the *Athenians* had done no worſe, than thoſe who worſhip with ſolemn Devotion *Saints* that never were in the World; and after ſo long a time of Worſhip of St. *Chriſtopher*, and St. *George*, the wiſeſt among them cannot to this Day tell, whether they were *Saints* or *Allegories*: and if *T. G.* pleaſe, he ſhall take *Baronius* his *Saint Synoris*, to joyn with the *Athenian Goddeſs Anaſtaſis*; or if this will not content him, let him take other three *Saints* which he may find in ſome old *Litanies* of their Church, as I have done, *viz.* St. *Faith*, St. *Hope*, St. *Charity*; all three *Daughters* of a grave *Matron*, called St. *Sapientia*; but which far outgoes the *Athenian* Devotion, every one of theſe hath an *Ora pro nobis* added to it; but what Work would *T. G.* have made with the poor *Athenians*, if they had cried *Sancta Anaſtaſis ora pro nobis*? yet he may find as groſs Abſurdities nearer Home.

Horæ ſecundum uſum Roman. in Litaniis.

§. 4. I now come to the ſecond Place, *Rom.* 1. 21, 23. in which *T. G.* ſaith, *Nothing can be more clear, than that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh there of the Idols or Images of the Heathens*; *for after he had laid down the Matter of Fact which he condemned*, viz. *That although they knew God, yet they did not glorifie him as God, but changed the Glory of the incorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man*; *he adds alſo, and to Birds, and* *fourfooted Beaſts, and creeping things,* (*which Words,* he ſaith, *were clapt under deck by me with an* &c. *becauſe they plainly declare what kind of Images the Apoſtle meant*) *and then,* v. 25. tells us, *that by ſo doing, they changed the Truth of God into a Lye, and worſhipped and ſerved the Creature rather than the Creator: Which Words,* he ſaith, *are ſo plain, that I had no way to evade them, but by ſaying that the Apoſtle diſcourſed againſt the Philoſophers, and the Wiſer Heathens; whom he proves from St.* Chryſoſtom, *to have been guilty of the ſame Idolatry with the People; and Inſtances in the* Ægyptians, *and* Plato, *and* Socrates, *who commanded a Cock to be offered to* Æſculapius. For the clearing the Senſe of this Place, we are to conſider, 1. Who the Perſons were that St. *Paul* ſpeaks off. 2. What he affirms concerning them.

1. *T. G.* ſaith, *The Words are ſo plain, that I could find no Evaſion, but to ſay, that the Apoſtle doth not diſcourſe againſt the moſt groſs and ſottiſh Idolaters, but the Philoſophers, and the wiſeſt among them;* but doth *T. G.* in good earneſt call this an *Evaſion*? Was it an *Evaſion* in *Cajetan,* when he ſaith, *St.* Paul *here reproved the Sin of the Philoſophers; and that the Philoſophers were they who detained the Truth in Unrighteouſneſs: That the Philoſophers did either make, or worſhip Images, therefore they changed the Glory due to God*? Was it nothing but a meer Evaſion in *Vaſquez,* when he ſaith, *The Apoſtle deſigns to prove, that the Philoſophers, both had the true knowledge of God, and held it in Unrighteouſneſs*? Or in *Eſtius,* when he ſaith in plain terms, *the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Philoſophers*? and inſtanceth in *Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Ariſtotle, Triſmegiſt,* and *Seneca, who, although they did know the true God, yet none of them worſhipped him as they ought to do.* I need not mention St. *Auſtin,* who in many Places applies this to the *Philoſophers,* as appears by *Bede*'s Commentary, when even the Words of St. *Chryſoſtom* ſhew this to be far enough from an *Evaſion; what is that to the Philoſophers? Marry, I anſwer,* as *T. G.* tranſlates him, *that what hath been ſaid moſt of all concerns them;* but this doth not fully expreſs his meaning, for his Words are, πρὸς αὐτοὺς μὲν οὖν μάλιστα πάντα τὰ εἰρημένα, or, as ſome Copies read it, πάντως, *all that hath been ſaid doth moſt of all concern them,* or *altogether;* and the *Greek Scholiaſt,* ſaith, *That it is plain St.* Paul *ſtrikes at the Wiſe Men among the* Greeks, *and thoſe who were like them. Origen* ſaith, *he ſpeaks of ſome of the Wiſe Men of* Greece. By theſe and many more *Teſtimonies,* if it were needful to heap them in ſo clear a Caſe, it appears ſufficiently, that this was no *Evaſion* of mine, but the natural Senſe, which their own *Commentators,* and the *Fathers* agree in.

Cajet. in loc.

Vaſquez in loc.

Eſti. in loc.

Bed. in loc.

2. As to what the *Apoſtle affirms of them,* viz. *That they held the Truth in Unrighteouſneſs,* v. 18. *i. e.* ſaith the *Greek Scholialiſt, That they gave the Worſhip of God to Idols; for the Knowledge of God is Truth, and the Deceitfulneſs of Idols is Unrighteouſneſs. Hear,* ſaith *Theophylact, what it is to detain the Truth in Unrighteouſneſs; the Truth, or the Knowledge of God is naturally put into all Mens Minds from the beginning; this Knowledge or Truth the* Greeks *held in Unrighteouſneſs,* i. e. *they did all the Injury to it they could, by giving the glory of God to Idols;* and both herein follow St. *Chryſoſtom,* who ſaith, *They did it, by giving the glory of God to Wood and Stone.* This the Apoſtle afterwards inlarges upon, when he ſaith, *That knowing God they did not gloriſie him as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their Imagination, and their fooliſh Heart was darkned. Profeſſing themſelves to*

be wiſe, they became Fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds and fourfooted Beaſts, and creeping things. And for the Senſe of this Charge, I am content to appeal to the Judgments of the moſt allowed Interpreters on both Sides, that have not been Parties in the Quarrel. *They thought themſelves Wiſe*, ſaith St. *Hierom*, or the Author of the *Commentaries* under his Name, *as thoſe that had found out*, quo modo inviſibilis Deus per ſimulachrum viſibile coleretur; *how an inviſible God might be worſhipped by a viſible Repreſentation*; which is the Senſe of *ſimulachrum* there; for he ſuppoſes the Worſhip to be directed to the *inviſible God* through the Image, and therefore the Image could not be taken either for God, or a Repreſentation of a *falſe God*; *ſo that nothing can be more clear* (to uſe T. G.'s Words) according to St. *Hierom, than* that *T. G. profeſſing to be Wiſe*, doth thereby diſcover his own Folly, when he ſaith, *That St.* Paul *ſpeaks of thoſe who took the Images themſelves for Gods*; *or worſhipped the Images of falſe Gods. And the Philoſophers profeſſing to be Wiſe, did become Fools*, becauſe, ſaith St. *Hierom*, *they did not underſtand that what is Mortal and Corruptible, could have no reſemblance to what is Immortal and Eternal.* The *Greek Scholiaſt* ſaith, *They became vain in their Imaginations, when they would repreſent him in a Figure that had none, and comprehend him in Corporeal Images, that was wholly Spiritual*; not as though they were ſuch *Fools* to think to ſhut up *Infinity* within the bounds of an Image; but to *comprehend*, there is taken with relation to that *Repreſentation* which conveys a thing to the Mind; and ſo he uſeth it a little after, *they thought themſelves wiſe, becauſe they thought they could comprehend every thing*: And ſo the *Image* was ſuppoſed to be *ſuch* a *Species* as did convey an Intellectual Being to the Mind. The ſame Words are uſed by *Theophylact*; which they both borrowed from St. *Chryſoſtom*, who condemns the *Greeks* for their Folly, not for *comprehending*, but for *ſeeking a Spiritual and Incorporeal Being, in Corporeal Images. And what can be more fooliſh*, ſaith the *Scholiaſt* and *Theophylact*, *than to fall down before Stocks and Stones*? And *Origen* doth expreſs the meaning of the *Apoſtle* in this Place, as fully as I can deſire, when he applies all theſe Expreſſions to thoſe that had a right Notion and
Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 277. Conception of God in their Minds, but gave *Divine Worſhip* to all *ſorts of Images*, as well of *Beaſts*, as of *Men*, εἰς τιμὴν ἐκείνου *for the Honour of the Deity*. And in truth, the *Apoſtle*'s Suppoſition being allowed, that theſe *Philoſophers did know the true God*, and his *Eternal Power and Godhead*, we muſt ſuppoſe them to be turned ſtark ſtaring *Fools*, that they ſhould take the *Images* either of *Men* or *Beaſts* to be *Gods*: But it is very agreeable to the *Philoſophers* Practice and Opinions to give *external Worſhip* to theſe *Images*, when they in the mean time did direct that external Worſhip to the Honour of the *inviſible Deity*.

§. 5. But the Senſe of this and the former Place will be made more evident by a diligent enquiry into the *State* of the *Controverſie*, about the Worſhip of *Images* between the *Chriſtians* and *Heathens*. (1.) Whether it was the *Heathens* took their *Images* for proper *likeneſſes* of the *Deity*? Or, (2.) That they worſhipped only the *Images of falſe Gods, or that they took their Images themſelves for Gods*? And if the *Controverſie* did not wholly relate to theſe things, then it will follow, that it was of the ſame Nature with that between us and the *Church* of *Rome*. I ſhall therefore ſhew,

1. That the *Wiſer Heathens*, concerning whom the Diſpute is, *did not ſuppoſe their Images to be proper likeneſſes of their Gods.* Which I prove, 1. From the *nature* and *kinds* of their *Images*. 2. From the *Notions* they had of their *Gods*.

1. From the *nature* and *kinds* of their *Images*. There are three ſorts of *Images* which were *worſhipped* among the *Heathens*, 1. Such as had no artificial *Shape* or *Figure*. 2. Such as had an *artificial Shape*, but it was of *no real Being*. 3. Such as had the *Shape* either of *Men* or *Beaſts*. Of the two firſt, and thoſe of *Beaſts*, I ſuppoſe, no Man *profeſſing himſelf to be Wiſe*, will ſhew himſelf ſuch a *Fool* to ſay, that the *Heathens thought their Gods to be like them.* My Buſineſs therefore as to them, is to ſhew, that there were ſuch among them to which they did give *Divine Worſhip*.

1. For *Images* without any artificial *Shape*, or *Figure*. By *Images* here I mean ſome *external viſible Things which are deſigned to repreſent ſome other Thing to our Minds.* So *Tully* calls Characters, *verborum Imagines*, and the Countenance, *Imaginem animi*; in which no exact *reſemblance* can be underſtood, but ſomething which is intended to repreſent another thing to us, which doth not depend on the Nature of Things, but the Arbitrary Inſtitution of Men; as may be ſeen by the Notes and Characters of *Tyro* and *Seneca*; of which no Account can be given, why they repreſent one thing rather than another, but only the *Will* of the *Maker* of them. Thus if Men agreed that a *Spear*, a *Cymeter*, a *Trunk*, a *Mountain*, a *rude Stone*, or a *Pyramid*, ſhould be ſet up to repreſent the *Deity* to them which they worſhipped, every one of theſe did thereby become the *Image* of that *Deity*. *Herodotus*, *Solinus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Arnobius* and *Ammianus Marcellinus*, all agree, that the ancient *Scythians* had no other *Image of a Deity among them, but only a* Scythian *Sword*, which *Herodotus* calls the *Image of Mars*, and he ſaith, *they ſprinkled the Blood of the Sacrifice upon it.* *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Arnobius* tell us from *Varro*, that the ancient *Romans* worſhipped a *Spear* for *Mars*, which is alſo affirmed by *Juſtin*; and the *Theſpians* a *Bough* for *Cinxia* or *Juno*; the *Icarians* an *unhewn piece of Wood* for *Diana*; the *Samii* a frame of Wood for *Juno*; the *Peſſinuntii* a *Flint* for the *Mother* of the *Gods*; which was carried by the *Roman* Ambaſſadors from *Phrygia* to *Rome*, ſaith *Livy*; called *Religioſa ſilex* by *Claudian*. The *Arabians an unpoliſh'd Stone*; which was ſquare, ſaith *Maximus Tyrius*, *of a black Colour*, ſaith *Suidas*, *without any Shape or Figure upon it, four foot high and two broad, to which they ſacrifice, aud ſprinkle the Blood upon it.* *Euthymius* charges the *Mahometans* with *Idolatry for kiſſing the Stone Bracthan*; concerning which, they have ſeveral fabulous Traditions, of its being one of the Stones of *Paradiſe*, and coming down from thence with *Adam*, &c. which is placed in one of the corners of the *Caaba*, or *Temple* at *Mecca*, above two Cubits above Ground, and was ſtolen from thence by the *Karmatiani*, hoping to draw away the Pilgrims; but finding it would not do, they reſtored it to the Inhabitants of *Mecca*, twenty Years after, who knew it to be the genuine Stone, as they ſaid, by its ſwimming *above Water*; which our learned Dr. *Pocock* Conjectures to have been one of the *Idols* of the old *Arabs*, as the *Temple* at *Mecca* was one of their *Idol-Temples*; but the *Mahometans* ſay they worſhip it out of a reſpect to *Abraham*; as they do another *Stone*, wherein they ſay are the *Footſteps* of *Abraham* to be ſeen, at which they ſay their Prayers; as others do

Herod. Melp. p. 276. *Solini Polyhiſt.* *Clem. Alex. in Prot. p.*29, 43. *Arnob. l.* 6. *Am. Marcell. l.* 31.

*Juſt. l.*43.

Liv. l. 29. *Claud. de Raptu Proſerp.* *Max. Tyr. diſſ.* 38. *Suid. in ver.* Θεὸς Ἀρὴς. *Euthym. in Saracen. Sylburgii, p.* 15. *Pocock not. ad ſpec. Hiſt. Arab. p.* 119.

do at *Loretto*, before a *Madonna* of the ſame *Complection* with the *Stone*
Bracthan; of which Colour I ſuppoſe the ſame Reaſon may be given
which the *Mahometans* do of the *Stone Bracthan*, viz. *That it came pure-*
ly white out of Heaven, but was turned black by the Sins of the People. Such
another Idol was *Manah* or *Meneth*, which was of old worſhipped be-
P. 91, 92. tween *Mecca* and *Medina*; which the *Arabick* Writers call a *Rock*
or a *Stone*; and was probably as the ſame *Author* Conjectures, the
P. 99. *Meni* mentioned *Iſa*. 65. 11. and *Saad*, which he deſcribes to be an
Max. Tyr. *oblong Stone lying on the Shore.* The *Paphians*, *Max. Tyrius* ſaith, *wor-*
ib. *ſhipped* Venus *under the Repreſentation of a White Pyramid*: And the *La-*
cedæmonians, ſaith *Pauſanias*, erected after the ancient Cuſtom, *ſeven*
Pauſ. Laconic. p. 103. ed. Sylburg. Achaic. p. 228. *Pillars to the ſeven Planets*; and the ſame *Author* affirms it to have been
the ancient Cuſtom *of all the* Greeks *to ſet up unpoliſh'd Stones inſtead of*
Images, to the Honour of the Gods; which Teſtimony is very conſider-
able, not only becauſe it makes it the *moſt ancient*, but an *univerſal Cu-*
ſtom among the *Greeks*; and near the *Statue* of *Mercury*, he ſaith, *there*
were thirty ſquare Stones, which the Pharii *worſhipped, and gave to every one*
the Name of a God. *Pauſanias* mentions many other ſuch *Images* remain-
Pauſ. Bœot. P. 300. P. 302. P. 311. ing in *Greece*, after the *ancient Mode*, as of *Hercules* in *Bœotia*, of *Cu-*
pid among the *Theſpienſes*, of the *Graces* among the *Orchomenii*, where
he ſaith, *the People worſhip the Stones which they believed to have dropt down*
from Heaven. They were wont, ſaith *Heſychius*, *to have Altars before the*
Heſych. v. ᾿Αγυιεὺς. Harpocr. p. 5. *Doors, in the faſhion of a Pillar, which was called* ᾿Αγυιεὺς; *ſome*, ſaith *Har-*
pocration, *make theſe proper to* Apollo, *others to* Bacchus, others *to both*;
theſe were common at *Athens*, as appears by the Teſtimonies of *Cra-*
tinus, *Menander* and *Sophocles*, quoted by *Harpocration*; and *Sophocles*,
he ſaith, applied that *Athenian* Cuſtom to *Troy*, in his *Laocoon*, λάμ-
Suid. in v. πει δὲ ᾿Αγυιεὺς βωμός, *&c.* whom *Suidas* follows. *Stephanus Byzant.* ſaith,
Steph. v. ᾿Αγυιὰ. the ᾿Αγυιὰ were *Obelisks erected to the Honour of the Gods*; for which he
quotes *Eupolis*. It ſeems both *Pyramids* and *Altars* were called by
this Name among them, being both deſigned for the *Worſhip of* their
Gods: And it is not improbable thoſe rude *Pyramids* in *Yorkſhire*, men-
Cambden in Brit. p. 570. tioned by *Cambden*, called the *Devil's Bolts*, and many ſuch in *Den-*
mark, by *Olaus Wormius*, might be firſt erected for the ſame purpoſe,
Ola. Worm. Monum. Danic. this Cuſtom having been ſo general. *Peter della Valle*, in his late Tra-
vels in the *Indies*, ſaith, that at *Almedabad*, there was a famous Tem-
ple of *Mahadeú*, wherein there was no other Image but a *little column*
of Stone, after a Pyramidal form, but ending at the top in a round Figure;
Viaggi. p. 3. Lett. 1. ſ. 15. p. 107. which *Mahadeú*, he ſaith, in their Language ſignifies *the great God*,
and *after this faſhion*, he ſaith, *it is the Cuſtom of the* Brachmans *to re-*
preſent Mahadeú; the like he obſerves at *Manél*. Although that Au-
P. 116. thor takes the liberty to call this an *Idol*, I do not ſee with what Con-
Lett 6. n. 17. p. 382. ſcience *T. G.* could do it; for an Idol, according to him, doth ſignifie
T.G. p. 48, 49. either *a Repreſentation of ſome imaginary Being, or in the utmoſt Senſe, ſome-*
thing which is falſely eſteemed and worſhipped as God; but this Pyramid to
repreſent *Mahadeú*, or, *the great God*, was neither *a Repreſentation of an*
imaginary Being, nor was it ſelf taken for God, and therefore was no *I-*
dol, nor the Worſhip given to *God* by it *Idolatry*: And upon his Prin-
P. 61. ciple, the Worſhip of the *Gioghi* is very juſtifiable by the Law of *God*,
for this is not a *Repreſentation* by which Men are in danger of being
Anthropomorphites; but only hath ſome *Analogical* and *Metaphorical Sig-*
nification; and therefore it is no Diſparagement to the Deity to be thus
repreſented. Thus it falls out, as I foreſaw, that *T. G.* could not ju-
ſtifie

ſtifie the Practice of their own *Church*, but he muſt unavoidably juſtifie that which is condemned by it, *viz.* the *Heathen Idolatry*. But to proceed, *Herodian* deſcribing the Worſhip of *Alagabalus* at *Emeſa*, in *Phœnicia*, ſaith, *That he had no kind of Image after the* Greek, *or* Roman *faſhion made by Mens Hands*; *but a great Stone round at the bottom, leſſening by degrees, after the faſhion of a Cone*; *and of a black Colour* (like the Stone Bracthan,) *which, they ſay, was not made by Mens Hands, but fell down from Heaven*. It is great pity *Gretſer* had not put it into his Book, *de Imaginibus non manufactis*; together with that of the *Peſſinuntii* in *Herodian*; and of *Diana* of *Epheſus*; and of the *Graces* among the *Orchomenii*; which were all believed *to have come from Heaven*, as well as thoſe mentioned by *Gretſer*; and the evidence is much alike for them all; and for the Miracles wrought by them. *Peter della Valle* ſaith, *That the Image of* Mahadeú *was in great Reputation among the* Indians *for working Miracles*; and in another Place he ſaith, *there were Perſons who believed themſelves cured of ſore Eyes by the Idols, and made their Preſents of Silver and Golden Eyes, and ſome Jewels* (as they do in other Places, on occaſion of the like Miracles.) And notwithſtanding what *Della Valle* intimates of the *honeſty of* Roman *Prieſts in Compariſon of the* Gioghi, in this matter of Miracles, a Man might venture a great deal on their Heads, that they come behind none of them in any thing that tends to deceive the People. And I do not at all wonder, that this Gentleman ſeeing their ſolemn Proceſſions in mighty Numbers, in Pilgrimage to certain Places of Devotion, ſhould naturally think of the *carrying of the Images of Saints, by a Fraternity in Proceſſion to* Loretto, *or* Rome, *in the Holy Year*; any more than that ſeeing the Tricks of *Hamant*, or the *Holy Apes* in the *Indies*, ſhould bring to his Mind thoſe he had ſeen plaid by ſome Creatures much of the ſame kind in *Europe*. But leaving the Conſideration of *Gretſer's Divine Images* to another Place, I return to the Stone of *Alagabalus*, whereof there were more than one, according to *Lampridius*, who ſaith, *Lapides qui Divi dicuntur ex proprio Templo, &c.* he took out of the *Temple of* Alagabalus, *the Stones which were called Gods*: Where the great *Criticks* are ſtrangely confounded by joining this Clauſe with that which follows, of the *Image* of *Diana* from *Laodicea*, and are very hard put to it, to tell what *Image*, and what *Laodicea* this was; a late Author ſuppoſes them to be the ſame with thoſe *Stones* mentioned in *Pauſanias*, and that it was *Laodicea* of *Achaia* which he meant; but *Triſtan* hath ſhewn the true Senſe by dividing the Clauſes; for the *Stones* mentioned before, had no relation to *Laodicea*, but to the proper *Temple of the Deity* from whom *Heliogabalus* took his Name. *Salmaſius* inſtead of the *Lapides qui Divi dicuntur*, would have it read, *Lapides qui vivi dicuntur*, alluding to the *Bætulia*, which *Philo Byblius* calls λίθȣς ἐμψύχȣς; *the animated Stones*, of which he ſpeaks in his Tranſlation of *Sanchoniathon's* Account of the *Phænician Idolatry*: And the Place agrees well enough with it; and they did ſuppoſe a more than *ordinary preſence of God* in thoſe *Stones*, for which Reaſon they attributed *Life* to them; and the *Arabians* called them the *Daughters of God*, being as it were, inſpired with *Life* by him, and believed that they could intercede with *God* for them; and therefore they gave them *Divine Honour*; of which ſort, *Allat*, *Alozza* and *Manah*, are mentioned in the *Alcoran*; although ſome think *Alozza* to have been the *Trunk* of a *Tree*, which was worſhipped among the *Arabians*. *Bern. de Breitenbach* ſaith, *That they had two Stones*, *one*

Herod. l. 5. *p.* 563.

Herod. l. 1. *ſect.* 35.

Viaggi p. 108. *p.* 46.

Id. p. 242.

Lamprid. vit. Anton. Heliogab.

Caroli Patini Numiſmata, p. 331.

Triſtan Comment. hiſtor. p. 324.

Salmaſ. in Hiſtor. Aug. Script. p. 181.

Euſeb. Præp. Ev. l. 1. *c.* 10.

Pocock. not. ad Specim. p. 89.

Hotting. hiſt. Orient. l. 1. *c.* 7. *p.* 231, 232, 233.

one black, which they called Camos, *and the other white, which they called* Mercury; *which two they went twice a Year to Worſhip; and the proper Rites of their Worſhip, were for the firſt, the caſting of Stones behind them, and for the other, burning Incenſe, naked and ſhaven; and not only the* Arabs, *but the* Ammonites *and* Moabites *joined in this Worſhip. Afterwards* Mahomet *finding this Worſhip among them, which was before deſigned to the Honour of* Saturn *and* Mars, *continues the Cuſtoms, but turns the Worſhip another way, and placed one of the Stones in the Corner of the Temple, and the other he pitched in the Ground in the middle, and required of all Perſons that came to* Mecca, *to kiſs theſe Stones, with their Heads ſhaven, and their Backs naked, caſting Stones backward. Petrus Alphonſus* tranſlated out of *Arabick*, a Conference between a *Chriſtian* and a *Saracen*; which is extant in *Vincentius Bellovacenſis*, wherein we have the ſame Account of the Worſhip of the two Stones; but, he ſaith, *The Cuſtom came firſt from the Nations of the* Indies, *which were called* Xechiam, *and* Albarachuma, *i. e.* ſaith *Scaliger*, *Brachmani*, *who were wont to Worſhip their Gods after that manner, by kiſſing the corners of Stones, and caſting them behind them. Maimonides* ſaith, *that* Markolis *was worſhipped by the caſting of Stones, and* Cemoſh, *by ſhaving the Head, &c.* By *Markolis* many underſtand *Mercury*; but *Elias Levita* ſaith, *he could find no ſuch Worſhip among the* Romans: *But,* he ſaith, *it was the Name of an Idol, whoſe peculiar Worſhip that was, and was believed to be an Interceſſor between them, and the Planet* Mercury, *from whom the Name was derived. Buxtorf* gives this Account of the Figure of *Markolis*, that it was after this faſhion, viz. *Two huge Stones ſtanding one againſt another, and a third lying croſs over them, covering the other two with one half of his bigneſs*; *which*, he ſaith, *the* Rabbins *called* בית קולים *domum Kolis. Thence,* he ſaith, *that the* Rabbins *in* Avoda Zara *ſay, that three Stones being placed after that manner are forbidden, becauſe that was the Figure of the Idol* Markolis. (What if our *Stone-henge* were ſome ſuch thing? For the Stones lie tranſverſely upon each other, after this Figure, which neither belonged to a *Roman* Temple, nor the *Daniſh* Monuments?) Towards theſe Stones they were wont to caſt Stones, which was the proper Rite of Worſhip belonging to *Markolis*; and is ſtill performed by the Pilgrims to *Mecca*, but directing their Intention another Way. This is done, ſaith *Scaliger*, on the Mount *Arraphoth*, without *Mecca*: They caſt them into the Valley of *Mena*, or *Akabah*, ſaith Dr. *Pocock* from the *Arabick* Writers; but they pretend to do it upon quite other Grounds than the ancient Idolaters did; *viz.* in imitation of *Abraham*, who, they ſay, *in that Place ſent the Devil packing with a Stone in his Forehead, when he came to interrupt him in the ſacrificing of his Son.* Others ſay, they do it out of Oppoſition to *Idolatry*, and in Contempt of the *Idols* formerly worſhipped there. But the *Jews* ſay, *He that uſeth a Rite proper to Idolatrous Worſhip, though by way of Contempt, is guilty*; and they inſtance particularly in this very thing; however, the *Mahometans* having looked *over* Ariſtotle*'s Threſhold*, do know, that *Acts go whither they are intended*, and for their Parts, *ſince they intend to knock the Devil in the Head with the Stones they caſt backward*, the Devil is like to ſuffer moſt by this Cuſtom; eſpecally, if it be true which ſome of the *Arabick* Writers ſay, that thoſe Stones do *break the Devil's Back.* And what harm can there be in *kiſſing* and *wor-*

Vinc. Bellovac ſpec. Hiſtor. l. 23. *c.* 60.

Scal. de Emend. Temp. l. 5. *p.* 519.

Maim. de Idol. c. 3. *ſect.* 7.

Pocock. Not p. 316

Elias in Thisbi p. 106.

Buxtorf. Lex. Talmud. in v. Markolis.

Scalig. de Emend. Temp. l. 2. *&* 5.

Pocock. not. in ſpec. p. 315

Maim. de Idol. c. 3. *ſect.* 7.

worſhipped the Stone *Bracthan*, as long as they pretend to Honour *Abraham* by doing it? For this is their pretence for it in *Damaſcen*; if *Relative Worſhip* be lawful, I do not ſee, why the *Mahometans* directing their Intention to the God of *Abraham*, are in any greater fault, than thoſe who worſhipping an *Image*, direct their worſhip finally to *God*, but after a *Relative and Inferior Manner*, ſuffer it to fall upon the *Image* for his ſake. But *Damaſcen* ſaith ſomething farther, viz. *That they who look more narrowly into this Stone* (as ſome may ſee farther into a Stone than others) *do find the Image of* Venus, *which they called* Chabar *in it*: To which Dr. *Pocock* anſwers from the *Arabick* Writers, that this is both a Miſtake of *one* Stone for *another*; and that all the Impreſſion in that Stone is as like the Face of *Venus*, as *a Man's Heels* are like his *Head*; unleſs, ſaith he, *the* Mahometans *be ſo blind with Superſtition, as not to be able to diſtinguiſh the Head and Feet from each other*; for ſo *Abulfeda* ſaith, it hath only the Impreſſion of *Abraham*'s Feet; but granting they were miſtaken, and that they could not tell *Abraham*'s Footſtep from an ordinary Pilgrim's, yet methinks they ſhould know ſome difference between the Foot of a Man, and the Face of *Venus*. And what Reaſon is there to ſearch for the figure of a Face upon a *Stone*, when I have already ſo fully proved it was the Cuſtom to Worſhip *rude* and *unpoliſh'd* Stones; eſpecially in thoſe *Eaſtern Parts*, where the *Bætalia* were in ſo much requeſt, which many Learned Men do ſuppoſe to have come at firſt from the Stone which *Jacob* anointed in *Bethel*, and ſet up for a Pillar there, to which the *Jews* ſay, the *Canaanites* afterwards gave *Divine Worſhip*; and that from hence came the Cuſtom of Worſhipping ſuch Stones, and the Name of them. Which makes the Conjecture of *Bochartus* very probable, that *Sanchoniathon* had written נשפים, which the Interpreter miſtaking but one Letter, read נפשים, and ſo render'd it λίθους ἐμψύχους *animated Stones*, which was no more than *anointed Stones*; which Cuſtom of *anointing Stones* for Worſhip among the *Heathens*, is mentioned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Minutius*, *Apuleius* and others. St. *Auguſtine* hath a Paſſage very obſervable to our Purpoſe concerning *Jacob*, viz. *That he did not anoint the Stone at* Bethel *after the Cuſtom of Idolaters, as if he made it a God: For*, ſaith he, *he did not Worſhip the Stone, nor Sacrifice to it*; where we not only find this Cuſtom of Idolaters, but the meaning of that Phraſe in the Fathers of taking *their Images for Gods*, by which they meant no more than what St. *Auguſtine* here explains it by, *viz. giving Divine Worſhip to them. Damaſcius* in *Photius* mentions many of theſe *Bætulia*, that were ſeen by *Aſclepiades* on Mount *Libanus*, near *Heliopolis* in *Syria*; of which, he ſaith, *ſome were conſecrated to* Saturn, *others to* Jupiter, *others to the* Sun.

Damaſc. de hæreſ. p. 941.

p. 942.

Pocock. not. in ſpec. p. 120.

Scalig. not. in Fragm. Vet. p. 39. Id. in Euſeb. Chron. n. 2050. Grot. in Gen. 28. 18. Voſſius, Selden. aliique. Bochart. Canaan. l. 2. c. 2.

Clem. Alex. Str. l. 7. Minut. Felix. p. 2. Arnob. l. 1. p. 22. Apul. Florid. l. 1. Theophraſt. char. de Superſtit. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 16. c. 38. Phot. Cod. 242. p. 1047.

Maximus Tyrius ſhews at large, *That Similitude to the Deity was not regarded in the things they gave Divine Worſhip to, and looked on as Symbols of the God they worſhipped; thus they gave Divine Honour to Fountains, Trees, tops of Mountains, and Mountains themſelves*; as the Inhabitants of *Weſt-Barbary* worſhipped *Mount Atlas*; and the *Cappadocians* the *Mount Argæus*, and others *Mount Caſius*, and ſo *Carmel* is called in *Suetonius* the God *Carmel*: And that Philoſopher makes it an Arbitrary Thing, what kind of Repreſentations of the *Deity* Men make uſe of, as long as they are deſigned *to put them in mind of God, and are worſhipped with a reſpect to him. The ancient* Celtæ, he ſaith, *had no other Image of* Jupiter, *but a great Oak*. The *Lacedæmonians* had ſome an-

Max. Tyr. diſſ. 38.

Triſtan. Comment. Hiſtor. To. 2. p. 316.

Suet. in Veſpaſ. c. 5.

one black, which they called Camos, *and the other white, which they called* Mercury; *which two they went twice a Year to Worſhip; and the proper Rites of their Worſhip, were for the firſt, the caſting of Stones behind them, and for the other, burning Incenſe, naked and ſhaven; and not only the* Arabs, *but the* Ammonites *and* Moabites *joined in this Worſhip. Afterwards* Mahomet *finding this Worſhip among them, which was before deſigned to the Honour of* Saturn *and* Mars, *continues the Cuſtoms, but turns the Worſhip another way, and placed one of the Stones in the Corner of the Temple, and the other he pitched in the Ground in the middle, and required of all Perſons that came to* Mecca, *to kiſs theſe Stones, with their Heads ſhaven, and their Backs naked, caſting Stones backward. Petrus Alphonſus* tranſlated out of *Arabick*, a Conference between a *Chriſtian* and a *Saracen*; which is extant in *Vincentius Bellovacenſis*, wherein we have the ſame Account of the Worſhip of the two Stones; but, he ſaith, *The Cuſtom came firſt from the Nations of the* Indies, *which were called* Xechiam, *and* Albarachuma, *i.e.* ſaith *Scaliger*, *Brachmani, who were wont to Worſhip their Gods after that manner, by kiſſing the corners of Stones, and caſting them behind them. Maimonides* ſaith, *that* Markolis *was worſhipped by the caſting of Stones, and* Cemoſh, *by ſhaving the Head, &c.* By *Markolis* many underſtand *Mercury*; but *Elias Levita* ſaith, *he could find no ſuch Worſhip among the* Romans: *But,* he ſaith, *it was the Name of an Idol, whoſe peculiar Worſhip that was, and was believed to be an Interceſſor between them, and the Planet* Mercury, *from whom the Name was derived. Buxtorf* gives this Account of the Figure of *Markolis*, that it was after this faſhion, viz. *Two huge Stones ſtanding one againſt another, and a third lying croſs over them, covering the other two with one half of his bigneſs; which,* he ſaith, *the* Rabbins *called* בית קולים *domum Kolis. Thence,* he ſaith, *that the* Rabbins *in* Avoda Zara *ſay, that three Stones being placed after that manner are forbidden, becauſe that was the Figure of the Idol* Markolis. (What if our *Stone-henge* were ſome ſuch thing? For the Stones lie tranſverſely upon each other, after this Figure, which neither belonged to a *Roman* Temple, nor the *Daniſh* Monuments?) Towards theſe Stones they were wont to caſt Stones, which was the proper Rite of Worſhip belonging to *Markolis*; and is ſtill performed by the Pilgrims to *Mecca*, but directing their Intention anoter Way. This is done, ſaith *Scaliger*, on the Mount *Arraphoth*, without *Mecca*: They caſt them into the Valley of *Mena*, or *Akabah*, ſaith Dr. *Pocock* from the *Arabick* Writers; but they pretend to do it upon quite other Grounds than the ancient Idolaters did; *viz.* in imitation of *Abraham*, who, they ſay, *in that Place ſent the Devil packing with a Stone in his Forehead, when he came to interrupt him in the ſacrificing of his Son.* Others ſay, they do it out of Oppoſition to *Idolatry*, and in Contempt of the *Idols* formerly worſhipped there. But the *Jews* ſay, *He that uſeth a Rite proper to Idolatrous Worſhip, though by way of Contempt, is guilty*; and they inſtance particularly in this very thing; however, the *Mahometans* having looked *over* Ariſtotle's *Threſhold*, do know, that *Acts go whither they are intended*, and for their Parts, *ſince they intend to knock the Devil in the Head with the Stones they caſt backward*, the Devil is like to ſuffer moſt by this Cuſtom; eſpecally, if it be true which ſome of the *Arabick* Writers ſay, that thoſe Stones do *break the Devil's Back.* And what harm can there be in *kiſſing* and *wor-*

Vinc. Bellovac ſpec. Hiſtor. l. 23. *c.* 60.

Scal. de Emend. Temp. l. 5. *p.* 519.

Maim. de Idol. c. 3. *ſect.* 7. *Pocock. Not p.*316 *Elias in Thiſbi p.* 106.

Buxtorf. Lex. Talmud. in v. Markolis.

Scalig. de Emend. Temp. l. 2. & 5. *Pocock. not. in ſpec. p.*315

Maim. de Idol. c. 3. *ſect.* 7.

worſhipped the Stone *Bracthan*, as long as they pretend to Honour *Abraham* by doing it? For this is their pretence for it in *Damaſcen*; if *Relative Worſhip* be lawful, I do not ſee, why the *Mahometans* directing their Intention to the God of *Abraham*, are in any greater fault, than thoſe who worſhipping an *Image*, direct their worſhip finally to *God*, but after a *Relative and Inferior Manner*, ſuffer it to fall upon the *Image* for his ſake. But *Damaſcen* ſaith ſomething farther, viz. *That they who look more narrowly into this Stone* (as ſome may ſee farther into a Stone than others) *do find the Image of* Venus, *which they called* Chabar *in it*: To which Dr. *Pocock* anſwers from the *Arabick* Writers, that this is both a Miſtake of *one* Stone for *another*; and that all the Impreſſion in that Stone is as like the Face of *Venus*, as a *Man's Heels* are like his *Head*; unleſs, ſaith he, *the* Mahometans *be ſo blind with Superſtition, as not to be able to diſtinguiſh the Head and Feet from each other*; for ſo *Abulfeda* ſaith, it hath only the Impreſſion of *Abraham*'s Feet; but granting they were miſtaken, and that they could not tell *Abraham*'s Footſtep from an ordinary Pilgrim's, yet methinks they ſhould know ſome difference between the Foot of a Man, and the Face of *Venus*. And what Reaſon is there to ſearch for the figure of a Face upon a *Stone*, when I have already ſo fully proved it was the Cuſtom to Worſhip *rude* and *unpoliſh'd* Stones; eſpecially in thoſe *Eaſtern Parts*, where the *Bætulia* were in ſo much requeſt, which many Learned Men do ſuppoſe to have come at firſt from the Stone which *Jacob* anointed in *Bethel*, and ſet up for a Pillar there, to which the *Jews* ſay, the *Canaanites* afterwards gave *Divine Worſhip*; and that from hence came the Cuſtom of Worſhipping ſuch Stones, and the Name of them. Which makes the Conjecture of *Bochartus* very probable, that *Sanchoniathon* had written נשפים, which the Interpreter miſtaking but one Letter, read נפשים, and ſo render'd it λίθȣς ἐμψύχȣς *animated Stones*, which was no more than *anointed Stones*; which Cuſtom of *anointing Stones* for Worſhip among the *Heathens*, is mentioned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Minutius*, *Apuleius* and others. St. *Auguſtine* hath a Paſſage very obſervable to our Purpoſe concerning *Jacob*, viz. *That he did not anoint the Stone at* Bethel *after the Cuſtom of Idolaters, as if he made it a God: For, ſaith he, he did not Worſhip the Stone, nor Sacrifice to it*; where we not only find this Cuſtom of Idolaters, but the meaning of that Phraſe in the Fathers of taking *their Images for Gods*, by which they meant no more than what St. *Auguſtine* here explains it by, *viz. giving Divine Worſhip to them.* *Damaſcius* in *Photius* mentions many of theſe *Bætulia*, that were ſeen by *Aſclepiades* on Mount *Libanus*, near *Heliopolis* in *Syria*; of which, he ſaith, *ſome were conſecrated to* Saturn, *others to* Jupiter, *others to the* Sun.

Damaſc. de hæreſ. p. 941.

p. 942.

Pocock. not. in ſpec. p. 120.

Scalig. not. in Fragm. Vet. p. 39. *Id. in Euſeb. Chron. n.* 2050. *Grot. in Gen.* 28.18. *Voſſius, Selden. aliique. Bochart. Canaan. l.* 2. *c.* 2.

Clem. Alex. Str. l. 7. *Minut. Felix. p.* 2. *Arnob. l.* 1. *p.* 22. *Apul. Florid. l.* 1. *Theophraſt. char. de Superſtit. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l.* 16. *c.* 38. *Phot. Cod.* 242. *p.* 1047.

Maximus Tyrius ſhews at large, *That Similitude to the Deity was not regarded in the things they gave Divine Worſhip to, and looked on as Symbols of the God they worſhipped; thus they gave Divine Honour to Fountains, Trees, tops of Mountains, and Mountains themſelves*; as the Inhabitants of *Weſt-Barbary* worſhipped *Mount Atlas*; and the *Cappadocians* the *Mount Argæus*, and others *Mount Caſius*, and ſo *Carmel* is called in *Suetonius* the God *Carmel*: And that Philoſopher makes it an Arbitrary Thing, what kind of Repreſentations of the *Deity* Men make uſe of, as long as they are deſigned *to put them in mind of God, and are worſhipped with a reſpect to him. The ancient* Celtæ, *he ſaith, had no other Image of* Jupiter, *but a great Oak.* The *Lacedæmonians* had ſome ancient

Max. Tyr. diſſ. 38.

Triſtan. Comment. Hiſtor. To. 2. *p.* 316.

Suet. in Veſpaſ. c. 5.

Plut. de frat. amore p. 478. Euſtath. ad Iliad. ϱ. Tacit. de Morib. Germ. c. 9. T. G. p. 75.

cient Images of the *Dioſcuri*, which they called Δόκανα, which, ſaith *Plutarch*, were nothing elſe, *but two pieces of Timber lying at an equal diſtance, with two others laid acroſs over them*; from whom *Euſtathius* repeats it. And *Tacitus* ſaith, *the old* Germans *had no Images of their Deities of any Humane Figure*; *and that they attributed the Names of their Gods to their Groves*: For they had, as *Claudian* expreſſes it, *Robora, numinis Inſtar.* T. G. ſaith, *It is evident from* Tacitus *himſelf, that they had other Figures and Symbols in their conſecrated Groves*; *altho' they had not any in the likeneſs of Men, becauſe they thought them unſuitable to the Celeſtial Deities*: But I deſire to be informed by him, 1. How other Figures come to be a leſs Diſparagement to the *Deity*, than Humane Figures? Did they indeed think it leſs diſhonour to *God* to be like a Brute, or a Plant, or a Cockboat, than to be like a Man? Did they who thought the *Images* of Men ſo much below their *Gods*, take the others to be more agreeable to them? 2. How doth *Tacitus* make it appear, that they had other Symbols and Figures *in the conſecrated Groves*? It is true that he ſaith, *part of the* Suevi *did ſacrifice to* Iſis: *But*, he ſaith, *this was a Foreign Religion, and he knows not how it came there, but he is ſure by the Figure it was Foreign*? and doth this prove, that the Religion of the *Germans* did allow of Images, becauſe a Religion was known to be *foreign*, by its Image? But this is the very Quinteſſence of Ingenuity, when he hath had no more to ſay againſt this Teſtimony, and not a Word againſt any of the reſt, to conclude after this faſhion, *His other Citations I took upon his Word without examining them* (which I hardly take upon his Word, finding him ſo ready to Cavil upon the ſlighteſt Occaſion) *and the Reader may gueſs by this out of* Tacitus, *whether it be not likely I did him a kindneſs in it*; which I am content to leave to the Reader's Ingenuity.

§. 6.

Plin. l. 12. c. 1. Quint. l. 10. Curt. l. 8. Codex Afric. c. 84. Capit. Caroli l. 1. tit. c. 4. l. 7. tit. 236. Leg. Longobard. l. 2. tit. 38. n. 1. Caniſ. Antiq. Lect. To. 4. p. 421. Serrar. Rer. Mog. l. 3. not. 19. Agath. r. l. 1. c. 18. St. Aug. Dom. 21. poſt Trin. ſer. 2.

We are certain it was the Cuſtom both of the *Germans* and *Gauls*, as well as other Nations, to worſhip not only Stones and Fountains, but Trees. *Pliny* ſaith in general, *That Trees were looked on as Temples of the Gods*; *and that the People did not more worſhip the Images of Gold and Ivory, than they did the Groves*; and the ſame *Quintillian* ſaith, eſpecially of Aged Oaks. *Curtius* ſaith, *the* Indians *accounted all things Gods which they worſhipped, eſpecially Trees.* The Council of *Carthage* mentions the remainders of *Idolatries* in Groves and Trees as well as *Images.* And there was no one Cuſtom of *Idolatry* which the *Northern Nations* eſpecially, were more hardly drawn from, after they had received Chriſtianity: Which was therefore ſtrictly forbidden in the *Capitular* of *Carolus M.* and the *Prieſts were ſeverely puniſhed if they did not diſcover thoſe who did, aut arbores, aut fontes, aut ſaxa venerari*, which are the Words there uſed. In the *Lombard Laws*, there is a Conſtitution of *Luitprandus*, againſt thoſe that did worſhip *ad arborem atque ad fontanas*, before a certain Tree, and at Springs. *Othlonus*, in the Life of *Boniface*, not only mentions this Cuſtom, but that *Boniface* cut down a *very great Tree*, which was called *Arbor Jovis*, in a Place called *Geſmere*; which is in the lower *Haſſia*, ſaith *Serrarius*. *Agathias* ſaith, that the *Germans* worſhipped Trees and Rivers, and Hills and Groves. In St. *Auguſtine*'s time, we find this Cuſtom continued among many called *Chriſtians, to pay their Vows before certain Trees, and to ſay their Prayers at Fountains*; for which he charges them with Idolatry ; *which Trees*, he ſaith, *If they fell, they would not take a Stick of them to burn, whereby they give Honour to a dead Tree, and contemn the Precepts of the living God.* The twelfth Council of *Toledo* produces the ſecond Commandment, and the other ſevere Prohibitions of *Idolatry* againſt this Practice. The ſecond Council of *Arles* hath a Canon againſt the *Biſhops* who ſuffer any Trees or Stones to remain in their Dioceſſes : The ſame hath the *Council* of *Braga* againſt *Presbyters*. The ſecond Council of *Tours* charges the Prieſts to Excommunicate thoſe who did theſe things : *Le Cointe* by the Stones underſtands the Boundaries, at which the *Heathens* did celebrate the *Terminalia*, but without any bloody Sacrifice, as he proves from *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſæus*, and *Plutarch*. The Synod of *Auxerre* forbids *Chriſtians paying their Vows*, either before holy Trees, or at Fountains. The Council of *Nants* commands the *cutting down all ſuch Trees*, and *caſting away the Stones*; *and that all People be told what a dreadful Sin Idolatry is, and that he that worſhips Trees and Stones, denies God, and renounces his Chriſtianity.* With a great deal more to that Purpoſe; and yet all this while theſe Men pretended to be *Chriſtians*, and to *direct the Intention of their Worſhip aright* ; which I beſeech T. G. to obſerve ; for all the Fault the Council found with them was, *That they did thoſe things before Trees and Stones, which ought to be done only in the Church*, viz. *making their Oblations, and ſaying their Prayers.* And in the Canons of *Eligius*, *this is one*, *Nullus Chriſtianus ad fana, vel ad Petras, vel ad Fontes, vel ad Arbores, aut ad Cellos, vel per trivia, luminaria faciat, aut vota reddere præſumat.* Where we ſee theſe Canons did reſpect Chriſtians, and not Infidels ; and ſeveral of them are inſerted in the *Collection of Canons* by *Burchardus* and *Regino* : Now I deſire to be reſolved by *T.G.* why it is not as lawful to ſay ones Prayers in a *conſecrated Grove*, or at a *Fountain*, or before a *Stone* or *Pillar*, as before a *conſecrated Image* ? Hath *God* only forbidden Groves and Statues to be worſhipped, and not Images at all ? Nay, one would think, that at the ſame time he had forbidden the one, he had commanded the other ; when we ſee how ſcrupulous theſe *Fathers* were in the former, and how much the practice of Devotion in the *Roman Church*, where it is openly and publickly allowed, conſiſts in the other. Surely a Man is not more apt to think God to be like a Tree, or a Stone, than to the Image of a Man ; and if this Argument of *Similitude* ſignifies any thing, it tends to juſtifie theſe Practices, condemned by ſo many Councils ; and to condemn the Worſhip of *Images* in the likeneſs of Men, which T.G. endeavours to juſtifie. And, to let us ſee how general this kind of Worſhip was among the *Heathen Idolaters*, I ſhall conclude this Diſcourſe with a double Teſtimony, to this Purpoſe : The one of *Dio Chryſoſtom*, who ſaith, *The generality of the barbarous Nations, called Mountains, Trees, and Stones, by the Name of Gods*, *i. e.* as the *Greeks* and *Romans* did their *Images*, to which they gave Divine Worſhip. The other of *Acoſta*, who ſaith, *The* Indians *worſhipped Rivers, Fountains, Rocks, or great Stones, Hills and the tops of Mountains, which they called Apachita's, and all things in Nature which ſeem'd to have ſomething extraordinary in them.*

Concil. Tolet. 12. *c.* 11.
Conc. Arelat. 2. *c.* 23.
Conc. Bracar. 3. *c.* 22.
Annales Eccleſiaſt. Franc. A. D. 566. *n.* 51.
Synod. Autiſſiod. A. D. 586. *c.* 3.
Concil. Nannet. A. D. 656. *c.* 20.
Annales Ecleſ. Franc. A. D. 659. *n.* 36.
Burchard. l. 10. *c.* 9, 10, 32.
Regino de Ecleſ. diſcipl. l. 1. *c.* 300. *l.* 2. *c.* 5. *n.* 43. *c.* 38.
Dio Chryſoſtom. orat. 12.
Acoſta Natur. & Moral Hiſtory of the *Indies l.* 5. *c.* 5.

§. 7. 2. The *Heathens* worſhipped ſuch *Images*, as had ſome Shape and Figure, but it was not of any Real Being, but only Imaginary. This I have ſo little Reaſon to go about to prove againſt *T. G.* that he deſires

T. G. *p.* 48.

Plut. de frat. amore p. 478.
Euſtath. ad Iliad. ρ.
Tacit. de Morib. Germ. c. 9.
T.G. p. 75.

cient Images of the *Dioſcuri*, which they called Δόκανα, which, ſaith *Plutarch*, were nothing elſe, *but two pieces of Timber lying at an equal diſtance, with two others laid acroſs over them*; from whom *Euſtathius* repeats it. And *Tacitus* ſaith, *the old* Germans *had no Images of their Deities of any Humane Figure; and that they attributed the Names of their Gods to their Groves*: For they had, as *Claudian* expreſſes it, *Robora, numinis Inſtar*. T. G. ſaith, *It is evident from* Tacitus *himſelf, that they had other Figures and Symbols in their conſecrated Groves; altho' they had not any in the likeneſs of Men, becauſe they thought them unſuitable to the Celeſtial Deities*: But I deſire to be informed by him, 1. How other Figures come to be a leſs Diſparagement to the *Deity*, than Humane Figures? Did they indeed think it leſs diſhonour to *God* to be like a Brute, or a Plant, or a Cockboat, than to be like a Man? Did they who thought the *Images* of Men ſo much below their *Gods*, take the others to be more agreeable to them? 2. How doth *Tacitus* make it appear, that they had other Symbols and Figures *in the conſecrated Groves*? It is true that he ſaith, *part of the* Suevi *did ſacrifice to* Iſis: *But*, he ſaith, *this was a Foreign Religion, and he knows not how it came there, but he is ſure by the Figure it was Foreign*? and doth this prove, that the Religion of the *Germans* did allow of Images, becauſe a Religion was known to be *foreign*, by its Image? But this is the very Quinteſſence of Ingenuity, when he hath had no more to ſay againſt this Teſtimony, and not a Word againſt any of the reſt, to conclude after this faſhion, *His other Citations I took upon his Word without examining them* (which I hardly take upon his Word, finding him ſo ready to Cavil upon the ſlighteſt Occaſion) *and the Reader may gueſs by this out of* Tacitus, *whether it be not likely I did him a kindneſs in it*; which I am content to leave to the Reader's Ingenuity.

§. 6.

Plin. l. 12. c. 1.
Quint. l. 10.
Curt. l. 8.
Codex Afric. c. 84.
Capit. Caroli l. 1. tit. c. 4. l. 7. tit. 236.
Leg. Longobard. l. 2. tit. 38. n. 1.
Caniſ. Antiq. Lect. To. 4. p. 421.
Serrar. Rer. Mog. l. 3. not. 10.
Agath. r. l. 1. c. 18.
St. Aug. Dom. 21. poſt Trin. ſer. 2.

We are certain it was the Cuſtom both of the *Germans* and *Gauls*, as well as other Nations, to worſhip not only Stones and Fountains, but Trees. *Pliny* ſaith in general, *That Trees were looked on as Temples of the Gods; and that the People did not more worſhip the Images of Gold and Ivory, than they did the Groves*; and the ſame *Quintillian* ſaith, eſpecially of Aged Oaks. *Curtius* ſaith, *the* Indians *accounted all things Gods which they worſhipped, eſpecially Trees*. The Council of *Carthage* mentions the remainders of *Idolatries* in Groves and Trees as well as *Images*. And there was no one Cuſtom of *Idolatry* which the *Northern Nations* eſpecially, were more hardly drawn from, after they had received Chriſtianity: Which was therefore ſtrictly forbidden in the *Capitular* of *Carolus M.* and the *Prieſts were ſeverely puniſhed if they did not diſcover thoſe who did, aut arbores, aut fontes, aut ſaxa venerari*, which are the Words there uſed. In the *Lombard Laws*, there is a Conſtitution of *Luitprandus*, againſt thoſe that did worſhip *ad arborem atque ad fontanas*, before a certain Tree, and at Springs. *Othlonus*, in the Life of *Boniface*, not only mentions this Cuſtom, but that *Boniface* cut down a *very great Tree*, which was called *Arbor Jovis*, in a Place called *Geſmere*; which is in the lower *Haſſia*, ſaith *Serrarius*. *Agathias* ſaith, that the *Germans* worſhipped Trees and Rivers, and Hills and Groves. In St. *Auguſtine*'s time, we find this Cuſtom continued among many called *Chriſtians, to pay their Vows before certain Trees, and to ſay their Prayers at Fountains*; for which he charges them with Idolatry ; *which Trees,* he ſaith, *If they fell, they would not take a Stick of them to burn, whereby they give Honour to a dead Tree, and contemn the Precepts of the living God.* The twelfth Council of *Toledo* produces the ſecond Commandment, and the other ſevere Prohibitions of *Idolatry* againſt this Practice. The ſecond Council of *Arles* hath a Canon againſt the *Biſhops* who ſuffer any Trees or Stones to remain in their Dioceſſes : The ſame hath the *Council* of *Braga* againſt *Presbyters.* The ſecond Council of *Tours* charges the Prieſts to Excommunicate thoſe who did theſe things : *Le Cointe* by the Stones underſtands the Boundaries, at which the *Heathens* did celebrate the *Terminalia,* but without any bloody Sacrifice, as he proves from *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſæus,* and *Plutarch.* The Synod of *Auxerre* forbids *Chriſtians paying their Vows,* either before holy Trees, or at Fountains. The Council of *Nants* commands the *cutting down all ſuch Trees,* and *caſting away the Stones; and that all People be told what a dreadful Sin Idolatry is, and that he that worſhips Trees and Stones, denies God, and renounces his Chriſtianity.* With a great deal more to that Purpoſe; and yet all this while theſe Men pretended to be *Chriſtians,* and to *direct the Intention of their Worſhip aright* ; which I beſeech T. G. to obſerve ; for all the Fault the Council found with them was, *That they did thoſe things before Trees and Stones, which ought to be done only in the Church,* viz. *making their Oblations, and ſaying their Prayers.* And in the Canons of *Eligius, this is one, Nullus Chriſtianus ad fana, vel ad Petras, vel ad Fontes, vel ad Arbores, aut ad Cellos, vel per trivia, luminaria faciat, aut vota reddere præſumat.* Where we ſee theſe Canons did reſpect Chriſtians, and not Infidels ; and ſeveral of them are inſerted in the *Collection of Canons* by *Burchardus* and *Regino :* Now I deſire to be reſolved by *T.G.* why it is not as lawful to ſay ones Prayers in a *conſecrated Grove,* or at a *Fountain,* or before a *Stone* or *Pillar,* as before a *conſecrated Image ?* Hath *God* only forbidden Groves and Statues to be worſhipped, and not Images at all ? Nay, one would think, that at the ſame time he had forbidden the one, he had commanded the other ; when we ſee how ſcrupulous theſe *Fathers* were in the former, and how much the practice of Devotion in the *Roman Church,* where it is openly and publickly allowed, conſiſts in the other. Surely a Man is not more apt to think God to be like a Tree, or a Stone, than to the Image of a Man ; and if this Argument of *Similitude* ſignifies any thing, it tends to juſtifie theſe Practices, condemned by ſo many Councils ; and to condemn the Worſhip of *Images* in the likeneſs of Men, which *T. G.* endeavours to juſtifie. And, to let us ſee how general this kind of Worſhip was among the *Heathen Idolaters,* I ſhall conclude this Diſcourſe with a double Teſtimony, to this Purpoſe : The one of *Dio Chryſoſtom,* who ſaith, *The generality of the barbarous Nations, called Mountains, Trees, and Stones, by the Name of Gods, i. e.* as the *Greeks* and *Romans* did their *Images,* to which they gave Divine Worſhip. The other of *Acoſta,* who ſaith, *The* Indians *worſhipped Rivers, Fountains, Rocks, or great Stones, Hills and the tops of Mountains, which they called* Apachita's, *and all things in Nature which ſeem'd to have ſomething extraordinary in them.*

Concil. Tolet. 12. c. 11.
Conc. Arelat. 2. c. 23.
Conc. Bracar. 3. c. 22.
Annales Eccleſiaſt. Franc. A. D. 566. n. 51.
Synod. Autiſſiod. A. D. 586. c. 3.
Concil. Nannet. A. D. 656. c. 20.
Annales Eccleſ. Franc. A. D. 659. n. 36.
Burchard. l. 10. c. 9, 10, 32.
Regino de Eccleſ. diſcipl. l. 1. c. 300. l. 2. c. 5. n. 43. c. 38.
Dio Chryſoſtom. orat. 12.
Acoſta Natur. & Moral Hiſtory of the *Indies* l. 5. c. 5.

§. 7.

2. The *Heathens* worſhipped ſuch *Images,* as had ſome Shape and Figure, but it was not of any Real Being, but only Imaginary. This I have ſo little Reaſon to go about to prove againſt *T. G.* that he

T. G. p. 48.

deſires me *to take notice, that the Heathens* (*as* Origen, Hom. 8. in Exod. 20. and Theodoret q. 38. in Exod. *tells us, when they expound the ſecond Commandment*) *had two ſorts of Images; ſome of which were purely Figments, or Fictions of their own Brain, made to repreſent what had no Exiſtence, but in their own Imaginations, as Sphinxes, Tritons, Centaures, and the like; and others which were made to repreſent ſuch things, as had a real and ſubſtantial Being in the World, as the Sun, Moon and Stars,* &c. *which they Eſteemed and Worſhipped as Gods.* I ſhall not now diſpute, whether the Idols forbidden in the ſecond Commandment, be only ſuch Repreſentations; nor whether *Sphinxes* and *Centaures* be ſuch imaginary Beings, (for about the latter St. *Hierom* is uncertain; and a *Sphinx* is nothing but an *Æthiopian Ape*, ſuch as *Philoſtorgius* ſaith himſelf ſaw;) but that which I inſiſt upon in this Place, is, that this ſort of *Images* was not certainly unlawful on the account of Similitude to the *Deity*; and thoſe who thought ſo were no Idolaters, but Atheiſts; for then they thought that to be like *God*, which was like to *Nothing*. And if the *Athenians* had any ſuch as theſe, (as they were as good at *Chimæra*'s as other People) St. *Paul*'s Argument would not reach to them; and, it ſeems, St. *Paul* miſtook his Point: For he, good Man, thought he had been talking againſt Idolatry at *Athens*: But it was no ſuch Matter; *For*, ſaith *T. G. he talked againſt ſuch Images as were proper Likeneſſes and Repreſentations of the Divinity.* Now the Divinity certainly is a *Real Being*, and *Idolatry* is the Worſhip of *Idols*: *But an Idol*, ſaith *T. G. is a Repreſentation of an Imaginary Being*; therefore thoſe Images St. *Paul* ſpake againſt at *Athens* were no Idols; and conſequently St. *Paul* doth not prove the *Athenians* guilty of Idolatry. But of theſe things more at large when I come to the ſecond Commandment.

S Hierom. vit. Pauli. p. 238. ed. Froben. Philoſtorg. hiſt. l. 3. c. 2.

§. 8. 3. They had *artificial Images of real Beings, in the Likeneſs of Men.* And I ſhall now ſhew, that even theſe Images were not ſet up or worſhipped among the Heathens, becauſe they ſuppoſed the *Gods* to be like them. For which, in the firſt Place I ſhall produce this Remarkable Teſtimony of *Cicero*, where he anſwers the *Epicurean* Argument for the *Gods* being of *Humane Form*, becauſe Men are wont to repreſent them ſo, *Quis tam cœcus*, ſaith he, *in contemplandis rebus unquam fuit, ut non videret ſpecies iſtas hominum collatas in Deos, aut conſilio quodam ſapientum, quo facilius animos imperitorum ad Deorum cultum à vita pravitate converterent; aut Superſtitione, ut eſſent ſimulachra, quæ venerantes, Deos ipſos ſe adire crederent? Who was there ever ſo blind in the judgment of things, as not to ſee that the Figures of Men are attributed to the Gods, either by the advice of wiſe Men, the eaſier to draw rude and wicked People to the Worſhip of them; or out of Superſtition, that when they worſhipped their Images, they might believe they approached to the Gods themſelves?* Where we obſerve, that theſe Words are brought to diſprove the *Epicurean Opinion of the Gods being like to Men*; and he undertakes to give an Account how they came to be repreſented in Humane Shape, although they were not like to it; *viz.* 1. To make the Notion of *God* more familiar and eaſie to rude and barbarous People, that knew not how to conceive of him, and therefore neglected his Worſhip, which is all one with making them *Books* for the *ignorant Laiety*. 2. To excite their Devotion, that when they made their Addreſſes to theſe Images, they might believe they made them to the *Gods* themſelves.

De Nat. Deor. l. 1. c. 27.

And, according to *T. G.* what harm was there in all this? Provided that theſe were declared not to be *proper Likeneſſes of the Deity*; and ſo we ſee they were, by their beſt and wiſeſt Men: *But the People might image the Gods to be like them*; and what then? May they not do the ſame in the *Roman Church*, and with as good Reaſon? When they ſee *God* painted like a *Pope*, with his Crown and Pontifical Veſtments; may they not as reaſonably think, that as the Pope is God's Vicar on Earth, God himſelf is the Pope in Heaven. If they ſay, *they take care the People be better informed*: Not too much of that neither. But did not *Cicero* and others do the like by the Heathens? Who argued againſt the Folly of ſuppoſing the *Gods to be like Men*, and derided the *Epicureans* for aſſerting it; as Men that neither underſtood the Nature of *Gods*, or *Men*. And *Cicero* in the ſame Place is ſo far from looking on this Practice of Worſhipping the *Gods in Images of Humane Shape, as Univerſal*, that he confeſſes it to be almoſt peculiar to the *Greeks* and *Romans*; and ſaith, *That the* Epicureans *who did aſſert the Gods to have the Members of Mens Bodies, but made no uſe of them, did only droll, and in Words aſſert a Deity, which in Truth they denied.* *Maximus Tyrius* debates the Caſe about the ſeveral ways of repreſenting God: And although he makes *the manner as indifferent, as whether our Words be expreſſed in* Phœnician, *or* Ionian, *or* Attick, *or* Ægyptian *Characters, they being all intended only as helps to our Underſtandings and Memories, and as far diſtant from the Deity as Heaven from Earth*: *Yet*, he ſaith, *they are uſeful to the duller part of Mankind, who, like Children, are taught to read and underſtand, by theſe broader Characters; which are intended only as a Manuduction to them*; *yet, he prefers that which he calls the* Greek *way, of repreſenting the Gods with the moſt exquiſite Art in Humane Figures*: But he doth it ſo timorouſly, that he only ſaith, *it is not unreaſonable*; not that he imagined the *Gods to be like them*, but only *becauſe the Soul of Man comes neareſt to God; and that Habitation which God had choſen for a Divine Soul ſeemed the fitteſt to be a Symbol of the Inviſible Deity*. But he does not blame the other Nations which made uſe of other ways of repreſenting the Deity, which he muſt have done, if he had thought the *Greek Images the proper Likeneſſes of God*; for although he diſputes againſt the *Perſians* and *Ægyptians*, yet he concludes all at laſt with this ſaying, *Whether Men Worſhip God by the Art of* Phidias, *as the* Greeks; *or by the Worſhip of living Creatures, as the* Ægyptians; *or by the Worſhip of Rivers, or of Fire, as other Nations, I condemn not the variety: Let them only underſtand and love, and remember him whom they worſhip.* Θεῖον εἰς γνώμην ἔσω μόνον, *i. e.* in *T. G.*'s Tranſlation, *Let a Man only direct his Intention towards God, and then without doubt the Actions go whither they are intended.* And upon theſe Grounds, none of the Heathens were to blame in the Worſhip of Images, provided they looked on them only as Symbols, or Analogical Repreſentations of the *Deity*, as *Maximus Tyrius* ſaith they did, and directed their Worſhip towards the Supreme Being, as he adviſeth them all to do. *For*, ſaith he, *God, who is the Father and Maker of all Things, elder than the Sun and Heaven, better than Time and Age, and all Fluid things, a Lawgiver without Name, that cannot be expreſſed with Words or ſeen with Eyes; whoſe Eſſence being incomprehenſible by us, we make uſe of all Helps from Sounds and Words, and living Creatures, and Images of Gold, and Ivory, and Silver, and Plants, and Rivers,* and

c. 29.

De Nat. Deor. l. 3. *c.* 1.

Max. Tyri. diſſ. 38.

and Mountains, to bring us to the Conception of him; and becauſe of our Weakneſs, thoſe things we account good we attribute to him, as lovers uſe to do, who delight in any Repreſentation of him they love; and behold with great Pleaſure, the Harp, or the Dart, or the Seat he ſate upon, or the Place he ran in, and whatever brings him to mind. What need I ſay any more concerning Images? Let God only be in the mind. Is not this a Vindication T.G. p. 17. of Heathen Idolatry to *T. G.*'s Hearts deſire? For, ſaith *T. G. Is it not an Honour to the King to kiſs his Picture? And the very light of Nature teaches, that the Honour or Diſhonour done to a Picture or Image, reflects upon the Perſon repreſented by it.* Now, ſaith *Max. Tyrius, we look upon Images, and Trees, and Rivers, and Mountains, but as ſo many imperfect Pictures, and Repreſentations of the Deity: But although they do not come near his Beauty, yet we Honour them for the ſake of him whom they repreſent*; wherein we do but as great Lovers do, we kiſs the Footſteps where he trod, we embrace, admire, and value things as they repreſent him, and bring him to our Minds. And is there any thing more natural than this? *For is it not an Honour to the King to kiſs his Picture?* Or, as the Emperor *Julian* more elegantly expreſſes it, Ὅστις ἂν φιλοβασιλεὺς ἡδέως ὁρᾷ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως εἰκόνα, &c. *He that loves* Julian. oper. p. 539. *the King, takes pleaſure in ſeeing the Picture of the King: He that loves the Child, loves any Repreſentation of him, and ſo doth he that loves his Father*; *even ſo*, ſaith the devout Emperor *Julian* by the meer Light of Nature, *every one that is* φιλόθεος, *a lover of God loves the Repreſentations of the Gods, and beholding their Images, doth ſecretly Fear and Reverence them, which although inviſible, themſelves do behold him.* Wherein we ſee how admirably *Julian* and *T. G.* have hit not only on the ſame Principle of Nature, but the very Inſtance, and almoſt the very ſame Expreſſions. It ſeems this great Man *did not corrupt himſelf in thoſe things he knew naturally*, but purſued the Light of Nature towards the Defence of Pagan Idolatry, making the Worſhip of Images a part of Natural Religion, as *T. G.* doth. *But what ſpight is this, for me to mention* Julian *and* T. G. *together? whereas it is well known that* Julian *was againſt Invocation of Saints, and called that as great Idolatry as the Heathens, as* T. G. *notably obſerves againſt Dr.* St. But for all this, *Julian*, though an Apoſtate, and great Enemy to Chriſtianity, was a ſhrewd underſtanding Man, and found out the very fundamental Principle of the Worſhip of Images, and reſolved it into the Light of Nature, as *T. G.* doth. *But* Julian *ſuppoſed theſe Images to be proper Likeneſſes of the Gods, and conſequently the Worſhip of them as ſuch is condemned*: No ſuch Matter, I aſſure you, *Julian* was a more Orthodox Man than ſo, he was no follower of that damnable Heretick called *Anthropomorphus* (for ſo I find him in an ancient Ca- Gennad de dogm. Eccleſ. c. 4. talogue of Hereticks;) *Julian* deteſts that Opinion, and calls the *Gods* ἀνειδέους καὶ ἀσχηματίστους, *without any Corporeal Figure or Shape*; and therefore he propoſes the Objection of a Chriſtian againſt him, *how* p. 537. *could it then be proper to make any Corporeal Images of them? Why, to that* ſaith *Julian, I anſwer, the Images of the Gods are placed by our Anceſtors, as Signs and Symbols of their Preſence, not that we ſhould believe them to be Gods, but that we ſhould Worſhip the Gods by giving Reverence to them. For, we living in the Body, ought to give them a Worſhip ſuitable to our Corporeal State,* ἀσώματοι δέ εἰσιν αὐτοὶ, *but they are Incorporeal.* So that *Julian* did not look on Images as the proper *Likeneſſes of the Gods*, but as ancient and venerable Symbols of their Preſence: *In which*, he ſaith, *all Nations of the World were agreed, and in all Ages.* Wherein he laſhes too far; but that is at leaſt but a Venial Sin, to ſtretch a little for the ſake of ſo good a Cauſe. And *Julian* was not ſingular in this Opinion of his, of the fitneſs of Corporeal Images, although the *Gods were not like them*: For *Varro* was of the ſame Mind, who gives this Account of the firſt Deſign of making the Images of the Gods like to Men, *Quorum qui ſimulachra ſpecie hominis fecerunt, hoc videri ſecutos, quod mortalium animus, qui eſt in corpore humano, ſimillimus eſt immortalis animi,* &c. *that the Soul of Man was moſt like the Deity; and Men made Images like to their Bodies, juſt as if a Wine-veſſel were put in the Temple of* Bacchus *to repreſent him, intending thereby to repreſent firſt the Wine which ſhould be in the Veſſel, and by the Wine him that is the God of Wine.* So, ſaith he, *by Images of Mens Shape they ſignified the Soul contained within the Body; and by the Soul they repreſented God, as of the ſame Nature,* viz. *the Soul of the World.* *Porphyry*, ſuch another good Catholick as *Julian* was, in this Point of the Worſhip of Images, doth not in the leaſt ſuppoſe any Similitude between the Shape of a Man, and the Nature of God, but he gives this Account of repreſenting the Gods in Figures like to *Men*, ϗ ἀνθρωποειδεῖς μὲν ἀνετύπουν τοὺς θεοὺς; ὅτι λογικὸν τὸ θεῖον, *They made the Gods like to Men, becauſe the Divinity is a rational Being: And withal,* he ſaith, *that many were wont to repreſent him by a black Stone, to ſhew, that he is inviſible.* *Dio Chryſoſtom* at large debates the Caſe about Images, in his *Olympick* Oration; wherein he firſt ſhews, *That all Men have a Natural Apprehenſion of one Supreme God, the Father of all things; that this God was repreſented by the Statue made by* Phidias *of* Jupiter Olympius, *for ſo he ſaid,* παρ᾽ ᾧ νῦν ἐσμεν, *before whom we now are*; and then deſcribes him to be the *King, Ruler and Father of all, both Gods and Men: This Image he calls the moſt Bleſſed, the moſt Excellent, the moſt Beautiful, the moſt Beloved Image of God.* He ſaith, *there are four ways of coming to the knowledge of God, by Nature, by the Inſtructions of the Poets, by the Laws, and by Images: But neither Poets, nor Law-givers, nor Artificers were the beſt Interpreters of the Deity, but only the Philoſophers who both underſtood and explained the Divine Nature moſt truly and perfectly.* After this he ſuppoſes *Phidias* to be called to Account for making ſuch an Image of God, as unworthy of him; when *Iphitus, Lycurgus*, and the old *Eleans*, made none at all of him, *as being out of the Power of Man to expreſs his Nature*; to this *Phidias* replies, *That no Man can expreſs Mind and Underſtanding by Figures, or Colours, and therefore they are forced to fly to that in which the Soul inhabits, and from thence they attribute the Seat of Wiſdom and Reaſon to God, having nothing better to repreſent him by: And by that means joining Power and Art together, they endeavour by ſomething which may be ſeen and painted, to repreſent that which is inviſible and inexpreſſible.* But it may be ſaid, *we had better then have no Image or Repreſentation of him at all: No,* ſaith he, *for Mankind doth not love to Worſhip God at a diſtance, but to come near and feel him, and with Aſſurance to Sacrifice to him, and Crown him. Like Children newly weaned from their Parents, who put out their Hands towards them in their Dreams, as if they were ſtill preſent: So do Men out of the Senſe of God's Goodneſs, and their Relation to him, love to have him repreſented as preſent with them, and ſo to converſe with him: Thence have come all the Repreſentations of God among the barbarous Nations in Mountains, and Trees and Stones. But if the Quarrel be, that I have given a Humane Shape*

Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 7. c. 5.

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 3. c. 7.

Dio Chryſoſt. Orat. 12. p. 199.

p. 206.

p. 207.

p. 209.

p. 210. 211.

to him; *for that*, ſaith he, *the Poets are much more to blame who began thoſe things*, *eſpecially* Homer, *who compared* Agamemnon *to God in his Head and Eyes*: *But for my Statue, no Man that is not mad would compare it to a mortal Man, much leſs to the Perfection of the Deity*: And ſo *Dio* proceeds with a great deal of Eloquence to ſhew, *how the Repreſentation of God, by his Image, was more decent and becoming God, than that which the Poets had made of him*: *And how he had endeavoured by the utmoſt of his Skill to repreſent the Perfections of the Divine Nature, in the admirable Workmanſhip of his Statue, as to his Power, Greatneſs, and Good Will to Mankind*; and concludes all with ſaying, *that as to his Workmanſhip he thinks he hath gone beyond all others*; *but yet no Workmanſhip can be compared to the God that made the whole World.* Thus we ſee from the Teſtimony of theſe very conſiderable Authors, the Wiſer Heathens had no ſuch fooliſh Imagination as *T. G.* ſuppoſes them to be poſſeſſed with, viz. *that the Images of the Deity which they worſhipped were the proper Likeneſſes of him*; and if *T. G.*'s Light of Nature and Common Senſe do ſufficiently decide this Controverſie, it is very plain on which ſide the Balance inclines, *viz.* towards Paganiſm againſt Chriſtianity. *Macrobius* ſaith, *That anciently they made no Image at all of the Supreme God, as being above any Repreſentation*; *but they made Images of the inferior Gods, although they were* formarum talium prorſus alieni, *in nothing like to them.* The former Clauſe in *Macrobius* muſt be underſtood of the moſt ancient Times, before the Age of *Phidias*, as appears by the foregoing Paſſages: And yet *Porphyry* ſaith, *That the* Ægyptians *were wont to repreſent the Creator whom they called* Cneph, *in the Figure of a Man of a dark blue Colour, holding a Girdle, and a Scepter in his Hand*: *Out of whoſe Mouth came an Egg, by which they repreſented the World as his Production.* Not much unlike to this, is the Image of the Creator in the Temple of *Meaco* in *Japan*, which is all over black, with a Scepter in his Hand, and they likewiſe repreſent the World by an Egg, as *Arnoldus Montanus* obſerves. In the Itinerary of *Alexander Geraldinus* to thoſe parts of *Africa*, under the *Æquinoctial* (which was written by him to the Pope, when he was Biſhop of St. *Domingo*) in the Account he gives of the Religion of thoſe Parts (which is far more particular than is to be met with elſewhere) he deſcribes ſeveral Images of the Great God, which were in mighty Veneration among them: As in *Baſſiana, the King, with all his People, do Worſhip the God of Nature in an Image of Marble, ſet upon a high Throne, holding the Sun in his right Hand, and the Moon in his left, and the Stars on either ſide of him*: *And wherever the King travels, he carries ſuch an Image along with him, and prays five times a day proſtrate before it.* In Damaſca, *upon the top of a Wall, is placed the Image of God holding all things, before which the People are bound to pray every Morning.* In *Ammaſenna, they repreſent the God of Heaven by four Heads coming out of the Body of a Linx looking towards the four Quarters of the World, to repreſent his Omniſciency and Omnipreſence, whom they call* Oriſſa. In *Logonſennea, the God of Nature is painted in the Image of a Man, and all other Images of him condemned.* Now if *T. G.* were ſent on a Miſſion into any of thoſe Parts, where God was worſhipped after ſuch a manner, I have a great deſire to underſtand, what his Opinion would be, concerning this kind of Worſhip; whether it were Idolatry or no? If not, they might ſtill continue in it and be ſaved; as far as Men can be ſaved by the meer Light of Nature, which herein *T. G.* thinks they

Macrob. in Somn. Scipion. l. 1. *c.* 2.

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 3. *c.* 11.

Montanus p. 279.

Alex. Geraldini Itinerar. l. 4. *p.* 68.

l. 11 *p.* 171.

l. 10 *p.* 168.

l. 8. *p.* 131.

follow exactly; for they Honour God by Worſhipping his Image. If it be Idolatry, how comes it to be ſo? For this is neither *the Repreſentation of ſome Figment, but of a real Being*; *nor is it of ſome real thing falſely taken to be God*, which is his larger Notion of an Idol; but T.G. p.49. it is looked on only as the Image of the *True God*; and that not as a proper Likeneſs, but by Analogical Repreſentation, and conſequently according to *T. G.* is no Diſparagement to the Deity.

But whatever *T. G.*'s Opinion in this Caſe is, the Fathers, when they §. 9. diſcourſed againſt the Heathen Idolatry, made uſe of ſuch Arguments which held againſt ſuch Images and Repreſentations as theſe; and that upon theſe two weighty Conſiderations.

1. Becauſe ſuch a Repreſentation of *God*, was unſuitable to his Nature.
2. Becauſe it was repugnant to his Will.

1. Becauſe ſuch a Repreſentation of *God*, was unſuitable to his Nature. ἐξευτελίζει γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θείου σεμνότητα ἡ ἐν ἑτοίμῳ τῆς ὄψεως συνήθεια, καὶ τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν δι᾽ ὕλης σεβάζεσθαι, ἀτιμάζειν ἐστὶν αὐτὴν δι᾽ αἰσθήσεως, ſaith *Clemens* Clem. Strom. 5. *Alexandrinus*. *A viſible Repreſentation of the Deity leſſens his Majeſty*; p. 559. *and it is a Diſparagement to an Intellectual Being to Worſhip him by ſenſible Matter*: Therefore, ſaith he, Moſes *forbad any Image to be made of* p. 584. *God, that we might aſcend above ſenſible Things*; *and thereby declaring God to be Inviſible, and incomprehenſible*. *And from hence* Zeno *the* Stoick *ſaid, no Workmanſhip of Man could be worthy of God.* And, in another Str. 1. Place he ſaith, *the Reaſon why* Numa *forbad any Image of God like to* p. 304. *Man, or any living Creature, was, becauſe the moſt Excellent Being could be repreſented only to our Minds*; *and that* Antiſthenes *learnt that from* Socrates, *that God was like to no Repreſentation we could make of him*; Protrept. *and therefore no Man could learn any thing of him from an Image*: *And* p. 46. Xenophon, *that it is apparent that God is Great and Powerful, but we know not how to make any thing like him.* Is it poſſible then, that ſuch *Athenians* as theſe ſhould look on any Images as the *proper Likeneſſes of God*? *Theſe wiſer Heathens*, T. G. confeſſes, *did mean, that the Nature of* T.G. p.74. *God being ſpiritual and inviſible, it could not be repreſented by any thing like unto it*: And yet theſe were *Athenian* Philoſophers, as well as thoſe whom, he ſaith, *St.* Paul *condemned for ſuppoſing their Images to be proper Likeneſſes, and Repreſentations of the Divinity.* But T. G. ſuppoſes, p. 96. *that the Reaſon why the Worſhip of Images is a Diſparagement to the Deity, and incongruous to the Divine Nature, is, becauſe the People gave Worſhip to them as Gods, or like unto the Gods they worſhipped*; whereas I have now plainly ſhewed, that thoſe who contended for the Worſhip of Images among them, did neither look upon them as *Gods*, nor like to their *Gods*, but only as *Symbolical Repreſentations of the Divine Nature*. And the Fathers make uſe of this Acknowledgment of theirs of *the incongruity of Images to the Deity*, from thence to prove the incongruity of the Worſhip of them. So that it is not, the ſuppoſing the *Images to be like God*, which they condemn in them, for none of their wiſer Men were ſuch Fools; but the making of ſuch Images, and worſhipping of them, which in their own Nature were ſo infinitely beneath the Divine Being, did tend to the begetting in Mens Minds mean and unworthy Thoughts of God. And therefore they frequently inſiſt upon this, *That Mens Imaginations are eaſily tainted and corrupted by the daily Repreſentations of things, eſpecially*

to him ; *for that*, ſaith he, *the Poets are much more to blame who began thoſe things, eſpecially* Homer, *who compared* Agamemnon *to God in his Head and Eyes* : *But for my Statue, no Man that is not mad would compare it to a mortal Man, much leſs to the Perfection of the Deity* : And ſo *Dio* proceeds with a great deal of Eloquence to ſhew, *how the Repreſentation of God, by his Image, was more decent and becoming God, than that which the Poets had made of him* : *And how he had endeavoured by the utmoſt of his Skill to repreſent the Perfections of the Divine Nature, in the admirable Workmanſhip of his Statue, as to his Power, Greatneſs, and Good Will to Mankind* ; and concludes all with ſaying, *that as to his Workmanſhip he thinks he hath gone beyond all others* ; *but yet no Workmanſhip can be compared to the God that made the whole World.* Thus we ſee from the Teſtimony of theſe very conſiderable Authors, the Wiſer Heathens had no ſuch fooliſh Imagination as *T. G.* ſuppoſes them to be poſſeſſed with, viz. *that the Images of the Deity which they worſhipped were the proper Likeneſſes of him* ; and if *T. G.*'s Light of Nature and Common Senſe do ſufficiently decide this Controverſie, it is very plain on which ſide the Balance inclines, *viz.* towards Paganiſm againſt Chriſtianity. *Macrobius* ſaith, *That anciently they made no Image at all of the Supreme God, as being above any Repreſentation* ; *but they made Images of the inferior Gods, although they were* formarum talium prorſus alieni, *in nothing like to them.* The former Clauſe in *Macrobius* muſt be underſtood of the moſt ancient Times, before the Age of *Phidias*, as appears by the foregoing Paſſages : And yet *Porphyry* ſaith, *That the* Ægyptians *were wont to repreſent the Creator whom they called* Cneph, *in the Figure of a Man of a dark blue Colour, holding a Girdle, and a Scepter in his Hand* : *Out of whoſe Mouth came an Egg, by which they repreſented the World as his Production.* Not much unlike to this, is the Image of the Creator in the Temple of *Meaco* in *Japan*, which is all over black, with a Scepter in his Hand, and they likewiſe repreſent the World by an Egg, as *Arnoldus Montanus* obſerves. In the Itinerary of *Alexander Geraldinus* to thoſe parts of *Africa*, under the *Æquinoctial* (which was written by him to the Pope, when he was Biſhop of St. *Domingo*) in the Account he gives of the Religion of thoſe Parts (which is far more particular than is to be met with elſewhere) he deſcribes ſeveral Images of the Great God, which were in mighty Veneration among them : As in *Baſſiana, the King, with all his People, do Worſhip the God of Nature in an Image of Marble, ſet upon a high Throne, holding the Sun in his right Hand, and the Moon in his left, and the Stars on either ſide of him* : *And wherever the King travels, he carries ſuch an Image along with him, and prays five times a day proſtrate before it.* In Damaſca, *upon the top of a Wall, is placed the Image of God holding all things, before which the People are bound to pray every Morning.* In *Ammaſenna, they repreſent the God of Heaven by four Heads coming out of the Body of a Linx looking towards the four Quarters of the World, to repreſent his Omniſciency and Omnipreſence, whom they call* Oriſſa. In *Logonſennea, the God of Nature is painted in the Image of a Man, and all other Images of him condemned.* Now if *T. G.* were ſent on a Miſſion into any of thoſe Parts, where God was worſhipped after ſuch a manner, I have a great deſire to underſtand, what his Opinion would be, concerning this kind of Worſhip ; whether it were Idolatry or no? If not, they might ſtill continue in it and be ſaved ; as far as Men can be ſaved by the meer Light of Nature, which herein *T. G.* thinks they follow

Macrob. in Somn. Scipion. l. 1. *c.* 2.

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 3. *c.* 11.

Montanus p. 279.

Alex. Geraldini Itinerar. l. 4. *p.* 68.

l. 11 *p.* 171.

l. 10 *p.* 168.

l. 8. *p.* 131.

follow exactly; for they Honour God by Worſhipping his Image. If it be Idolatry, how comes it to be ſo? For this is neither *the Repreſentation of ſome Figment, but of a real Being*; *nor is it of ſome real thing falſely taken to be God*, which is his larger Notion of an Idol; but it is looked on only as the Image of the *True God*; and that not as a proper Likeneſs, but by Analogical Repreſentation, and conſequently according to *T. G.* is no Diſparagement to the Deity. T.G. p.49.

§. 9. But whatever *T. G.*'s Opinion in this Caſe is, the Fathers, when they diſcourſed againſt the Heathen Idolatry, made uſe of ſuch Arguments which held againſt ſuch Images and Repreſentations as theſe; and that upon theſe two weighty Conſiderations.

1. Becauſe ſuch a Repreſentation of *God*, was unſuitable to his Nature.

2. Becauſe it was repugnant to his Will.

1. Becauſe ſuch a Repreſentation of *God*, was unſuitable to his Nature. Ἐξευτελίζει γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ σεμνότητα ἡ ἐν ἑτοίμῳ τῆς ὄψεως συνήθεια, καὶ τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν δι' ὕλης σεβάζεσθαι, ἀτιμάζειν ἐστὶν αὐτὴν δι' αἰσθήσεως, ſaith *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Clem. Strom. 5. p. 559. *A viſible Repreſentation of the Deity leſſens his Majeſty; and it is a Diſparagement to an Intellectual Being to Worſhip him by ſenſible Matter: Therefore*, ſaith he, Moſes *forbad any Image to be made of God, that we might aſcend above ſenſible Things; and thereby declaring God to be Inviſible, and incomprehenſible. And from hence* Zeno *the* Stoick *ſaid, no Workmanſhip of Man could be worthy of God.* p. 584. And, in another Place he ſaith, *the Reaſon why* Numa *forbad any Image of God like to Man, or any living Creature, was, becauſe the moſt Excellent Being could be repreſented only to our Minds*; *and that* Antiſthenes *learnt that from* Socrates, *that God was like to no Repreſentation we could make of him*; *and therefore no Man could learn any thing of him from an Image*: Str. 1. p. 304. *And* Xenophon, *that it is apparent that God is Great and Powerful, but we know not how to make any thing like him.* Protrept. p. 46. Is it poſſible then, that ſuch *Athenians* as theſe ſhould look on any Images as the *proper Likeneſſes of God*? *Theſe wiſer Heathens*, T. G. confeſſes, *did mean, that the Nature of God being ſpiritual and inviſible, it could not be repreſented by any thing like unto it*: T.G. p.74. And yet theſe were *Athenian* Philoſophers, as well as thoſe whom, he ſaith, *St.* Paul *condemned for ſuppoſing their Images to be proper Likeneſſes, and Repreſentations of the Divinity.* But T. G. ſuppoſes, p. 96. *that the Reaſon why the Worſhip of Images is a Diſparagement to the Deity, and incongruous to the Divine Nature, is, becauſe the People gave Worſhip to them as Gods, or like unto the Gods they worſhipped*; whereas I have now plainly ſhewed, that thoſe who contended for the Worſhip of Images among them, did neither look upon them as *Gods*, nor like to their *Gods*, but only as *Symbolical Repreſentations of the Divine Nature.* And the Fathers make uſe of this Acknowledgment of theirs of *the incongruity of Images to the Deity*, from thence to prove the incongruity of the Worſhip of them. So that it is not, the ſuppoſing the *Images to be like God*, which they condemn in them, for none of their wiſer Men were ſuch Fools; but the making of ſuch Images, and worſhipping of them, which in their own Nature were ſo infinitely beneath the Divine Being, did tend to the begetting in Mens Minds mean and unworthy Thoughts of God. And therefore they frequently inſiſt upon this, *That Mens Imaginations are eaſily tainted and corrupted by the daily Repreſentations of things, eſpecially*

when they are propoſed as Objects of Worſhip: And however, the very
manner of worſhipping an infinite and immaterial Being, by a groſs
and material Repreſentation, is that which the Fathers condemn as
Juſtin. moſt unſuitable to the Divine Nature. *For this*, Juſtin Martyr ſaith,
Martyr. *is, not only unreaſonable, but it is done* ἐφ' ὕβρει τȣ̃ θεȣ̃ *with the Reproach*
Apol. 2. *of God, whoſe Glory and Form is inexpreſſible.* Athenagoras ſaith, *If*
p. 57. *Athenag.* *God and Matter be all one, it is then reaſonable to Worſhip God by giving*
p. 14. *Worſhip to ſenſible Matter: But if there be an infinite diſtance between*
them, why are we accuſed for not doing it? And if we refuſe to Worſhip
p. 16. *the Workmanſhip of God*, viz. *the Heaven and Elements, why ſhould we*
Orig c. *do it to the Workmanſhip of Men? Origen* looks on this as *one of the*
Celſ. *moſt peculiar Characters of the Chriſtian Doctrine, that it raiſes Mens*
l. 2. *p.* 91. *Minds above Images, and all Worſhip of Creatures to the Creator of all*
l. 5. *p.* 255. *l.* 3. *p.* 120. *Things; and that it is one of the firſt things the* Catechumens *are inſtructed*
l. 5. *p.* 375. *in, to deſpiſe Idols, and all Images.* He ſaith, *it is not only a fooliſh*
thing to pray to Images, as Heraclitus *ſaid; but to ſeem to do it as the*
Philoſophers did. If they are worſhipped, it muſt be either as Gods, which
p. 376. Celſus *denied, or as Repreſentations of God, which cannot be, becauſe God*
p. 374. *is Inviſible and Incorporeal: And therefore*, he ſaith, *that the Chriſtians*
would not endure the Worſhip of God by Images; and although other Nations
did refuſe the Worſhip of Images, (with whom *Celſus* parallels the
Chriſtians) *yet it was not upon the ſame Ground that the Chriſtians did*,
viz. *becauſe they would not debaſe and draw down the Worſhip of God towards*
Lact. l. 2. *Matter ſo faſhioned and formed.* Lactantius *ſhews, how unreaſonble*
c. 2. *it is to worſhip God by an Image, ſince Images are intended to repreſent*
the abſent, but God is every where preſent. But if there ought to be any
Image of God (which he calls *ſimulachrum Dei*, and ſurely doth not
ſignifie an Idol in *T. G.*'s Senſe; and I hope here he will not charge
me with want of Fidelity in tranſlating it Image) *it ought to be living*
and ſenſible, becauſe God lives for ever: Therefore that cannot be the
Image of God that is made by the Work of Mens Hands, but Man himſelf,
who gives all the Art and Beauty to them which they have: But, poor ſilly
Men as they are, they do not conſider, that if their Images had Senſe and
Motion, they would Worſhip the Men that made them; and brought them
into ſuch a curious Figure out of rude and unpoliſh'd Matter. Who can
be ſo fooliſh to imagine, there can be any thing of God in that Image,
in which there is nothing of Man, but the meer ſhadow? But their Minds
have the deepeſt tincture of Folly; for thoſe who have Senſe, worſhip things
that have none; they who think themſelves Wiſe, things that are uncapable
of Reaſon; they that live, things that cannot ſtir, and they that came from
Heaven, things that are made of Earth. What is this, ſaith he, *but to*
invert the order of Nature, to adore that which we tread upon? Worſhip
him that lives, if ye would live; for he muſt dye, that gives up his Soul to
things that are dead. And after he hath fully ſhewn his Rhetorick in
c. 18. expoſing the folly of worſhipping Images, he concludes very ſeverely;
Quare non eſt dubium quin Religio nulla ſit, ubicunque ſimulachrum
eſt. Wherefore there can be no true Religion, where there is the worſhip
of Images: No, although it be *ſimulachrum Dei, the worſhip of God by*
an Image, for his Reaſon holds againſt all. *Religion*, ſaith he, *is a*
Divine Thing, and whatever is Divine is Heavenly; but whatever is in
Tertul. Apol. Images is Earthly, and therefore there can be no Religion in the Worſhip
Minu. Octav. *of Images.* What ſport do *Tertullian*, *Minucius*, and *Arnobius* make
Arnob. l. 6. with the Images which were conſecrated to Divine Worſhip? from
the

the meanneſs of the Matter they are made of, the Pains, and Art that is uſed to bring them into their Shape, the Caſualties of Fire and Rottenneſs, and Defilements they are ſubject to, and many other Topicks on purpoſe to repreſent the ridiculouſneſs of worſhipping ſuch things, as God by them. *O*, ſaith *Arnobius*, *that I could but enter into the Bowels of an Image, and lay before you all the worthy Materials they are made up of; that I could but diſſect before you a* Jupiter Olympius, *and* Capitolinus. Yet theſe were dedicated to the Worſhip of the Supreme God. Would Men ever have been ſuch Fools to have expoſed themſelves rather than ſuch Images to laughter and ſcorn, if they had uſed any ſuch themſelves, or thought them capable of relative Divine Worſhip? How eaſily would a Heathen of common Underſtanding have ſtopt the Mouths of theſe powerful Orators, with ſaying but a few ſuch Words to any one of them. “Fair and ſoft, good Sir; while you declaim ſo much againſt our Images, think of your own: What if our *Jupiter Olympius*, or *Capitolinus*, be made of Ivory, or Braſs, or Marble; what if the Artificer hath taken ſo much pains about them; what if they are expoſed to Weather, and Birds, and Fire, and a thouſand Caſualties? Are not the Images of St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul*, or the ſeveral *Madonna*'s of ſuch and ſuch Oratories liable to the very ſame Accuſations? If ours are unfit for Worſhip, are not yours ſo too? If we be Ridiculous, are not you ſo? And ſo much the more, becauſe you laugh at others, for what you do your ſelves. So that we muſt either think the firſt Chriſtians prodigious Fools, or they muſt utterly condemn all Images for Religious Worſhip; and not meerly the Heathens, on Conſiderations peculiar to them. And that we may not think this a meer heat of Eloquence in theſe Men, we find the ſame thing aſſerted by the moſt grave and ſober Writers of the Chriſtian Church, when they had to deal not with the Rabble, but their moſt underſtanding Adverſaries. *We have no material Images at all*, ſaith Clemens Alexandrinus, *we have only one Intellectual Image, who is the only true God*; *we Worſhip but one Image, which is of the Inviſible and Omnipotent God*, ſaith St. *Hierome*. *No Image of God ought to be worſhipped, but that which is what he is, neither is that to be Worſhipped in his ſtead, but together with him*, ſaith St. *Auguſtine*. Where it is obſervable, that the reaſon of worſhip given to this Eternal Image of God, is not Communicable to any Image made of him, as to his Humane Nature; for it cannot be ſaid of the Humane Nature it ſelf, that it is God, much leſs of any Image, or Repreſentation of it. Therefore let *T. G.* judge whether the Worſhipping Chriſt by an Image, be not equally condemned by the Fathers with the Worſhip of *God* by an Image: But of that hereafter. *Euſebius* anſwering *Porphyry* about the Image of God, ſaith, *What agreement is there between the Image of a Man, and the Divine Underſtanding? I think it hath very little to a Man's Mind, ſince that is Incorporeal, Simple, Indiviſible: The other quite contrary, and only a dull Repreſentation of a Man's Shape. The only Reſemblance of God lies in the Soul, which cannot be expreſſed in Colours or Figures: And if that cannot which is infinitely ſhort of the Divine Nature, what madneſs is it to make the Image of a Man to repreſent the Figure and Form of God? For the Divine Nature muſt be conceived with a clear and pure Underſtanding free*

Clem. Protrept. p. 34.
Hierom. in c. 16. *Ezek. c.* 4. *prope fin.*
Aug. ep. 119. *c.* 11.

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 3. *c.* 10.

from all corruptible Matter: But that Image of God, in the likeneſs of Man, contains only the Image of a mortal Man, and that not of all of him, but of the worſt part only, without the leaſt ſhadow of Life or Soul. How then can the God over all, and the Mind which framed the World, be the ſame that is repreſented in Braſs, or Ivory?

S. Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 7. c. 5.

St. *Auguſtine* relating the ſaying of *Varro*, about *repreſenting God by the Image of a Man's Body, which contains his Soul, which reſembles God*, ſaith, *that herein he loſt that Prudence and Sobriety he diſcovered in ſaying, that thoſe who firſt brought in Images among the* Romans, *abated their Reverence* (to the Deity) *and added to their Error:*

L. 4. c. 31.

And that the Gods were more purely worſhipped without Images: Wherein, ſaith St. *Auguſtine*, *he came very near to the Truth. And if he durſt ſpeak openly againſt ſo ancient an Error, he would ſay, that one God ought to be Worſhipped, and that without an Image: The folly of Images being apt to bring the Deity into Contempt.* Is it poſſible to condemn the Worſhip of God by an Image in more expreſs Words than St. *Auſtin* here does?

§. 10. 2. Becauſe the Worſhip of God by Images is repugnant to his Will.

Clem. Alex. Str. 5. p. 559.

Clemens Alexandrinus mentions the Law given by *Moſes*, *againſt the making any Image of God* in the Place before mentioned; and which he there aſſerts to be ſtill obligatory to Chriſtians. But although he there repeats the Command at large againſt all ſorts of Images, yet it is obſervable, that when he goes about to ſet down all the Commandments, this by ſome Artificial Hand is conveyed out of the way; and the third Commandment is, *Thou ſhalt not take the Name of the Lord*, &c.

Strom. 6. p 682.

which made me not a little wonder, finding *Clemens* ſo often in other Places expreſſing his Zeal againſt Images. But it is not hard to gueſs what Hands his *Greek* Copies have paſſed through, ſince the *ſecond Nicene Council*; yet we are beholding to them for leaving ſo much evidence of their foul-dealing behind them;

P. 688.

for within few Pages he ſaith, *The tenth Commandment takes in all ſorts of Concupiſcence*, and therefore the Precept againſt Images muſt be a diſtinct Command to make up the Number: So that *Sylburgius* juſtly complains, that the Place is mutilated. If *Clemens* did not think this Precept concerned Chriſtians, he would never have objected it as an abſurdity againſt a ſort of *Gnoſticks*, that thought themſelves bound to oppoſe the Law,

Strom. 3. p. 441.

Why then, ſaith he, *when God ſaid, Thou ſhalt not make any Graven Image, you were beſt go and Worſhip Images.* By all which we ſee, that he thought the Precept to be ſtill in force, and that it was intended againſt the Worſhip of Images, and thoſe Images, ſuch as reſpect *God*, and not meerly the Heathen Idols.

Orig. c. Cel. l. 7. p. 375.

Origen ſaith, *That for the ſake of that Law, thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any Graven Image: The Chriſtians would rather die than defile their Faith with ſuch Impieties as the Worſhip of Images: And therefore their Caſe was very different from that of the* Scythians, Numidians, Seres *and* Perſians, *with whom* Celſus *joined them in the Contempt of Images.*

Symmach. Ep. l. 11. Ep. 54.

When *Symmachus* pleaded with *Valentinian* for the Toleration of the Pagan Religion, on this Pretence, *That the ſame God was worſhipped by all, and that by ſeveral ways Men aimed at the ſame End:*

Ambroſ. c. relat. Symmac. 2.

St. *Ambroſe* anſwers, *That God himſelf was fitteſt to teach what way he would be ſerved in: You worſhip the Work of Mens Hands, we account it an injury to God to call any thing by* *his Name that can be made by Man*; Non vult ſe Deus in Lapidibus coli, *God hath declared, He will not be worſhipped after ſuch a manner.* Whereby we ſee the Primitive *Chriſtians* fixed themſelves on the Command of God, as upon an immoveable Rock, againſt the Worſhip of Images.

Thus much may ſuffice to have ſhewn in this Place, that the Controverſie between the *Chriſtians* and *Heathens* about the Worſhip of Images, was not whether they were *proper Likeneſſes of God*, from the Apprehenſions they had of their Images. I proceed now to ſhew it.

§. 11. 2. From the Notions they had of their *Gods*. And here, I muſt in the firſt place, exclude thoſe who in Truth were *Atheiſts* and not *Idolaters*, I mean the *Epicurean Philoſophers*, who although they ſeemed to aſſert ſome pleaſant Beings, that lived in perfect eaſe, far from the noiſe and ſmoke of the World; yet they utterly overthrew all foundations of worſhip in Prayers, or Sacrifices, by denying the *Gods* to have any regard to the actions of Men, for fear of diſturbing their ſweet repoſe. Theſe indeed made *their Gods like Men*, but ſo thin and airy, that they could not bear the leaſt juſtle of *Atoms*, and ſo quiet and ſtill that the leaſt thought of buſineſs would deſtroy their happineſs. Theſe were only made for fine *Idea's* to amuſe the People with, but any one might ſee that they were never intended for the *objects* of *Worſhip*; and therefore *Plutarch* and *Athenæus* ſay, That *Epicurus* took away all the worſhip of the *Gods*; however he complyed with the common practices of the People; and when he lift up his Hands to his Mouth in token of Adoration, he could not but laugh through his Fingers at the *Gods* they worſhipped.

Plut. adverſ. Colot. Athen. l. 4. c. 27.

But we may ſee by the diſcourſe of the *Academick* and *Stoick*, with the *Epicurean* in *Cicero*, how much they abhorred this *Epicurean* Doctrine of *the Gods being like to Men*; and *Velleius* the *Epicurean* doth in effect confeſs, there were no *Philoſophers* of that mind beſides themſelves. For he reckons up all the Opinions of the other *Philoſophers* concerning the Nature of the Gods after ſuch a manner, as to diſcover that this Opinion was peculiar to their own Sect. He acknowledges, that *Thales* aſſerted *God to be an Eternal Mind, which framed all things out of Water*; even *Anaximander* and *Anaximenes*, who held only *Material Gods*, or *firſt principles* (for even the Atheiſts were willing to have matter believed to be a God by them, to avoid the odium of *Atheiſm* among the People) yet *theſe rejected a humane form*; at which the *Epicurean* is diſpleaſed, as though they might have flattered the People, (as they did) in the faſhion, as well as in the name of a Diety. Some have undertaken to clear *Anaximenes*; and to make him of the ſame Opinion with *Thales*, concerning an *Incorporeal Diety*; ſaying that by Air, he meant only a *Divine Spirit*; and therefore in *Plutarch* he compares it to the Soul of Man, which being Air doth *animate the Body*; and *Diogenes Apolloniates* his diſciple held Air only for Matter and Reaſon for the *efficient cauſe*: as St. *Auguſtine* tells us. However, *Anaxagoras* another diſciple of *Anaximenes* is confeſſed by *Velleius* to hold God to be an *infinite and active mind*; *free from all mixture of matter*; as the words of *Anaxagoras* in *Simplicius* do expreſs his meaning: and St. *Auguſtine* undertakes his Vindication againſt the *Epicurean* objections, which ſuppoſe it impoſſible for us to underſtand

Cicer. de Nat. Deor. l. 1. c. 25.

Leſcaloper ad Cicer. de Nat. Deor. p. 40.
Plut. de Placit. l. 1. c. 3.
De Civit. Dei l. 8. c. 2.
Simplic. in Phyſ. Ariſtot. l. 1 p. 33. ed. Aldi.

ſtand any ſuch thing as Mind without the *conjunction of Senſe and Matter*. *Pythagoras* ſaid, *That God was a quickening Spirit diffuſed through the World*; which is beſt expreſſed by *Virgil*, in thoſe words after the ſenſe of *Pythagoras*.

Æneid. 6. *v.*724,&c.

Spiritus intus alit, totoſq; infuſa per artus
Mens agitat molem, & magno ſe corpore miſcet.

Xenophanes falls under the ſame condemnation with the reſt for aſſerting *God to be a Mind*; but he went ſomewhat farther, for in the Verſes cited out of him by the Fathers, he ſaid, *That God was like to Man neither in Body, nor in Mind: and for Men to make an Image of God like to themſelves, was all one as if a Horſe ſhould paint him with a long Tail and four Feet*, if he had underſtanding enough to make a repreſentation of the Diety; *or an Ox or a Lion ſhould draw him by their own Figures*. *Parmenides* made *God to be of a circular figure in the faſhion of a Crown or Orb of Light compaſſing about the Heavens.* Whatever the Opinions of *Alcmæon*, *Empedocles*, *Protagoras*, *Diogenes Apolloniates* were, it is certain the *Epicurean* deſpiſes them all; becauſe they either appeared too doubtful and obſcure in their Opinion about a Diety, or at leaſt ſeemed to make him of an inconvenient form to deceive the People. Even *Democritus* himſelf doth not pleaſe him, for although he makes his Images to be Gods, yet he did not by them underſtand ſuch as *T. G.* doth, but he means no other than his *Atoms* (which *Laertius* calls εἴδωλα)and that *firſt matter* whence they ariſe; but ſaith *Velleius*, *while he deſtroys an Eternal Being*, Democritus *muſt needs overthrow the very Opinion of a Deity*; *however he would give the title of it to his Images or matter, or the minds of Men*. He grants, that according to *Plato*, *God is an incorporeal Mind*; but then, he ſaith, *he muſt want Senſe, and Prudence, and Pleaſure* (i. e. *Epicurean* Pleaſure,) but withal he adds, *that* Plato *contradicts himſelf, making the World, and the Heavens and Stars, and Men to be Gods, which are both falſe in themſelves, and inconſiſtent with each other*. This charge againſt *Plato* ſeems to be the moſt material, and therefore deſerves to be more fully cleared, which ſhall be afterwards done, when I come to the Platonick Doctrine about Divine Worſhip, where it will be made appear, that *Plato* did aſſert *one Supreme and Incorporeal Deity*, and that the worſhip allowed by him to *inferiour Gods* was of the ſame nature with that which is practiſed in the *Roman Church*, and that he no more believed Images to be like the true God than they do. I now proceed to the reſt of the Philoſophers Opinions in this matter: *Xenophon* is charged by the *Epicurean*, to be guilty of the ſame fault with *Plato*, and that in the *Memoirs* of *Socrates*, written by him, he ſaith, *that Men ought not to enquire after the Form of God; and that it is impoſſible for us to know it: for we only know*, ſaith he, *that he is great and powerful, who makes all things to quake and tremble*. *Antiſthenes acknowledged but one God in Nature, although there were many of the Peoples making*; by which, ſaith *Velleius*, he *deſtroyed the force and nature of the Gods:* and upon the Epicurean Suppoſition that they were like to Men, he thought it neceſſary for their Pleaſure, that there ſhould be more than one to keep up good Fellowſhip among them. And becauſe *Speuſippus* ſaid, *That the Divine Nature did imply a Governing Spirit*, he thought this as bad as *the denying his Being*; it being to his apprehenſion impoſſible to be

Euſeb. de Præp. Evang. l. 13. *c.* 13. *Theodoret. de cur. Græc. ſerm.* 3. *Clem. Alex. Str.* 5.

Xenop. Mem. 4.

happy and to Govern. He grants, that *Ariſtotle* affirmed *God to be an Incorporeal Being*; *however*, he ſaith, *that he was not conſtant to himſelf, ſometimes making nothing to be God but only Mind*; *at other times attributing Divinity to the Heavens and parts of the World*; but as the late Commentator on that part of *Tully* obſerves, the former was only the *Firſt*, *Eternal and Infinite God*, the other a *ſecondary*, *limited*, and *participative Divinity* and rather an Image of the *Divinity* than it ſelf: as he proves from comparing ſeveral places in *Ariſtotle* together, and concludes with that excellent deſcription of God draw out of *Ariſtotle* by *Du Vall*, *God is an Eternal Subſtance*, *and Act*, *without Potentiality and Matter*, *without Magnitude*, *Parts*, *Diviſion*, *Paſſion*, *Change*, *intelligible by himſelf*, *the principle of Motion*, *but immoveable*, *the cauſe of Heaven*, *and Nature*, *and infinitely Happy*. *Mirare Lector*, ſaith *Du Val*, *Hominis Ethnici Theologiam*. See how far *Ariſtotle* was from thinking the *Athenian Images to be proper Likeneſſes of the Deity*. If to theſe now we add the *Stoicks*, who aſſerted *God to be a Divine Reaſon and Spirit actuating the World*, we have a full Diſcovery, that by the confeſſion of thoſe who were of another Opinion, all the famous Sects of Philoſophers agreed in rejecting that principle that *the Gods were of humane Shape*, and conſequently the Idolatry they were guilty of in the Worſhip of Images could not lie in this, that they thought their *Images to be proper likeneſſes of God*. Of the ſame mind with theſe were the freer Philoſophers of following Ages: among whom *Cicero* deſerves a name, were it only for that excellent Deſcription of God, which *Lactantius* and St. *Auguſtine* quote out of him, with great Approbation, *Neither can God himſelf be otherwiſe underſtood by us*, *than as a Mind free*, *and diſentangled from all corporeal Mixtures*, *perceiving and moving all things*. The ſame thing might be proved of *Seneca*, *Epictetus*, *Plutarch*, *Alcinous*, *Plotinus*, *Proclus*, *Salluſtius*, and others; but I purpoſely forbear, both becauſe theſe are ſufficient for my purpoſe, and becauſe it may be ſaid by thoſe who have nothing elſe to ſay, in this matter that they came to have truer Apprehenſions of God only by the means of the *Chriſtian Religion*. Nay, I might prove that many of the very Poets themſelves had much nobler Conceptions of the Deity, than to imagine him to have any thing Coporeal; but I ſhall only mention theſe Verſes out of the Ancient *Tragædian*.

Leſcaloper. ad Cic. de N.D.p.55.

De Ariſtot. Theologia, p.184,&c. Du Vall. Synopſ. Analyt. Doctr. Peripat. ad Metaphyl. l. 14. c. 7.

Cicer. Tuſcul. 1. Lact. l. 1. c. 5. Aug. de. Civ. Dei l. 22. c. 20.

χώριζε θνητῶν τὸν θεὸν καὶ μὴ δόκει
Ὅμοιον αὐτῷ σάρκινον καθεστάναι

Think not that God is like to mortal Fleſh.

From whence we ſee, that if there were any ſo fooliſh among the *Athenians* to imagine their Gods to be juſt like their Images, they did it not for want of Inſtruction to the contrary; and if the nature of their Idolatry did lie in this, ſcarce any underſtanding Man among the *Heathens* that did really believe a Diety was guilty of it.

§. 12.

2. *But if they did not ſuppoſe their Images to be the proper Likeneſſes of God*, *yet they worſhipped the Images of falſe Gods*, *or they worſhipped their Images themſelves for Gods*, *and therefore*, *ſaith* T. G. *the Apoſtle condemns them*, Rom. 1. *To make my Diſcourſe come home to them I muſt ſhew*, *ſaith he*, *that the Images by which they honour Chriſt and his Saints*, *are worſhipped by them as Gods*, *or as the Images of falſe Gods*, *as thoſe were of which*

T.G.p.99.

which the Apoſtle ſpeaks in that place. That is it I aim at, to bring my diſcourſe as home to them as may be; and therefore to give him full Satisfaction, I ſhall enquire whether the *Heathen Idolatry* condemned by St. *Paul*, did conſiſt in one of theſe two things, either, 1. *That they worſhipped only the Images of falſe Gods.* Or, 2. *That they took the Images themſelves for Gods.*

1. Whether their Idolatry lay in worſhipping the *Images of falſe Gods?* If I can prove, 1. That they did intend to worſhip the true God, either by an Image purpoſely for him, or to direct the worſhip through the Gods and Images they worſhipped to him; And 2. That there is no greater repugnancy in the manner of their worſhip, than is uſed in the *Roman Church*, I hope I ſhall bring my Diſcourſe home enough to *T. G.*

To do this more convincingly I ſhall give an account of the *Principles of Divine Worſhip* among the *Heathens* from their own Writers (which I ſuppoſe will be another way of bringing it home to them) and becauſe *T. G.* particularly charges *Socrates* and *Plato*, I ſhall make choice of the *Platonick Principles of Divine Worſhip*, and ſee upon what grounds they become guilty of *Idolatry*, which will not reach home to themſelves. *Card. Beſſarion* hath written an elaborate Vindication of *Plato* againſt *Trapezuntius* wherein he ſhews that *Plato* did aſſert the *Unity*, *Power*, and *Goodneſs* of *God*, and the *Creation of all things* by him; and that he doth this frequently and conſtantly, in his *Parmenides*, *Phædrus*, *Phædo*, *Philebus*, *Timæus*, *Sophiſta*, *Laws*, *Politicks*, *Epiſtles*, every where. But *Trapezuntius* charges *Plato*, *that although he did acknowledge God, he did not worſhip him, and that he ſacrificed only to the inferiour Gods*; to this *Beſſarion* anſwers,
“ *that in his* Books *of* Laws, which were made for the People, he
“ doth not expreſly preſcribe any worſhip to God under the name
“ of One or Firſt, or Ineffable, which were the Titles he had given
“ him in his Dialogues, and were not known to the People; but in
“ his eighth Book of *Laws*, he appoints twelve ſolemn Feaſts to the
“ twelve Gods of whom *Jupiter* was chief; under which name the
“ *Supreme God* was known among the People, than which name
“ in the proper Importance of it, none could have been more ſigni-
“ ficant of the Nature of the *Supreme God*; and that he retain-
“ ed the other common names of the Gods worſhipped among them
“ (that he might not ſeem to innovate any thing in Religion) al-
“ though the *Philoſophers* underſtood them in another ſenſe than the com-
“ mon People did; by *Jove* they meant the *Firſt being* or *Supreme Deity*,
“ by *Minerva Wiſdom*, by *Mercury Reaſon*, by *Saturn Eternity*, by
“ *Neptune Form*, by *Juno Matter*, by *Venus Nature*, by *Apollo* the *Sun*,
“ by *Pan* the *Univerſe*; but when they ſpake to the People about
“ the worſhip of them, they did not mention *Wiſdom*, or *Reaſon*, or
“ *Eternity*, but *Minerva*, *Mercury*, *Saturn*; and he ſaith, it would
“ have been folly in them to have done otherwiſe, the People be-
“ ing accuſtomed to worſhip the Gods under theſe Names, and nothing
“ more was requiſite but to make them underſtand them aright.
“ But for *Plato* himſelf, he ſaith, *he worſhipped the Supreme God after*
“ *the beſt manner*, i. e. *with inward Reverence and Adoration*; in *Plato*'s
“ own Expreſſions, *by thinking the beſt and moſt worthy things of him*,
“ which *Beſſarion* interprets *in Spirit*, *and in Truth*; and he adds,
“ that *Plato* looked on *Sacrifices*, and *Images as unworthy of him who*

Beſſarion adverſ. calumniat. Platonis. l. 2. c. 3.

l. 3. c. 5.

“ *was a pure Mind, and could not be repreſented by any Image to Men.* But *Plato*'s *Adverſary* charges him, *with giving the Worſhip of* Latria *to Inferior Gods, aud Creatures:* To which *Beſſarion* ſaith, l.3.c.4. “ That *Latria* among the Heathens ſignified only a ſtricter “ kind of Service which ſome Men paid to others that were above “ them; and that the Worſhip by Sacrifice by a long Cuſtom from “ the time of *Zamolxis* and *Orpheus*, was looked on as common to “ all things worſhipped by them: But, ſaith he, he referred all that “ worſhip which others gave to *many and different Gods*, to the *Firſt* “ *and Chief Principle of all things*: And again mentions that ſaying “ in his *Epinomis, That the moſt ſuitable Worſhip of God is to think* “ *honourably of him.* Which I ſuppoſe *Plato* would have ſaid, was the ſame thing with thoſe of the *Church of Rome* call *Latria*, and that he could by no means underſtand how Sacrifices come to be appropriated to it: And to this Purpoſe *Beſſarion* quotes the ſaying of *Porphyrius, That God is to be worſhipped in Silence, and with a pure Mind, and with the Sacrifice of a good Life.* And as to other *Deities* which *Plato* allowed to be worſhipped, he ſaith, “ That he ſuppos'd them l.2.c.4. “ to be *Inferior and Subordinate to the Supreme, and dependant upon him*; “ *and that he did not Worſhip empty Statues, but one God, the Princi-* “ *pel of All.* Which being compared with *Plato*'s Law, and Practice about Worſhipping, according to the Cuſtom of the Country, doth imply that he worſhipped Images with a reſpect to the *True God.* Let now the Reader judge, whether according to the Judgment of this Learned Cardinal, *Plato* was guilty of worſhipping only the *Images of falſe Gods.* But *Trapezuntius* ſtill urges hard upon *Plato, That if he allowed the Worſhip of a ſecond and third Order of Gods, which were* l.3.c.6. *but Creatures, he might on the ſame Ground Worſhip any Creatures, becauſe all Creatures are infinitely diſtant from the Creator.* *Beſſarion*, like an underſtanding Man, tells him, “ That this Argument would hold “ as well againſt the Church of *Rome*, as againſt *Plato*, which wor- “ ſhips *Angels, although they be Creatures:* But yet he doth not think “ the Argument will reach to the worſhip of all Creatures; becauſe “ though all Creatures be equally diſtant as to Exiſtence, yet ſome “ come nearer than others, as to Perfection. This *Trapezuntius* takes off, by ſaying that *Plato* worſhipped *Dæmons*; which *Beſſarion* grants. “ But by *Dæmons*, he ſaith, *Plato* and *Ariſtotle*, and other c.7. “ Philoſophers, did not underſtand ſuch Evil Spirits as we do, but “ certain Aereal *Beings*, lower than *Gods*, and above Men, whom they “ looked on as Mediators and Interceſſors between God and Men: “ But for Evil Spirits, he ſaith, they were not received into their Re- “ ligion; and that *Lucifer* was looked on as accurſed by them, under “ the Name of *Ate*. And ſhews farther from St. *Auguſtine*, that all c.8. “ the Poetical Theology was rejected by *Plato*. So that the whole “ diſpute with *Plato* about worſhip, muſt come to theſe two Points. 1 Whether it be lawful to worſhip the Supreme God, by external and viſible Repreſentations, ſuppoſing that a Man direct his Intention aright towards the Honour of *God* by them? 2. Whether it be lawful to give an *Inferior Worſhip to any Created Beings*, whoſe Excellencies are ſuppos'd to be far above Mens, in order to their Interceſſion between God and Us? And now let T. G. judge whether I have not brought my Diſcourſe *Home to their own Doors.* I omit *Marſilius Ficinus* as a Man that may be ſuppos'd too partial to *Plato*; but I hope

Auguſtinus Steuchus Eugubinus may paſs for a ſound Catholick; being
an *Italian Biſhop*, and a *Roman Courtier*, that had ſo much
Zeal as to vindicate *Conſtantine*'s Donation againſt *Valla*; and therefore
his Teſtimony cannot be rejected. He undertakes at large
Aug. Steuch. Eugub. de perenni Philoſ. l. 5. c. 1. to prove, that *Plato* acknowledged *one True and Supreme God*,
and that all other *Beings* are created by him; and when he ſeems
to attribute Divinity to other things, it is only a Divinity
by way of Gift and Participation, ſuch as Angels and Holy
Men are ſaid to have; which doth not hinder our believing
them to be all at firſt created by one *God*. There were three ſorts
of Inferior Deities, he ſaith, aſſerted by the Philoſophers, *viz. Dæmons*,
c. 2. or *Gods*, with *Aereal Bodies*, who have a particular Care of Humane
Affairs; Intelligences, or the Spirits which *animate and move the
Stars, and Cœleſtial Deities* who converſe with the *Supreme God*; now
all theſe he makes appear from many Paſſages in *Plato*, eſpecially
the famous one in his *Timæus*, to have been made by *God*. And that
when in his Books of *Laws*, and the *Epinomis*, or *Appendix* to them, he
c. 3. ſo much ſets forth the Divinity of the Stars and the Heavens, he muſt
either contradict himſelf, or attribute only an *Inferior Divinity* to them:
And that he did not ſpeak ſo clearly of the Worſhip of the *Supreme
God*, becauſe he looked on him as Incomprehenſible, and that he could
c. 5. not ſo well know in *what way it was fit to Worſhip him*. However, he
Invocates him in ſeveral Places; eſpecially when he was to ſpeak
concerning the *Gods*: And in his Epiſtle to *Hermias*, *Eraſtus* and *Coriſcus*,
which he writ when he was grown old: He calls to witneſs,
the God over all, *Governor of all Things and Times*, *and Father of the
Lord and Cauſe of things*; *but as to the publick manner of Worſhip*, he
Plato. Epinomis p. 989. ed. Serran. ſaith, *that no Man ought to teach unleſs God himſelf direct him*. He farther
ſhews, that notwithſtanding *Plato* ſpake ſo much, and ſo well
concerning the *True God*, yet he attributed the Title of *Divinity* to
c. 6. ſeveral ranks of Spirits, to the Heavens, the Sea, to the World, to
Zamolxis, to *Mercurius Triſmegiſtus*, and to good Men in general, to
whom he commands Sacrifices, and other *Acts of Worſhip* to be performed,
Quod in Religione noſtra juſtiſſimè fit Sanctis & Divis: Which
is with great Reaſon done among us to Saints and Deified Men. I
now appeal to *T. G.* whether *Aug. Steuchus* doth not bring this Matter
c. 11. very home to them? When, he ſaith, that they either worſhipped
Angels (ſo he ſaith *Philo* renders their *Dæmons*) or Saints, as
they verily believed, and ſuppos'd the Honour of theſe was very
well pleaſing to the *Supreme God*, whom they conſtantly acknowledged;
as he at large proves, not only concerning *Plato*, but *Ariſtotle*,
and all the Philoſophers of any Reputation: And he ſaith, that
c. 12. Socrates *in* Plato *not only confeſſed the True God, but that he ought to
be Worſhipped and Obſerved by Men, and that for his ſake Men ought never
to forſake the way of Righteouſneſs, and therefore he reſolved rather to
follow God than the Advice of his Friends*, πείσομαι δὲ τῷ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ὑμῖν,
which cannot be better rendred than in the Apoſtles Words, *It is
better to obey God than Men*. It would be endleſs to repeat the Places
wherein he ſhews at large, that *Plato* and the reſt of the Philoſophers,
did acknowledge the *Unity*, *Power*, *Wiſdom*, *Goodneſs and Providence
of the Supreme God*. And after all theſe Acknowledgments
is it poſſible to conceive that they ſhould never intend to refer the
Honour they gave to *Inferior Deities* and their *Images* to this *Supreme
God*?

God? Nay, it is not poſſible, ſay ſome, they ſhould do otherwiſe, ſince they believed all the other Deities they worſhipped to be created and dependent Beings.

But I need not make uſe of ſuch a way of proving it, *Paulus Benius Eugubinus* hath made it appear, he ſaith, that according to *Plato the Supreme God is to be worſhipped after a ſingular and peculiar Manner*: And he gives this Account of the *Platonick Principles of Divine Worſhip as to the Inferior Deities*. 1. That *Plato*'s *Gods* were no other than our *Angels*, and that he ſets God, the maker of them, at a mighty diſtance from them. 2. That when he ſpeaks ſo much of the Worſhip of *Heavenly Bodies*, he doth not thereby intend the Worſhip ſhould be given ſo much to the Bodies, as to thoſe bleſſed Minds that mov'd them; yea, ſaith he, to them *properly and preciſely*, and ſo that they being removed, no Honour or Worſhip is to be given to the Bodies themſelves. Which certainly is no more Idolatry on this Suppoſition, than Adoration of the Hoſt is, upon one far more extravagant. But, he ſaith, by one Place in *Plato*'s *Epinomis*, it may be queſtioned, whether he intended the Stars ſhould be worſhipped otherwiſe than as Images of the Gods; and therefore, ſaith he, very ingenuouſly, *Plato* did ſcarce at all differ, unleſs in Words, from the *doctrine* of the *Roman Church* in this Matter. 3. That *Plato* did put a difference in the Nature and kind of the Worſhip which he gave to Inferior Deities, and that which was due to the Supreme God, and the ſame kind of difference as is made among them; and that when he acknowledges them to be created by him, he could not give Sovereign Worſhip to them. 4. That when *Plato* gave Worſhip to *Dæmons*, the difference is only about Words, becauſe by *Dæmons* he underſtood an inferior Order of Angels, whom he ſuppoſed to be Good and Holy, and to have a *Care of Mankind*. The only difference then, that this Learned Man could find worth taking notice of between *Plato*'s Worſhip and theirs, was this, that they worſhipped thoſe for Saints and Deified Men, and the Images of ſuch who were not truly Saints (not being Canonized by the *Pope*) but if they had been ſuch, he then confeſſes, that they did nothing amiſs in the *Worſhip* they gave to them, or their Images. *Alioquin*, ſaith he, *ea cultus venerationiſque ratio cum noſtra magnopere congrueret*. So that all the diſpute comes to this, whether *Mercurius Triſmegiſtus* were not as good a Saint as *Thomas Becket*, and as much deſerved to be worſhipped; or *Socrates*, as *Ignatius Loyola*; not, whether we account them ſo, but whether they, upon their Suppoſition of their Excellencies and Vertues, might not as *innocently worſhip them*, as the *Papiſts* do the other. P. *Leſcalopier*, a late Jeſuit, ſaith, that *Plato* makes ſo palpable a diſtinction between the *Supreme God*, *Maker of all Things*, and *other Deities*, that no one but an *Epicurean Backbiter* can deny, that *Plato* did openly and conſtantly aſſert *one God*; and that he did not give equal Honour to any as he did to him; and delivers this as the Subſtance of his Opinion, *Unum Deum imprimis adorandum, cujus gratiâ cætera numina colenda ſunt. One God to have Sovereign Worſhip given him, and others to have a Relative and Inferior Worſhip*. And now, I hope, I have brought this Matter home to *T. G.* and made it appear from their own Writers, that theſe Philoſophers went upon the ſame Principles of *Divine Worſhip* that they do in the *Roman Church*.

Platon. & Ariſt. Theolog. Decad. 2. l. 2. p. 213.

p. 217.

p. 219.

p. 220.

Comment. in Cic. de Nat. D. p. 51.

§. 13. The only appearance of difference is about the Worſhip of Deified Men, and that not as to the nature and kind of the *Worſhip*, but only as to the Perſons; and yet as to this it ought to be conſider'd, 1. That it was only a Miſtake, ſuch a one as many may be guilty of in the *Roman* Church, who it is poſſible may Worſhip thoſe for Saints in Heaven, who are in a worſe Place. 2. Many of thoſe worſhipped by the Heathens, are confeſſed to have been Good Men: So *Campanella* confeſſes of *Janus*, whom he took to be *Noah*, and he ſaid, *deſerved to be worſhipped, as well as Moſes*, and *Peter*, and *Paul* and the Prophets: And he ſaith farther, *That many Wiſe and Vertuous Men were worſhipped by the Heathens, who did not look on them as eſſentially Gods.* Thus many Learned Men have ſhewed that the Veneration of *Adam* and *Eve*, of *Noah*, *Shem* and *Japhet*, of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, of *Joſeph*, *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, &c. hath been preſerved among the *Gentiles*, under the Names of the ſeveral Deities of *Saturn*, *Tuiſto*, *Mannus*, *Mercury*, *Bacchus*, *Apollo*, *Hercules*, &c. in which Caſe the Heathens were Innocent as to the Perſons they worſhipped. 3. The Papiſts ought in reaſon to allow them all the *Excuſes* they make uſe of for themſelves, ſuch as *Invincible Ignorance*, *Oral Tradition*, *Authority of Teachers*, and *Conditional Worſhip*, which alone would juſtifie them: For by that the Intention of the Worſhip, is to ſomewhat ſuppoſed to be worthy of it; but if they be miſtaken in the particular Application of it, that *general Intention* is thought ſufficient to render the Worſhip lawful.

Campan. Triumph. Atheiſm. c. 11. n. 18.

T. G. p. 98. But what ſaith *T. G.* all this while? Why, forſooth, St. *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *That* Plato *gloried in the Worſhip of Images and Creatures* (of which he ſpeaks before) ſo he renders ἐγκαλλωπίζεται τȣ́τοις, which ſignifies no more than *ſetting them off with the beſt Advantage:* Of which I have given an Account already; *and* Socrates *commanded a Cock to be ſacrificed to* Æſculapius: Who denies it? All the Queſtion is, what *Socrates* underſtood by *Æſculapius*. For thoſe who have had the greateſt inſight into the Doctrine of *Socrates* and *Plato*, tell us (ſuch as *Marſilius Ficinus*, and *Cælius Rhodiginus*) that by Æſculapius, *Socrates* underſtood *the Divine Beneficence that cures all Diſeaſes, to which a Cock was ſacrificed, as the forerunner of Day and the Sun, thereby acknowledging the Light of Life to be derived from the Divine Bounty, the Daughter of Providence: And, that now eſpecially they ſhould do it in token of his deliverance from the Diſeaſes of Doubt and Fear; and the ancient Oracles ſay, that Souls returning to Heaven ſing an* Iô Pæan, *the fitteſt Emblem of which was the offering up a Cock.* But beſides this, *Tacitus* hath a remarkable Paſſage to explain this ſacrificing to *Æſculapius*, viz. *That many called God by the Name of* Æſculapius, *as he healed the Diſeaſes of Mankind*; of which *Seguinus* takes notice in ſome ancient Coins, wherein the Serpent, the proper Symbol of *Æſculapius*, is joined with the Horn of *Jupiter Ammon*, and the Rays of the Sun; to ſhew, ſaith that Learned Antiquary, *That the ſame God was meant by all thoſe ſeveral Titles.* So that hereby appears no Contradiction to what I have ſaid as to the *Platonick Doctrine and Principles of Divine Worſhip.*

Ficin. in Platon. Phædon. Cæl. Rhodig. Antiq. Lect. l. 16. *c.* 12.

Tacit. hiſtor. l. 4.

Seguin. ſelect. Numiſmat. p. 2, 3, 4.

However, T. G. *is content to ſuppoſe, that the Philoſophers were as ſubtil as I would make them* (or rather as honeſt as their own Writers make them) *Yet,* ſaith he, *were they not worthily condemned by the Apoſtle, tho'* *but for the external Profeſſion of Praying, and offering Sacrifice to the Statues of* Jupiter, Venus, Mercury, &c. *as alſo to thoſe of Birds, and four-footed Beaſts, and creeping Things, as the Vulgar did?* I anſwer, that upon the Principles of Worſhip allowed in the *Roman* Church, they were not to blame in what they did, ſuppoſing that to be their meaning, which their own Writers allow, as appears by the foregoing Diſcourſe. But T. G. ſaith, *However, they were to blame in two things.* 1. *Becauſe the Images being inſtituted by Publick Authority for the Worſhip of falſe Gods, they concurred, as I acknowledge, with the Vulgar, in all the external Practices of their Idolatry.* 2. *Becauſe though in the Schools they denied them to be Gods, yet, as* Origen *charges* Celſus, *they worſhipped them as Gods, and the People are confirmed in their Opinion.* But all the queſtion is, how this external Worſhip comes to be Idolatry, ſuppoſing they acknowledged one Supreme God, and gave only a Relative or Inferior Worſhip to other Beings created by him, or to the Images of them. Wherein, I pray, did this Idolatry conſiſt? Not in worſhipping the *True God by Images*: That *T. G.* utterly denies to be Idolatry. Was it then in giving Sovereign Worſhip to Inferior Gods? That their own Writers deny that they did, but only a Subordinate and Relative Worſhip. *But it lay,* ſaith T. G. *in worſhipping the Images of falſe Gods*: Theſe falſe Gods, by the Confeſſion of their own Writers, were either Good Angels, or Deified Men; and is it at laſt confeſſed to be Idolatry to give Divine Worſhip to theſe? *But they concurred with the People in their Worſhip,* and why not upon their Grounds? What Scandal did this give among them? *But it was the external Profeſſion of Idolatry*; of what Idolatry? Of the *Worſhip of falſe Gods.* What! ſtill in a round? I grant they were falſe Gods, as they had Divine Worſhip given to them: And ſo whatever Creature it be, that is ſo worſhipped, though never ſo Real, or Excellent a Being, becomes a falſe God; and ſo doth the Image of that Being ſo worſhipped. *But the People had other Notions of theſe falſe Gods than the Philoſophers had, and yet they complied with the People in external Acts of Worſhip.* This is juſt the Caſe of the *Roman* Church, their Learned Men have complained, that the People worſhip the Images for Gods among them; but doth T. G. think himſelf guilty of *external Profeſſion of Idolatry in uſing the ſame external Acts of Worſhip with the People, though with another Intention*? If not, why ſhall not the ſame excuſe hold for *Titius*, which holds for *Sempronius?* Will they undertake to defend the Follies of the Ignorant People? No, they do not think themſelves bound to do it, but blame them for their *Ignorance and Superſtition*, and ſay, *The Church is free, becauſe it hath taken care to inſtruct them better.* Might not the Philoſophers have ſaid the very ſame thing? "We are not bound "to anſwer for the madneſs of the Rabble; we inſtruct them better, and our Schools are open for them to learn: But ſince the Nature of ſuch Actions depends upon the Intention of the Doers; we "declare our Intentions to be to Honour the Supreme God in the "firſt place; then the *Cœleſtial Deities*, with a Worſhip inferior to his, "but above all other Beings; next to them we worſhip the Heavens, "on the account of the Intelligences that animate and move them; "then the *Aereal Dæmons*, or *Lower Angels*, which have the neareſt intercourſe with Men; and, laſt of all, the Souls of Deified Men, "whom ſome extraordinary Excellency hath advanced above the "Condition of other Souls: And according to the Worſhip we give "to

TG.p.108

“ to the Beings repreſented, we give Worſhip to the Images or Re-
“ preſentations. And if you allow the diſtinctions of *Divine Wor-*
“ *ſhip*, into Sovereign and Subordinate, into Abſolute and Relative,
“ what harm is there in all that we do? Indeed, if it be unlawful
“ to worſhip *God* by any Image: If it be unlawful to give any *Divine*
“ *Worſhip* to any Creature; we are then to blame, and are juſtly con-
“ demned, otherwiſe we think we ſtand upon equal Terms with thoſe
“ who make uſe of the ſame Diſtinctions, and only change the Names
“ of ſome, and the Perſons of others. Thus *T. G* may ſee the parallel is not ſo extravagant as he would make it to be: And while St. *Paul* condemned the *Philoſophers for changing the Glory of the Incorruptible God, into Images of Men or Beaſts, while they ſtill retained God in their Minds*, he doth effectually condemn all thoſe who worſhip the *True God* by any Images either of himſelf, or of any of his Creatures.

Ferd. Ughelli Italia ſacra Tom. 8. p. 559. Majoli Dies Canicul. par 2. coll. 1. p. 435.

But beſides this Opinion of the *Platonick Philoſophers*, there was another currant among the *Heathens*, viz. *That one and the ſame God was Worſhipped under different Names and Titles*; and *Simon Majolus* an *Italian Biſhop*, and of great Reputation, as appears by the Character given of him by *Ferd. Ughellus*, is of Opinion, *That they who began the Poetick Theology among the Heathens were wiſer than* Pythagoras, Socrates, *or any of the Philoſophers*; *for their deſign was*, ſaith he, *under the Repreſentation of a Multitude of Gods, to ſhew to the People that God did ſee and know all things*; *becauſe the common People were uncapable of underſtanding how one God ſhould be preſent in all Places*; *therefore they called that Divine Power which governed the Heavens*, Jove; *the Air*, Juno; *the Sea*, Neptune, *&c. And we may obſerve*, ſaith he, *that all the Gods of the Ancients were nearly related to* Jove, *by which it appears that their Deſign was to ſignifie but one God that ruled and governed all things, whoſe Power was diffuſed over the whole World*. To which that ſaying of *Plotinus* agrees, ſpeaking of *God that made the World, bringing the reſt of the Gods with him*, or rather, ſaith he, εἷς ὢν καὶ πάντες, καὶ ἕκαστος πάντες, συνόντες εἰς ἓν καὶ ταῖς μὲν δυνάμεσιν ἄλλοι· τῇ δὲ μιᾷ ἐκείνῃ τῇ πολλῇ πάντες εἷς, μᾶλλον δὲ εἷς πάντες. *Who is one and all; and every one is all agreeing in one; in Powers different, yet in that various Power they are all one, or rather one is all.* Plutarch ſaith, *That there were not different Gods among the* Greeks *and* Barbarians, *in the Northern and Southern Parts: But as the Sun, Moon, Heavens, Earth and Sea are common to all Nations, but called by different Names; ſo that one Reaſon and Providence which orders, diſpoſes, and manages all things, hath different Honours, and Titles and Symbols, ſome more plain and eaſie, others more difficult and obſcure.* So *Apuleius* ſaith, *the ſame Deity was worſhipped through the whole World, under different Names, and Images, and Cuſtoms.* Which Hypotheſis makes it yet more difficult for *T. G.* to charge the Heathens with the worſhipping the Images of falſe Gods; for if the ſame God were worſhipped only under different Titles and Repreſentations as they ſay, if the *worſhip of God by an Image be lawful*, all the Heathens which went upon this Principle, muſt be freed from the charge of Idolatry.

Plotin. Ennead. 5. l. 8. c. 9.

Plutarch. de Iſid. & Oſirid. p. 377. ed. Francf.

Apul. Metam. l. 11.

§. 14. 2. But *T. G.* is a Man of Tricks, and he hath one fetch yet behind; which is, *That the Heathens took the Images themſelves for Gods, and therein were guilty of Idolatry.* St. *Paul*, ſaith he, *ſpeaks of ſuch Images as were worſhipped for Gods, or for Images of falſe Gods.* This is the

T. G. p. 99. 106.

the very laſt reſerve, and if this doth not help him, nothing can. Who would not commend the various Artifices of my Antagoniſt, that doth with ſo much ſlight of Hand convey one diſtinction after another, to blind the Spectator's Eye? If Idolatry be forbidden, and the command be too plain to be denied; *Yes*, ſaith he, *Idolatry is a very naughty thing; but what is Idolatry? Idolatry is the worſhip of an Idol, is it not?* Yea, verily. *Now pray tell me, what is an Idol?* An *Idol is an Idol*, in the *Self-evident* and *Scientifical* Way. But to be ſerious,

" Methinks, Sir, ſaith a Diſciple of *T. G.* to him, my Conſcience " is a little unquiet when I worſhip an Image of a *Madonna*, for fear " that ſhould be an *Idol*.

Now ſee what a Fool you are; is not the Bleſſed Virgin in Being? " Yes " without doubt in Heaven.

Then her Image can be no Idol.

" Say you ſo? But, I pray, how doth that appear?

Why, ſaith *T. G.* to his Scholar, *an Idol is a Repreſentation of nothing that ſeems to be ſomething; as if you imagine a Centaur, or a Triton, or any Chimera.* And ſo farewel the Commandment.

" But doth not St. *Paul* condemn the *Athenians* for Idolatry in " *worſhipping the Work of Mens Hands*? And although *Chimera's* be " the Work of Mens Brains, yet ſurely Images are the Work of " Mens Hands.

It is true, ſaith T. G. *but then he condemns not all Images, but ſuch as are the proper Likeneſſes of the Deity.*

" Hold, Sir, a little, you are too quick for me; were theſe *Athenians* Idolaters, or no?

Why do you ask me that Queſtion?

" I will tell you, Sir, an Idol you told me was a *Chimera*, but " the *proper Likeneſs of the Deity is no Chimera*, unleſs you ſuppoſe the " Deity it ſelf to be one; ſo that, methinks, you free them from that " which St. *Paul* condemns them for, *viz.* Idolatry. But, I pray, " Sir, what think you of thoſe St. *Paul* condemns, *Rom.* 1. did they " believe their Images to be proper *Likeneſſes of their Gods*? had they " any *four-footed* and *creeping Gods*, as they had Images like to ſuch " things?

No, ſaith T. G. *theſe were another kind of Images from thoſe at* Athens.

" Of what kind were theſe?

Theſe were the Images of falſe Gods.

" You mean they were Idols, do you not? *Yes, they were Idols.*

" Very well; then I have them right; they were Images of *Centaurs, Tritons, Sphinxes, Chimera's*; but he doth not ſpeak againſt " ſuch Images, but the Repreſentations of Living and Real Beings, " as Men, or Beaſts, *&c.* which are no *Chimera's*. Therefore is ſeems " whatever St. *Paul* ſaith, theſe were not guilty of Idolatry; and ſo, " methinks we have done a very good Act of Charity, for we have " freed almoſt all the Heathens from Idolatry.

Hold a little, ſaith T. G. *they were guilty for all this.*

" Of what? of Idolatry? when St. *Paul* ſaith, *They knew God,* " *but did not glorifie him as God, becauſe they worſhipped ſuch Images*; then it ſhould ſeem to be Idolatry to worſhip God by an Image.

You run too faſt; I ſaid they were guilty; but, do you mark me, I did not ſay of Idolatry, but of complying with the People in the external practice of Idolatry.

“Very well; the People then were guilty of *Idolatry*, and they only of *Compliance*: But why doth not St. *Paul* lay this only to their Charge, which was their only fault, as he doth when he blames the *Corinthians* for eating in the Temple of *Idols*? I remember, Sir, a good Principle of yours, *That Actions go whither they are intended*: Now if theſe Men intended to Worſhip the *True God* by the publick *Images*, this Action of Worſhip muſt be free from *Idolatry* in them, whatever it were in others who had not ſuch *Intention*.

“But what do you mean by the *exterior practice of Idolatry*? If all *external Actions be equivocal*, and the Nature of *Idolatry* depends on the Intention of the Mind, how comes the guilt of *Idolatry* to be charged upon external Acts when you do not know the inward Intention? Suppoſe among us, a Perſon falls to his Prayers before the *Image* of the Bleſſed Virgin; here is all the *external Profeſſion of Idolatry that may be*, for I can ſee no difference in any outward Act between what he doth to the *Image*, and what he would do to the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, if he appeared to him. If this be *Idolatry*, *Wo be to us all*; if it be not *Idolatry* in us, how came it to be ſo in the Philoſophers, who, I have heard, owned the ſame *True God*, and had the ſame diſtinctions of the degrees of Worſhip that we have?

But theſe were falſe Gods that they worſhipped.

“I hope the *true God* is not a *falſe God*, but I ſaid *they worſhipped the true God*.

Suppoſe that, yet they joined falſe Gods with him.

“Not in the ſame degree with him, for they ſuppos'd him to be far above them all which were created by him, and dependent upon him: And do not we do the very ſame in the worſhip of *Angels* and *Saints*?

True, but theirs were falſe Gods, and ours are Saints and Angels.

“Upon the whole Matter then, I find the fault of the Wiſer Heathens, did not lie either in the general Principles or Practices of *Divine Worſhip*: But only that they called theſe *Gods* whom we call *Angels* (which I have heard St. *Cyril* and St. *Auguſtine* thought not worth diſputing) and that they did not Worſhip ſuch good Saints as we do, and of whom we have ſo good Aſſurance, that they were (as St. *Chriſtopher*, *Longinus*, the *Eleven Thouſand Virgins*, the *Seven Sleepers*) whereas the poor Heathens were bred up with Fables; and we have ſuch eminent Proofs of their Sanctity, as St. *Dominick*'s butchering Hereticks, and St. *Ignatius Loyola*'s founding the Order of Jeſuits. I am now very well ſatisfied, how juſtly the Philoſophers were condemned, and how innocently we give the ſame kind of Worſhip to *thoſe* that far better deſerve it.

Yet, ſaith T. G. *there is another thing behind, which makes the difference ſo apparent, that nothing but Malice and Blindneſs can hinder Men from ſeeing it.*

“What is that, good Sir? for hitherto I have been forced to uſe my Spectacles; the difference was ſo fine and ſubtle.

Why, ſaith T. G. *the Heathens took their Images themſelves for Gods, which you know we do not.*

“ This I confeſs is a very notable thing; but I pray, Sir, tell me how
“ they did it, and how we do it not? Did they really believe that the
“ *Wood* and *Stone of their Images did make and govern the World*? Or,
“ that a Man by *Hob's* and an *Ax* could cut a *God* out of a *Tree*?
“ That were as great a Miracle, as our *Prieſts turning a Wafer into God,*
“ *by ſaying five Words*; but I hope ſuch Miracles are peculiar to the
“ *Roman Catholick Church.* What was it then they meant, when they
“ took their *Images for Gods*? I ſuppoſe it was only, that they believed
“ a more *ſpecial Preſence of their Gods* in them; and that by their means
“ Miracles were wrought at them, and that they *ſometimes ſpake, and*
“ *ſometimes bowed and moved themſelves.* But do not all good Catholicks
“ believe the very ſame things of our *Images*? Do not we know that
“ our Lady is more preſent in one Image than in another? And that
“ ſhe works Miracles at ſome *Images* more than at others, and that ſhe
“ *moves, and ſpeaks, and travels too*; witneſs the *Holy Houſe of Loretto,*
“ and the *Madonna* there; where was there ever ſuch a thing done in
“ Old *Rome*? The bringing the Stone from *Phrygia*, of the *Mater Deorum*,
“ or the Serpent from *Epidaurus*, or the tattling of the *Image of*
“ *Juno Moneta* at *Veii*, were not to be compared to this. Therefore,
“ Sir, give me leave to adviſe you in this Point; have a care
“ of diſparaging our Wonder-working *Images*, while you would
“ charge the Heathens with *Idolatry*, and free our Church from the
‘ guilt of it.

§. 15. I had thought I had ſaid enough in my former *Diſcourſe*, to make it appear, *That the Wiſer Heathens did not look on their Images as Gods, but as Symbols and Repreſentations of that Being, to which they did give Divine Worſhip.* For I ſhewed that *Celſus* ſaid, *none but Fools think otherwiſe of them*: That *Porphyry and the Heathens in* Athanaſius *ſaid they were only Books for the Ignorant*: *That in* Arnobius *they denied that they ever thought their Images to be Gods, or to have any Divinity in them, but what only comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an Uſe; and in St.* Auguſtine, *that they worſhipped not the Images themſelves, but through them they worſhipped the Deity: That* Maximus Tyrius *at large proves, that Images were but Signs of Divine Honour, and helps to remembrance: That* Julian *ſaith, they do not think their Images to be Gods, but that through them they may Worſhip the Deity; and that* Euſebius *in general teſtifies of the Heathens, that they did not look on their Images as Gods.* All this put together I thought had ſignify'd ſomething to the proving that the Heathen Idolatry did not lie *in taking their Images to be Gods*: And ſo it ſeems it did. For *T. G.* runs quite off from the Buſineſs, ſaying, *That all theſe Quotations do only prove* (what I brought them for) *that they did not look on their Images as Gods*; *but*, he ſaith, *it appears from ſome of them that they looked on them nevertheleſs as Images, or Symbols of falſe Gods.* And did not I ſay, that I would prove by them, that they looked on them as Symbols, or Repreſentations of *that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip*? I never ſaid, or thought that the Heathens looked on all their *Images as Repreſentations of the Supreme God*: For I very well conſidered, that they worſhipped *Inferior Gods by Images* made for them. And therefore, after the producing theſe Teſtimonies, I ſtate the Queſtion thus, *I deſire to know whether theſe Men, who worſhipped Images upon thoſe Grounds, did amiſs or no in it? I do not ask whether they were miſtaken as to the Objects of their Worſhip, but on Suppoſition they were not, whether they were to blame in the* T.G. p. 100

You run too faſt; I ſaid they were guilty; but, do you mark me, I did not ſay of Idolatry, but of complying with the People in the external practice of Idolatry.

“ Very well; the People then were guilty of *Idolatry*, and they only of *Compliance*: But why doth not St. *Paul* lay this only to their Charge, which was their only fault, as he doth when he blames the *Corinthians* for eating in the Temple of *Idols*? I remember, Sir, a good Principle of yours, *That Actions go whither they are intended*: Now if theſe Men intended to Worſhip the *True God* by the publick *Images*, this Action of Worſhip muſt be free from *Idolatry* in them, whatever it were in others who had not ſuch *Intention*.

“ But what do you mean by the *exterior practice of Idolatry*? If all *external Actions be equivocal*, and the Nature of *Idolatry* depends on the Intention of the Mind, how comes the guilt of *Idolatry* to be charged upon external Acts when you do not know the inward Intention? Suppoſe among us, a Perſon falls to his Prayers before the *Image* of the Bleſſed Virgin; here is all the *external Profeſſion of Idolatry that may be*, for I can ſee no difference in any outward Act between what he doth to the *Image*, and what he would do to the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, if he appeared to him. If this be *Idolatry*, *Wo be to us all*; if it be not *Idolatry* in us, how came it to be ſo in the Philoſophers, who, I have heard, owned the ſame *True God*, and had the ſame diſtinctions of the degrees of Worſhip that we have?

But theſe were falſe Gods that they worſhipped.

“ I hope the *true God* is not a *falſe God*, but I ſaid *they worſhipped the true God*.

Suppoſe that, yet they joined falſe Gods with him.

“ Not in the ſame degree with him, for they ſuppos'd him to be far above them all which were created by him, and dependent upon him: And do not we do the very ſame in the worſhip of *Angels* and *Saints*?

True, but theirs were falſe Gods, and ours are Saints and Angels.

“ Upon the whole Matter then, I find the fault of the Wiſer Heathens, did not lie either in the general Principles or Practices of *Divine Worſhip*: But only that they called theſe *Gods* whom we call *Angels* (which I have heard St. *Cyril* and St. *Auguſtine* thought not worth diſputing) and that they did not Worſhip ſuch good Saints as we do, and of whom we have ſo good Aſſurance, that they were (as St. *Chriſtopher*, *Longinus*, the *Eleven Thouſand Virgins*, the *Seven Sleepers*) whereas the poor Heathens were bred up with Fables; and we have ſuch eminent Proofs of their Sanctity, as St. *Dominick*'s butchering Hereticks, and St. *Ignatius Loyola*'s founding the Order of Jeſuits. I am now very well ſatisfied, how juſtly the Philoſophers were condemned, and how innocently we give the ſame kind of Worſhip to *thoſe* that far better deſerve it.

Yet, ſaith T. G. *there is another thing behind, which makes the difference ſo apparent, that nothing but Malice and Blindneſs can hinder Men from ſeeing it.*

“ What is that, good Sir? for hitherto I have been forced to uſe my Spectacles; the difference was ſo fine and ſubtle.

Why, ſaith T. G. *the Heathens took their Images themſelves for Gods, which you know we do not.*

“ This I confeſs is a very notable thing; but I pray, Sir, tell me how
“ they did it, and how we do it not? Did they really believe that the
“ *Wood* and *Stone of their Images did make and govern the World*? Or,
“ that a Man by *Hob's* and an *Ax* could cut a *God* out of a *Tree*?
“ That were as great a Miracle, as our *Prieſts turning a Wafer into God*,
“ *by ſaying five Words*; but I hope ſuch Miracles are peculiar to the
“ *Roman Catholick Church*. What was it then they meant, when they
“ took their *Images for Gods?* I ſuppoſe it was only, that they believed
“ a more *ſpecial Preſence of their Gods* in them; and that by their means
“ Miracles were wrought at them, and that they *ſometimes ſpake, and*
“ *ſometimes bowed and moved themſelves*. But do not all good Catholicks
“ believe the very ſame things of our *Images*? Do not we know that
“ our Lady is more preſent in one Image than in another? And that
“ ſhe works Miracles at ſome *Images* more than at others, and that ſhe
“ *moves, and ſpeaks, and travels too*; witneſs the *Holy Houſe of Loretto*,
“ and the *Madonna* there; where was there ever ſuch a thing done in
“ Old *Rome*? The bringing the Stone from *Phrygia*, of the *Mater Deo-*
“ *rum*, or the Serpent from *Epidaurus*, or the tattling of the *Image of*
“ *Juno Moneta* at *Veii*, were not to be compared to this. There-
“ fore, Sir, give me leave to adviſe you in this Point; have a care
“ of diſparaging our Wonder-working *Images*, while you would
“ charge the Heathens with *Idolatry*, and free our Church from the
“ guilt of it.

§. 15. I had thought I had ſaid enough in my former *Diſcourſe*, to make it appear, *That the Wiſer Heathens did not look on their Images as Gods, but as Symbols and Repreſentations of that Being, to which they did give Divine Worſhip*. For I ſhewed that *Celſus* ſaid, *none but Fools think otherwiſe of them*: That *Porphyry and the Heathens in* Athanaſius *ſaid they were only Books for the Ignorant*: *That in* Arnobius *they denied that they ever thought their Images to be Gods, or to have any Divinity in them, but what only comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an Uſe*; *and in St.* Auguſtine, *that they worſhipped not the Images themſelves, but through them they worſhipped the Deity*: *That* Maximus Tyrius *at large proves, that Images were but Signs of Divine Honour, and helps to remembrance*: *That* Julian *ſaith, they do not think their Images to be Gods, but that through them they may Worſhip the Deity*; *and that* Euſebius *in general teſtifies of the Heathens, that they did not look on their Images as Gods*. All this put together I thought had ſignify'd ſomething to the proving that the Heathen Idolatry did not lie *in taking their Images to be Gods*: And ſo it ſeems it did. For *T. G.* runs quite off from the Buſineſs, ſaying, *That all theſe Quotations do only prove* (what I brought them for) *that they did not look on their Images as Gods*; *but*, he ſaith, *it appears from ſome of them that they looked on them nevertheleſs as Images, or Symbols of falſe Gods*. And did not I ſay, that I would prove by them, that they looked on them as Symbols, or Repreſentations of *that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip*? I never ſaid, or thought that the Heathens looked on all their *Images as Repreſentations of the Supreme God*: For I very well conſidered, that they worſhipped *Inferior Gods by Images* made for them. And therefore, after the producing theſe Teſtimonies, I ſtate the Queſtion thus, *I deſire to know whether theſe Men, who worſhipped Images upon thoſe Grounds, did amiſs or no in it? I do not ask whether they were miſtaken as to the Objects of their Worſhip, but on Suppoſition they were not, whether they were to blame in the* T.G.p.100

manner of ſerving God by Images in ſuch a way as they deſcribe? And to this T. G. ſaith not one wiſe Word, but only talks of *Scandal and Compliance with exterior Practice of Idolatry*, and what I have already anſwered: But he charges me with *miſrepreſenting the Teſtimonies, becauſe, forſooth,* Celſus *adds, that they were Statues erected to the Gods: And Divinity and Deity are not in the Teſtimonies of* Arnobius *and St.* Auguſtine; *and then bids the Reader learn what Credit he is to give hereafter to my citing of Authors; and at the ſame time receive a farther Teſtimony of his Kindneſs to me, in taking the reſt upon my Word.* Very artificially done, I confeſs, to paſs thoſe by to which no anſwer was to be returned, and to ſpend ſome Pages in moſt diſingenuous Cavils about the two Teſtimonies he inſiſts upon. I deſire only the Reader to conſider what I was proving, *viz. That the Heathens did not take their Images themſelves for Gods,* which he yet aſſerts ſeveral times in that Chapter, after I had produced theſe Teſtimonies expreſly to the contrary. Had it not become him either to have anſwered theſe Teſtimonies, or not to have aſſerted that, which theſe Teſtimonies moſt fully and clearly denied? *But he is content to take them upon my Word*; I thank him for his kindneſs in it. But doth he take them as true or falſe? If as true, then the Heathens did not Worſhip their Images as Gods, which he yet ſaith they did: If he took them as falſe when I quoted them as true, the Kindneſs was very extraordinary, and ought to be acknowledged. If he had produced the Teſtimonies of *Bellarmine, Vaſquez, Suarez, Valentia,* and others, to ſhew *that the Papiſts do not take their Images for Gods,* and I ſhould ſay, *I took the Teſtimonies upon his Word,* and yet aſſerted the direct contrary to them, without ſo much as the leaſt anſwering to what they ſaid, would not any indifferent Reader account me either Impudent or Ridiculous? p. 101.

Yet this is exactly the Caſe of *T. G.* for he ſaith ſeveral times in this Chapter, *That the Heathens did worſhip their Images as Gods,* whereas thoſe Teſtimonies ſay as plainly as Words can expreſs it, *that they did not; and yet theſe Teſtimonies he takes upon my Word,* i. e. in common Conſtruction he believes them to be true, and yet the Matter contained in them to be falſe: Which is an admirable piece of *T. G.*'s Art and Ingenuity. But to add yet more to his Kindneſs, at the *ſame time he takes theſe Teſtimonies on my Word,* he will let the Reader ſee, *what Credit he is to give to my citing of Authors.* But why then will he take any upon my Word, if I have ſo little Credit with him? Herein he ſhews himſelf either very weak, if he will take my Word, when he thinks I deſerve no Credit; or very malicious, if he knows I deſerve Credit, and yet goes about to blaſt it, as much as in him lies.

§. 16. But wherein is it, I have expoſed my Reputation ſo much in the two Teſtimonies, he hath faſtned his Talons upon? The firſt is that of *Arnobius*, wherein, I ſay, *the Heathens deny that they ever thought their Images to be Gods, or to have any Divinity in them, but what only comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an Uſe.* That which he charges me with is, *that by cogging in the Word Divinity in the ſingular Number, I would repreſent it to the Reader, as though the Wiſer Heathens intended to Worſhip the true Divinity by thoſe Images, whereas all that they ſay in* Arnobius, *is, that they did not look on their Images as Gods* per ſe *of themſelves, but they worſhipped the Gods, which by Dedication were made to dwell in them,* i. e. ſaith he, *by Magical Incantation, by which the Souls of Wicked* T. G. p. 102, 103.

Men were evocated, and as it were tied to dwell in thoſe Images, as St. Auſtin *relateth* l. 8. de Civ. Dei c. 23. & 26. Hereupon he charges me very ſeverely *with foul dealing; in putting Divinity in the ſingular Number, when the Infernal Spirits were meant by it; as if they intended to worſhip the true God by theſe Images, when they declared they worſhipped falſe Gods by them.* A very heavy Charge; to which I ſhall give a diſtinct anſwer: 1. To that of tranſlating Divinity in the ſingular Number, *T. G.* may, if he pleaſe, take it upon my word (or, if not, let him ſearch the Place once more) that I tranſlated theſe very words of *Arnobius, Nihil Numinis ineſſe ſimulachris, That the Images have no Divinity in them,* and if theſe Words be not in that very Place, and but two Lines before thoſe quoted by him, *Erras & laberis,* &c. I will venture my Credit in citing Authors upon *T. G.*'s ingenuity: But if they be there, as moſt certainly they are, what doth ſuch a Man deſerve for ſo notorious fair dealing? 2. My deſign was not to repreſent by this means that the Heathens only intended to worſhip the *True God by Images,* but that the worſhip of *Images* was unlawful, although Men did not take the *Images* themſelves for Gods: So I find in the very beginning of thoſe Quotations, *That I would prove that the Heathens did look on their Images as Symbols, or Repreſentations of that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip.* Do I ſay of the True God? Are not the Words ſo general on purpoſe to imply that, *whatever Being they worſhipped,* they looked on the *Images* as Symbols or Repreſentations of it? And after, to prevent all ſuch Cavils, I purpoſely added, *I do not ask whether they were miſtaken as to the Objects of their Worſhip?* But what can a Man do to prevent the Cavils of a diſingenuons Sophiſter? 3. As to what he ſaith, *That what they plead in* Arnobius, *is only that their Images were not Gods* per ſe *of themſelves, but by virtue of the Spirit's dwelling in them:* I anſwer, *That* T. G. *charges the Heathen Idolaters with Worſhipping the Images themſelves:* And ſaith, *that I deal very diſingenuouſly in affirming, that the Wiſer Heathens did not worſhip the Images themſelves.* Now what could be more pertinent to my Purpoſe, than to produce thoſe very Words of *Arnobius, You err, and are miſtaken,* O T. G. *in what you affirm, for we do not think the Matter of Braſs, Silver and Gold to be Gods, or adorable Deities* per ſe *of themſelves.* Whereby we ſee *T. G.*'s own Words, as he renders them out of *Arnobius* do ſufficiently vindicate me, and contradict him. He ſaith, *They did worſhip the Images themſelves, and they ſay they did not.* What doth he mean elſe, when he ſaith in other Places, that *the Heathens worſhipped their Images as Gods;* what is this but to take the *Images themſelves for Gods?* For he never once ſuppoſes it unlawful to worſhip *Images* on the Account of a Divine Spirit being preſent in the *Images,* ſuppoſing that Spirit of it ſelf to deſerve Adoration: As *ſuppoſe* upon Conſecration of an *Image* of the Bleſſed Virgin, ſhe ſhould manifeſt *her ſelf* in, and by that *Image,* in *ſpeaking, or moving, or working Miracles,* doth *T. G.* think it the more unlawful to worſhip ſuch an *Image?* No, certainly, but that Men ought to ſhew more Devotion towards it. Therefore *T. G.* could not condemn the *Heathens* for the worſhipping the *Images, ſuppoſing good Spirits did dwell in them.* Setting aſide then the diſpute about the nature of the Spirits, all that he could imagine the Fathers had to condemn in thoſe that worſhipped *Images,* was, that they worſhipped the *Images themſelves for Gods;* which the *Heathens* in *Arnobius* deny, and

T.G.*p.*106

T.G. *p.* 99. 106.

manner of ſerving God by Images in ſuch a way as they deſcribe? And to this T.G. ſaith not one wiſe Word, but only talks of *Scandal and Compliance with exterior Practice of Idolatry*, and what I have already anſwered: But he charges me with *miſrepreſenting the Teſtimonies, becauſe, forſooth,* p. 101. Celſus *adds, that they were Statues erected to the Gods: And Divinity and Deity are not in the Teſtimonies of* Arnobius *and St.* Auguſtine; *and then bids the Reader learn what Credit he is to give hereafter to my citing of Authors; and at the ſame time receive a farther Teſtimony of his Kindneſs to me, in taking the reſt upon my Word.* Very artificially done, I confeſs, to paſs thoſe by to which no anſwer was to be returned, and to ſpend ſome Pages in moſt diſingenuous Cavils about the two Teſtimonies he inſiſts upon. I deſire only the Reader to conſider what I was proving, *viz. That the Heathens did not take their Images themſelves for Gods,* which he yet aſſerts ſeveral times in that Chapter, after I had produced theſe Teſtimonies expreſly to the contrary. Had it not become him either to have anſwered theſe Teſtimonies, or not to have aſſerted that, which theſe Teſtimonies moſt fully and clearly denied? *But he is content to take them upon my Word*; I thank him for his kindneſs in it. But doth he take them as true or falſe? If as true, then the Heathens did not Worſhip their Images as Gods, which he yet ſaith they did: If he took them as falſe when I quoted them as true, the Kindneſs was very extraordinary, and ought to be acknowledged. If he had produced the Teſtimonies of *Bellarmine, Vaſquez, Suarez, Valentia,* and others, to ſhew *that the Papiſts do not take their Images for Gods,* and I ſhould ſay, *I took the Teſtimonies upon his Word,* and yet aſſerted the direct contrary to them, without ſo much as the leaſt anſwering to what they ſaid, would not any indifferent Reader account me either Impudent or Ridiculous?

Yet this is exactly the Caſe of *T. G.* for he ſaith ſeveral times in this Chapter, *That the Heathens did worſhip their Images as Gods,* whereas thoſe Teſtimonies ſay as plainly as Words can expreſs it, *that they did not; and yet theſe Teſtimonies he takes upon my Word,* i. e. in common Conſtruction he believes them to be true, and yet the Matter contained in them to be falſe: Which is an admirable piece of *T. G.*'s Art and Ingenuity. But to add yet more to his Kindneſs, at the *ſame time he takes theſe Teſtimonies on my Word,* he will let the Reader ſee, *what Credit he is to give to my citing of Authors.* But why then will he take any upon my Word, if I have ſo little Credit with him? Herein he ſhews himſelf either very weak, if he will take my Word, when he thinks I deſerve no Credit; or very malicious, if he knows I deſerve Credit, and yet goes about to blaſt it, as much as in him lies.

§. 16. But wherein is it, I have expoſed my Reputation ſo much in the two Teſtimonies, he hath faſtned his Talons upon? The firſt is that of *Arnobius,* wherein, I ſay, *the Heathens deny that they ever thought their Images to be Gods, or to have any Divinity in them, but what only comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an Uſe.* That which he charges me with is, *that by cogging in the Word Divinity in the ſingular Number, I would repreſent it to the Reader, as though the Wiſer Heathens intended to Worſhip the true Divinity by thoſe Images, whereas all that they ſay in* Arnobius, *is, that they did not look on their Images as Gods* per ſe *of themſelves, but they worſhipped the Gods, which by Dedication were made to dwell in* T. G. p. 102, 103. *them,* i. e. ſaith he, *by Magical Incantation, by which the Souls of Wicked*

Men were evocated, and as it were tied to dwell in thoſe Images, as St. Auſtin *relateth* l. 8. de Civ. Dei c. 23. & 26. Hereupon he charges me very ſeverely *with foul dealing; in putting Divinity in the ſingular Number, when the Infernal Spirits were meant by it; as if they intended to worſhip the true God by theſe Images, when they declared they worſhipped falſe Gods by them.* A very heavy Charge; to which I ſhall give a diſtinct anſwer: 1. To that of tranſlating Divinity in the ſingular Number, *T. G.* may, if he pleaſe, take it upon my word (or, if not, let him ſearch the Place once more) that I tranſlated theſe very words of *Arnobius, Nihil Numinis ineſſe ſimulachris, That the Images have no Divinity in them,* and if theſe Words be not in that very Place, and but two Lines before thoſe quoted by him, *Erras & laberis,* &c. I will venture my Credit in citing Authors upon *T. G.*'s ingenuity: But if they be there, as moſt certainly they are, what doth ſuch a Man deſerve for ſo notorious fair dealing? 2. My deſign was not to repreſent by this means that the Heathens only intended to worſhip the *True God by Images,* but that the worſhip of *Images* was unlawful, although Men did not take the *Images* themſelves for Gods: So I find in the very beginning of thoſe Quotations, *That I would prove that the Heathens did look on their Images as Symbols, or Repreſentations of that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip.* Do I ſay of the True God? Are not the Words ſo general on purpoſe to imply that, *whatever Being they worſhipped,* they looked on the *Images* as Symbols or Repreſentations of it? And after, to prevent all ſuch Cavils, I purpoſely added, *I do not ask whether they were miſtaken as to the Objects of their Worſhip?* But what can a Man do to prevent the Cavils of a diſingenuons Sophiſter? 3. As to what he ſaith, *That what they plead in* Arnobius, *is only that their Images were not Gods* per ſe *of themſelves, but by virtue of the Spirit's dwelling in them:* I anſwer, *That* T. G. *charges the Heathen Idolaters with Worſhipping the* T.G.p.106 *Images themſelves:* And ſaith, *that I deal very diſingenuouſly in affirming, that the Wiſer Heathens did not worſhip the Images themſelves.* Now what could be more pertinent to my Purpoſe, than to produce thoſe very Words of *Arnobius, You err, and are miſtaken,* O T. G. *in what you affirm, for we do not think the Matter of Braſs, Silver and Gold to be Gods, or adorable Deities* per ſe *of themſelves.* Whereby we ſee *T. G.*'s own Words, as he renders them out of *Arnobius* do ſufficiently vindicate me, and contradict him. He ſaith, *They did worſhip the Images themſelves, and they ſay they did not.* What doth he mean elſe, when he ſaith in other Places, that *the Heathens worſhipped their Images as Gods;* T.G. p. 99, 106. what is this but to take the *Images themſelves for Gods?* For he never once ſuppoſes it unlawful to worſhip *Images* on the Account of a Divine Spirit being preſent in the *Images,* ſuppoſing that Spirit of it ſelf to deſerve Adoration: As *ſuppoſe* upon Conſecration of an *Image* of the Bleſſed Virgin, ſhe ſhould manifeſt *her ſelf* in, and by that *Image,* in *ſpeaking, or moving, or working Miracles,* doth *T. G.* think it the more unlawful to worſhip ſuch an *Image?* No, certainly, but that Men ought to ſhew more Devotion towards it. Therefore *T. G.* could not condemn the *Heathens* for the worſhipping the *Images, ſuppoſing good Spirits did dwell in them.* Setting aſide then the diſpute about the nature of the Spirits, all that he could imagine the Fathers had to condemn in thoſe that worſhipped *Images,* was, that they worſhipped the *Images themſelves for Gods;* which the *Heathens* in *Arnobius* deny, and which was the thing I produced that Teſtimony to prove. *Bellarmine*, whom my Adverſary follows, ſaith, *That the Heathens did take the Images themſelves for Gods*, for which he gives ſome very ſubſtantial Reaſons. 1. *Becauſe their Prieſts told them ſo.* 2. *Becauſe almoſt all the World believed it.* This one would think were enough to juſtifie the belief of it, having the *Authority of their Teachers*, and *Conſent of Nations for it.* 3. *The Motion, Speech and Oracles that came from them.* 4. *The Humane Shape it ſelf*, which he ſaith, *is a very notable Argument to make Men think that Images live, becauſe Men do; eſpecially*, he ſaith, *if it be ſaid ſo by wiſe Men.* But whatever the Reaſons be, he ſaith, *he would prove that the Heathens believed* ipſa idola eſſe Deos, *the very Images themſelves to be Gods.* Now what could be more contradictory to this Aſſertion, than thoſe Words of the Heathens in *Arnobius* are? So that the *Per ſe* which *T. G.* charges me with leaving out, adds rather more *Weight* and *Emphaſis* to the Teſtimony. 4. After all this, I ſay, that *Arnobius* doth reject the *Worſhip of Images* on ſuch Grounds as do hold againſt the *Worſhip of the true God by an Image.* For he brings that as the Objection of the *Heathens againſt the Chriſtians, that ſuppoſing they had never ſo right Apprehenſions of the nature of thoſe Beings which the Heathens worſhipped for Gods, yet they were to blame for not worſhipping their Images*, Nec eorum effigies adoramus, ſaith *Arnobius* of the Chriſtians, which I beſeech *T. G.* to remember are the Words I tranſlate, for fear he ſhould take the next words, *Templa illis extruimus nulla*; and then cry out, *There is no ſuch thing as Images in the Words, that I have cogged in the Word to ſerve my turn; that this is ſetting up a Flag in a Fireſhip* ——— *Dolus an Virtus* ——— with ſuch kind of laudable plain-dealing. Nay, *Arnobius* goes yet farther, *For*, ſaith he, *what greater Honour can we attribute to them, than that we place them there, where the Head and Lord, and King of all is, to whom they owe the ſame Acknowledgments that we do? But do we Honour him, delubris aut Templorum conſtructionibus*, with Images and Temples? So I render it without the fear of *T. G.*'s new Charge of Diſingenuity; for, beſides that the *delubra* were, ſaith *Feſtus*, *wooden Images*; it is certain that afterwards, according to *Varro*, the moſt Learned of the *Romans*, when *delubrum* was applied to a *Place*, it ſignified ſuch a one, *in quo Dei ſimulachrum dedicatum eſt*: And in the old *Gloſſaries* it is rendred into *Greek*, by καθίδρυμα, ξόανον, ἀνάθημα, therefore to Honour God *ſine delubris*, muſt be to worſhip him without *Images*; and this was the reaſon why the Chriſtians denied they had any Temples, becauſe the Heathens ſuppos'd there could be no proper *Temples without Images*; therefore in St. *Hierom*, *Sanctorum Baſilicas in Templa convertere*, is all one as turn *Churches into Idol-Temples*: And both in *Origen* and *Minucius*, the Heathens join thoſe Accuſations together, that the Chriſtians had *no Altars, nor Images, nor Temples*: and *Vitruvius* in the building of a Temple, takes the greateſt care of placing the *Images*, that they may ſtand ſo, that the *Images* may look on thoſe who come up to the Altars. And it appears by the *Diſcourſe* in *Arnobius*, that they valued no *Temples*, where there were no *Images*; thence came the ſuſpicion, that *Hadrian* intended to *Worſhip Chriſt*, becauſe he commanded *Temples* to be built in all Cities without any *Images*; as *Lampridius* ſaith in the Life of *Alexander Severus*. It is all one to our Purpoſe, whether *Hadrian* had any ſuch Intention, or no; for its being believed, that he had from this Reaſon, becauſe the *Temples* were without *Images*, is

Bell. de Imag. l. 2. p. 13.

Arnob l. 6. p. 190.

Macrob. l. 3. c. 4.

Hier. ad Ripar. adv. Vigilant.

Vitruv. l. 4. c. 5.

Lamprid. vit. Alex. Sever.

is a moſt undeniable Evidence that the *Chriſtians* then did not worſhip God or Chriſt, by any Images in their Churches. After this, *Arnobius* argues againſt the uſe of Images for this Reaſon; *if you believe your Gods to be in Heaven, to what purpoſe do you make Images of them to worſhip? cannot you as well pray to the Gods themſelves? But it may be you will ſay, becauſe you cannot ſee the Gods themſelves, you repreſent them as preſent by thoſe Images? But*, ſaith he, *he that thinks he muſt have Gods to be ſeen, doth not believe any at all. However, ſay they, we worſhip them through theſe Images. And what*, ſaith he, *can be more injurious, or reproachful than to know God to be one thing, and yet to pray to another? to expect help from the Deity, and yet to fall down before a ſenſeleſs Image? which is like a Man that ſhould pretend to take advice from Men, and to ask it of Aſſes and Swine. Is not that*, ſaith he, *not meer miſtake but madneſs*, ſupplicare tremebundum factitatæ abs te rei, *to fall down trembling before a thing made by your ſelves?* Beſides this, he argues from the *Matter*, *Form*, and *Deſign* of them, how ridiculous it is to worſhip Images; and after expoſing the other pretences of the *Heathen Idolaters*, in the laſt place he conſiders this, *that the Ancients underſtood well enough, Nihil habere Numinis ſigna:* that there was no Divinity in Images, (*T. G.* ſees I am for the ſingular number ſtill, and I think *Numen* is ſo too) *but that Images were ſet up to keep the rude People in awe*; *which*, he ſaith, *they were ſo far from, that they only made their Gods contemptible, and thereby encouraged them more in their Wickedneſs.* I deſire now the Reader to reflect, whether theſe Arguments are peculiar to the worſhip of falſe Gods; and whether they do not with as much force hold againſt the worſhip of the *true God by Images?* And if it be poſſible to ſuppoſe that a Man, that hath not the *ſtupidity of an Image*, ſhould object thoſe things againſt their worſhip, which would be returned upon his own, and never provide in the leaſt for any defence of it? So that after all the loud clamours, and inſolent charges of T. G. we find that *Arnobius* himſelf doth fully prove, that the Divinity cannot be worſhipped by Images; and that what the *Heathens* plead for themſelves in him, doth ſhew, that they believed there was *no Divinity in Images*; *but what only comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an Vſe.*

Arnob.l.6. p. 195.

p. 200.

p. 208.

§. 17. The next Teſtimony he charges me with foul-dealing in, is that of St. *Auſtin*, *wherein I ſay the Wiſer Heathens deny, that they worſhipped the Images themſelves, but they add, that through them they worſhip the Deity.* After this *T. G.* ſets down thoſe words of St. *Auſtin*, *Videntur ſibi purgatiores eſſe Religionis*, &c. And becauſe in the following Expreſſions, mention is made of the *Corporeal Creatures*, or the *Spirits that Rule over them as worſhipped by their Images*, therefore he charges me with great Diſingenuity in ſaying, *that the Heathens in St.* Auſtin *affirmed that through their Images they did worſhip the Deity:* and yet as it falls out, theſe are the very words I tranſlated in St. *Auſtin*, *Non hoc viſibile colo, ſed Numen quod illic inviſibiliter habitat*; and I now appeal to Men of any common Ingenuity, what uſage I have met with from this Adverſary, who paſſes by the very words I tranſlated, as near to the ſignification as poſſible; and produces other Paſſages; and then Hectors, and Triumphs, and cries out of my Diſingenuity; when ſcarce ever any Man diſcovered greater than in ſo doing, and I fear againſt his own Conſcience. The true ſtate of the

Aug. in Pſ. 113.

the Caſe in St. *Auſtin* about the worſhip of Images is this, 1. He expoſes the worſhip of Images in general as a ſilly and ridiculous thing; being of things much inferiour to the meaneſt *Brutes*; and if Men are aſhamed to worſhip Beaſts, that hear and ſee, and live and move, they ought to be much more aſhamed to worſhip a *dumb, ſtupid, ſenſleſs Image*; and they might with greater reaſon worſhip the Mice and Serpents which are not afraid of their Images, but ſhelter themſelves within them. Now it is plain this diſcourſe of St. *Auſtin* doth reach to all ſorts of Images for whomſoever they are intended. For an Image made for the true God hath no more *Senſe*, or *Life*, or *Motion* in it than one of *T. G*'s *Idols*, or an *Image* made for a *Chimera*. But becauſe the Chriſtian Church knew nothing at that time of the worſhip of Images, therefore he directs his diſcourſe againſt the *Heathens*, to conſider the Pleas and Excuſes they made for it. 2. He reckons up their ſeveral Pleas for their Images; 1. Some ſaid that there was a *Secret Deity which lay hid in the Image, and which worſhipped through it*. 2. Others, *that thought themſelves of a more refined Religion*, ſaid, *they neither worſhipped Images, nor Dæmons, but only beheld in the corporeal Image the Symbol of that which they ought to worſhip*. Which is the place cited by *T. G.* Now I appeal to the Reader, whether this very place doth not prove what I intended, *viz.* that the *Heathens* did look on their Images as Symbols or Repreſentations of that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip. Whereby I ſee *T. G.* hath done me a Kindneſs indeed, which I thank him for, *i. e.* he hath proved that which I did intend, and confuted that which I did not.

§. 18. But there remains yet another charge of *Diſingenuity* to be anſwered, which concerns the *Quotation* of *Trigautius*; the occaſion whereof was this, “ I had ſaid, if St. *Paul* had not thought Men to blame in the
“ worſhip of God by an Image, he would never have condemned
“ them for it; as he doth *Rom.* 1. But he ought to have done as
Trigaut. l. 5. c. 16. p. 588. “ the *Jeſuits* in *China* did, who never condemned the People for
“ worſhipping Images, but for worſhipping falſe Gods by them; and
“ perſwaded them not to lay them aſide, but to convert them to the
“ honour of the true God, and ſo melted down the former Images and
“ made new ones of them. Can we imagine St. *Paul* meant the ſame thing,
“ when he blames Men not for believing them to be Gods, but that God
“ could be worſhipped by the Work of Mens Hands; and for changing
“ thereby the glory due to God in regard of his infinite and incorruptible
“ Being into mean and unworthy Images, thinking thereby to give Ho-
“ nour to him. Theſe are my Words. Now obſerve *T. G*'s Ingenuity; inſtead of anſwering the Argument he falls to the exerciſe of his beſt Talent, Cavilling: the force of the Argument lay in this, St. *Paul* condemns the very manner of *worſhipping God by Images*; the *Jeſuits* in *China* do not that, but bid them lay aſide their old Images and worſhip new Ones: what is the reaſon, that the *Jeſuits* vary from St. *Paul*'s method, but only becauſe they differ in Judgment, *i. e.* St. *Paul* thought the worſhip of Images in general unlawful, *Jeſuits* do not, but only the *Images* of *falſe Gods*. This was the thing deſigned by me, to which he gives no manner of anſwer; but only for ſeveral Pages he tells a ſad Story how hard it was for him to come by the Book of *Trigautius*; and when he had it, he thought he had gotten a mighty Advantage againſt me; becauſe, forſooth,

T.G.p.110. 111. 112, 113.

forſooth, *I render Simulachra Images*; for the whole charge comes to this at laſt; for whereas *Trigautius* diſtinguiſhed the *Heathen ſimulachra* from the *Images of Chriſt*, becauſe I did not in the account of the Thing; (for I deſigned no verbal Tranſlation, as *T. G.* knew well enough by the Character) therefore this is charged to be *the effect of ſome very bad Deſign*; *and an Inſtance of my want of Fidelity*, *Sincerity*, *Honeſty*, *Ingenuity*, and what not? I am ſorry *Trigautius* was ſo hard to come by, for it is poſſible, if he had not been put to ſo much trouble in procuring him, I might have eſcaped better. But is it in good earneſt, ſuch a horrible Fault to tranſlate *Simulachra Images?* I ſee what a good thing it is to have a good *Catholick Dictionary*, for a hundred to one, but others would have rendred it, as I have done. I had thought *Tully*'s uſing the Words *Statua*, *Imagines*, *Signa* and *Simulachra* promiſcuouſly might have been ſufficient ground for my Tranſlating it by Images: But it ſeems *the Eccleſiaſtical uſe of the Word is otherwiſe*. I had thought *Iſidore* a good Judge of the *Eccleſiaſtical uſe of a Word*; and he uſes it promiſcuouſly with *Imagines & Effigies*; but I confeſs *Eccleſiaſtical Vſes* have been much changed ſince *Iſidore*'s time. And it ſeems *Simulachra* is only applyed to *Heathen Images*, by no means to *thoſe among Chriſtians*. But why ſo? do they not *vultum ſimulare*, as *Horace* expreſſes it; *bear a Reſemblance to what they Repreſent?* Do they not *pariles lineas principali ab ore deducere*, which is *Arnobius* his Deſcription of the proper notion of *Simulachrum?* *But for all this*, *their Images are not* Simulachra, *and ſhall not be Simulachra*. It ſeems when Images were baptized Chriſtian, they loſt their former Name, and have gotten a new one: and very much good may it do them, and all thoſe that worſhip them, if the change of Name would excuſe their Guilt. Yet *Agobardus* was of another Opinion when he ſaith, *that if thoſe who forſook the worſhip of Devils had been bidden to worſhip the Images of Saints, puto quod videretur eis non tam Idola reliquiſſe, quam Simulachra mutaſſe*: *I think*, ſaith he, *that it would have ſeemed to them, that they had not left their Idols, but only changed their Images. Where we ſee* Agobardus *is my Author for making* Simulachra *common to the Images of Heathens and Chriſtians.* And St. *Auguſtine* calls the Image of the true God *Simulachrum*. But to ſet aſide Authorities, I hope the Images uſed in *China* before the *Gentiles* Converſion, and thoſe after did agree in ſomething common to them both: although they were before the *Images of falſe Gods*, and after of Chriſt or the Bleſſed Virgin, yet they were all Images ſtill. Might I not be allowed to ſay, that the Jeſuits did not perſwade the Converts to lay aſide the uſe of Images; but to convert them to the Honour of the true God; and ſo melted down the former Images and made new ones of them? *No, by no means, For them and them, coming after one another, and the firſt being the Images of falſe Gods, it was ſcarce poſſible for an ordinary Proteſtant Reader not to avoid being miſtaken.* In what? in thinking they did not worſhip Images after, as well as before their Converſion? no, *but in ſuppoſing, that they made uſe of the ſame Images afterwards, which they did before?* and what if they did? what harm was there in it on *T. G*'s Principles, ſuppoſing the Intention be directed aright? Nay, *T. G.* after all his Clamour yields the Thing, for ſaith he, St. *Gregory turned the Pagan Feſtivals into Chriſtian Aſſemblies, and Heathen Temples to Chriſtian Churches* without ever pulling them down to build them up again; and ſuppoſing the *Worſhip of Images lawful*, why not thoſe to be uſed as well *Temples?*

Cicer. pro Archia c. 12. Pro domo ſua.

Iſid. Origen. l. 8. c. 11.

Horat. ep. l. 2. ep. 1.

Arnob. l. 6.

Agobard. de Imag. ſect. 19.

Aug. de Fide & Symbolo c. 7.

Greg. l. 9. ep. 72.

And yet, I no where ſay, that they made uſe of the *very ſame*, but *they melted them down and made new ones of them*; which is plainly to ſay, that though they did not allow thoſe particular Images, yet they did not condemn the uſe of Images for Divine Worſhip; but of the Materials of the former Images they made new ones to be uſed by them as Chriſtians, after that manner of Worſhip which the Jeſuits delivered to them; which was all that was neceſſary to my Purpoſe. And now I leave the Reader to Judge whether in all this charge about theſe Citations, *T. G.* hath not ſhewed himſelf to be a Man of admirable Ingenuity; and whether he be not well accompliſhed in the moſt laudable Vertue of a Writer of Controverſies, viz. Sincerity, and fair Dealing?

CHAP. II.

The State of the Controverſie about Images, in the Chriſtian Church.

§. 1. HAving thus far endeavoured to State the Diſpute about *Image-Worſhip*, as it was managed between *Chriſtians* and *Heathens*, I now come to the Riſe and Progreſs of this *Controverſie* in the *Chriſtian Church*. Wherein I ſhall proceed according to theſe following Periods, 1. When Images were not uſed or allowed in the *Chriſtian Church*. 2. When they were uſed, but no Worſhip allowed to be given to them. 3. When Inferiour Worſhip was given to them, and that Worſhip publickly defended. 4. When the Doctrine and Practice of Image-Worſhip was ſettled upon the Principles allowed and defended in the *Roman Church*; and from thence to ſhew, wherein lie the main points of Difference between us and the *Church of Rome*, as to this *Controverſie* about the Worſhip of Images.

1. As to the *Firſt Period* I had ſaid in my former Diſcourſe, “ That the “ Primitive Chriſtians were declared Enemies to all worſhip of God “ by Images, but I need the leſs to go about to prove it now, ſince “ it is at laſt confeſſed by one of the moſt learned *Jeſuits* they ever “ had, that for the four firſt Centuries and farther, there was little “ or no uſe of Images in the *Temples*, or *Oratories* of *Chriſtians*: but “ we need not their Favour in ſo plain a Cauſe as this; as ſhall be evi- “ dently proved if occaſion be farther given. This *T. G.* had no mind to; and therefore ſaith, *Not to diſpute the matter of fact, of which he confeſſes there was ſome little uſe* (much as if I ſhould ſay, that *T. G.* hath ſhewn *little or no Ingenuity* in his Book, and he to his great comfort ſhould infer there was *ſome little Ingenuity* in in) but *Petavius* his Words, are *Supprimi omittique ſatius viſum eſt, it was thought better to ſuppreſs them and let them alone*; was it all one in *T. G*'s ſenſe *to uſe them*, and to omit the uſe of them? And for the little Reaſon, he ſaith, *he had to doubt my Sincerity in relating* Petavius *his Words, from what I did with* Trigautius; in truth there was as little as might be; but I have great reaſon to believe from his uſage of me about other Citations, that if he could have found any Words before or after, that he could have interpreted to another Senſe, he would have made *little or no Conſcience* of ſaying, thoſe were the Words I tranſlated thus.

Petav. Dogmat. Theolog. Tom. 5. *l.* 15. *c.* 13. *ſect.* 3. *c.* 14. *ſect.* 8. T.G.p.171.

thus and thus. But inſtead of debating the matter of Fact as to the Primitive Church, he ſaith, *he will give me the anſwer of* Mr. *Thorndyke, that at that time there might be jealouſie of Offence in having Images in Churches, before Idolatry was quite rooted out, of which afterwards there might be no Appearance; and therefore they were afterwards admitted all over, for it is manifeſt, the Church is tyed no farther than there can appear danger of Idolatry.* This he calls Mr. *Thorndyke*'s Anſwer, but it is truly the Anſwer of *Petavius*, from whoſe words it ſeems to be tranſlated; *dum periculum erat,* ſaith *Petavius, ne Offenſionis aliquid traheret externa quorundam rituum ſpecies, cum iis quæ ab Ethnicis celebrabantur, ſimilitudine ipſa congruens, &c.* Therefore I ſhall conſider it as the Anſwer of *Petavius*, and here examine, whether this were the ground on which the Primitive Church did forbear the uſe and worſhip of Images? I ſhall prove that it was not from theſe two Arguments. 1. Becauſe the Reaſons given by them againſt the worſhip of Images will equally hold againſt the worſhip of Images among *Chriſtians*. 2. Becauſe the notion of Idolatry, which they charged the *Heathens* with, may be common to *Chriſtians* with them.

1. This ſuppoſes the *Primitive Chriſtians* to look on the worſhip of Images as in it ſelf indifferent, and to be made good or evil according to the nature of the Object repreſented by them: which is a ſuppoſition as remote from the ſenſe of the *Primitive Church* as any thing we can eaſily imagine. For then all the Arguments uſed by them againſt the worſhip of Images muſt have been deduced only from the Objects repreſented, or the nature of the worſhip given to them; whereas they frequently argue from the unſuitableneſs of Images as a means of Worſhip, and the Prohibition of the Divine Law. Would any Man of common Senſe that had thought the worſhip of Images in it ſelf Indifferent, have ſaid as *Origen* doth; *that the Chriſtians as well as the Jews abſtain from the worſhip of Images for the ſake of the Law of God, which requires rather that we ſhould die than defile our ſelves with ſuch Impieties? Yes,* it may be ſaid, *this is acknowledged that the Law of God did forbid the worſhip of the Heathen Images*; but they who make this Anſwer never looked into *Origen*, or have forgotten what they read there; for *Origen* doth not there give an account why the *Chriſtians* did not comply with the *Heathen Idolatry*; but why the *Chriſtians* had no Images in their own worſhip. For *Celſus* charges this upon *the Chriſtians, that they thought it ſuch a mighty Matter, that they had no Images, whereas herein,* ſaith he, *they were but like the barbarous Scythians, Numidians, and Seres, and other Nations that had neither Religion, nor Civility.* To this *Origen* Anſwers, *that we are not only to look at the bare Action, but at the Reaſon and Ground of it, for thoſe that agree in the ſame thing, may yet have very different Principles; and they that do it on a good Principle do well, and not otherwiſe; as for Inſtance, the Stoicks forbear Adultery, and ſo may the Epicureans; but the former do it, becauſe it is a thing repugnant to Nature, and civil Society; the latter, becauſe allowing themſelves this ſingle Pleaſure may debar them of many more: So,* ſaith he, *in this matter thoſe barbarous Nations forbear Images an other accounts than Jews and Chriſtians do, who dare not make uſe of this way of Worſhipping God.* Obſerve, that he doth not ſay this of the way of Worſhipping *falſe Gods*, or *Images for Gods*, but of Worſhipping τὸ Θεῖον *the Deity*. And he gives three principal Reaſons wherein they differed from thoſe Nations. 1. Becauſe this way of Worſhip did

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 375.

And yet, I no where ſay, that they made uſe of the *very ſame*, but *they melted them down and made new ones of them*; which is plainly to to ſay, that though they did not allow thoſe particular Images, yet they did not condemn the uſe of Images for Divine Worſhip; but of the Materials of the former Images they made new ones to be uſed by them as Chriſtians, after that manner of Worſhip which the Jeſuits delivered to them; which was all that was neceſſary to my Purpoſe. And now I leave the Reader to Judge whether in all this charge about theſe Citations, *T. G.* hath not ſhewed himſelf to be a Man of admirable Ingenuity; and whether he be not well accompliſhed in the moſt laudable Vertue of a Writer of Controverſies, viz. Sincerity, and fair Dealing?

CHAP. II.

The State of the Controverſie about Images, in the Chriſtian Church.

§. 1. HAving thus far endeavoured to State the Diſpute about *Image-Worſhip*, as it was managed between *Chriſtians* and *Heathens*, I now come to the Riſe and Progreſs of this *Controverſie* in the *Chriſtian Church*. Wherein I ſhall proceed according to theſe following Periods, 1. When Images were not uſed or allowed in the *Chriſtian Church*. 2. When they were uſed, but no Worſhip allowed to be given to them. 3. When Inferiour Worſhip was given to them, and that Worſhip publickly defended. 4. When the Doctrine and Practice of Image-Worſhip was ſettled upon the Principles allowed and defended in the *Roman Church*; and from thence to ſhew, wherein lie the main points of Difference between us and the *Church of Rome*, as to this *Controverſie* about the Worſhip of Images.

1. As to the *Firſt Period* I had ſaid in my former Diſcourſe, “That the Primitive Chriſtians were declared Enemies to all worſhip of God by Images, but I need the leſs to go about to prove it now, ſince it is at laſt confeſſed by one of the moſt learned *Jeſuits* they ever had, that for the four firſt Centuries and farther, there was little or no uſe of Images in the *Temples*, or *Oratories* of *Chriſtians*: but we need not their Favour in ſo plain a Cauſe as this; as ſhall be evidently proved if occaſion be farther given. This *T. G.* had no mind to; and therefore ſaith, *Not to diſpute the matter of fact, of which he confeſſes there was ſome little uſe* (much as if I ſhould ſay, that *T. G.* hath ſhewn *little or no Ingenuity* in his Book, and he to his great comfort ſhould infer there was *ſome little Ingenuity* in in) but *Petavius* his Words, are *Supprimi omittique ſatius viſum eſt, it was thought better to ſuppreſs them and let them alone*; was it all one in *T. G*'s ſenſe *to uſe them*, and to omit the uſe of them? And for the little Reaſon, he ſaith, *he had to doubt my Sincerity in relating* Petavius *his Words, from what I did with* Trigautius; in truth there was as little as might be; but I have great reaſon to believe from his uſage of me about other Citations, that if he could have found any Words before or after, that he could have interpreted to another Senſe, he would have made *little or no Conſcience* of ſaying, thoſe were the Words I tranſlated thus.

Petav. Dogmat. Theolog. Tom. 5. l. 15. c. 13. ſect. 3. c. 14. ſect. 8. T. G. p. 171.

thus and thus. But inſtead of debating the matter of Fact as to the Primitive Church, he ſaith, *he will give me the anſwer of* Mr. *Thorndyke, that at that time there might be jealouſie of Offence in having Images in Churches, before Idolatry was quite rooted out, of which afterwards there might be no Appearance; and therefore they were afterwards admitted all over, for it is manifeſt, the Church is tyed no farther than there can appear danger of Idolatry.* This he calls Mr. *Thorndyke*'s Anſwer, but it is truly the Anſwer of *Petavius*, from whoſe words it ſeems to be tranſlated; *dum periculum erat, ſaith Petavius, ne Offenſionis aliquid traheret externa quorundam rituum ſpecies, cum iis quæ ab Ethnicis celebrabantur, ſimilitudine ipſa congruens, &c.* Therefore I ſhall conſider it as the Anſwer of *Petavius*, and here examine, whether this were the ground on which the Primitive Church did forbear the uſe and worſhip of Images? I ſhall prove that it was not from theſe two Arguments. 1. Becauſe the Reaſons given by them againſt the worſhip of Images will equally hold againſt the worſhip of Images among *Chriſtians*. 2. Becauſe the notion of Idolatry, which they charged the *Heathens* with, may be common to *Chriſtians* with them.

1. This ſuppoſes the *Primitive Chriſtians* to look on the worſhip of Images as in it ſelf indifferent, and to be made good or evil according to the nature of the Object repreſented by them: which is a ſuppoſition as remote from the ſenſe of the *Primitive Church* as any thing we can eaſily imagine. For then all the Arguments uſed by them againſt the worſhip of Images muſt have been deduced only from the Objects repreſented, or the nature of the worſhip given to them; whereas they frequently argue from the unſuitableneſs of Images as a means of Worſhip, and the Prohibition of the Divine Law. Would any Man of common Senſe that had thought the worſhip of Images in it ſelf Indifferent, have ſaid as *Origen* doth; *that the Chriſtians as well as the Jews abſtain from the worſhip of Images for the ſake of the Law of God, which requires rather that we ſhould die than defile our ſelves with ſuch Impieties? Yes,* it may be ſaid, *this is acknowledged that the Law of God did forbid the worſhip of the Heathen Images;* but they who make this Anſwer never looked into *Origen*, or have forgotten what they read there; for *Origen* doth not there give an account why the *Chriſtians* did not comply with the *Heathen Idolatry*; but why the *Chriſtians* had no Images in their own worſhip. For *Celſus* charges this upon *the Chriſtians, that they thought it ſuch a mighty Matter, that they had no Images, whereas herein,* ſaith he, *they were but like the barbarous Scythians, Numidians, and Seres, and other Nations that had neither Religion, nor Civility.* To this *Origen* Anſwers, *that we are not only to look at the bare Action, but at the Reaſon and Ground of it, for thoſe that agree in the ſame thing, may yet have very different Principles; and they that do it on a good Principle do well, and not otherwiſe; as for Inſtance, the Stoicks forbear Adultery, and ſo may the Epicureans; but the former do it, becauſe it is a thing repugnant to Nature, and civil Society; the latter, becauſe allowing themſelves this ſingle Pleaſure may debar them of many more: So,* ſaith he, *in this matter thoſe barbarous Nations forbear Images an other accounts than Jews and Chriſtians do, who dare not make uſe of this way of Worſhipping God.* Obſerve, that he doth not ſay this of the way of Worſhipping *falſe Gods*, or *Images for Gods*, but of Worſhipping τὸ θεῖον *the Deity*. And he gives three principal Reaſons wherein they differed from thoſe Nations. 1. Becauſe this way of Worſhip did

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 375.

diſparage the *Deity*; (τὸ θεῖον again) by drawing it down to matter ſo faſhioned. 2. Becauſe *the evil Spirits* were apt to harbour in thoſe Images, and to take pleaſure in the Sacrifices there offered: which Reaſon as far as it reſpects the Blood of Sacrifices doth relate to the *Heathen Images*, ſtanding over the Altars at which the Sacrifices were offered. But then *Celſus* might ſay, *what is all this to the purpoſe? my Queſtion is, why you have no Images in your own way of Worſhip*; therefore he adds his third Reaſon, which made it utterly unlawful for *Chriſtians* as well as *Jews* to worſhip them, which is *the Law of God* mentioned before: now I ſay, if *Origen* anſwered pertinently, he muſt give this as the Reaſon why *Chriſtians* uſed no Images in their own way of Worſhip; and conſequently was ſo far from thinking the Worſhip of Images indifferent, that he thought *Chriſtians* ought rather to ſuffer Martyrdom than to worſhip them. But to put this beyond poſſibility of Contradiction; *Origen* mentions a ſaying of *Heraclitus* objected by *Celſus*, *that it is a fooliſh thing to pray to Images, unleſs a Man know the Gods and Heroes worſhipped by them*; which ſaying *Celſus* approves, and ſaith, *the Chriſtians were Fools, becauſe they utterly contemned Images, (in totum*, the Latin Interpreter renders it) To which *Origen* thus anſwers, *we acknowledge that God may be known, and his only Son, and thoſe whom he hath honoured with the Title of Gods, who partake of his Divinity, and are different from the Heathen Deities which the Scripture calls Devils* (i. e. *cauſally* if not *eſſentially*, as *Cajetan* diſtinguiſheth) *but* ſaith he, *it is impoſſible for him that knows God to worſhip Images*. Mark that, he doth not ſay, it is impoſſible for him that knows the Idols of the *Heathens* to worſhip them; or the evil Spirits that lurk in their Images: but for him, *that knows the true God, and his Son Chriſt Jeſus*, and the *Holy Angels* to do it. Is it poſſible after this, to believe that *Origen* ſuppoſed the worſhip of Images to be indifferent in it ſelf, and that God and Chriſt and Angels might be lawfully worſhipped by them? Was all this only *periculum Offenſionis, jealouſie of Offence*, before the *Heathen Idolatry* was rooted out? Which Suppoſition makes the *Primitive Chriſtians* in plain terms Jugglers and Impoſtors, to pretend that to be utterly unlawful even for themſelves to do; and to mean no more by it, but this; *yes, it is unlawful to do it, while there is any danger of Heatheniſm, but when once that is overthrown, then we may worſhip Images as well as the beſt of them.* For my part, I believe the *Primitive Chriſtians* to have been Men of ſo much Honeſty and Integrity, that they would never have talked at this rate againſt the worſhip of Images, (as not only *Origen*, but the reſt of them, the beſt, and wiſeſt among them did, as I have ſhewed in the foregoing Chapter) if they had this ſecret reſerve in their Minds, that when *Heatheniſm* was ſunk paſt Recovery, then they might do the ſame things, which they utterly condemned now. Which would be juſt like ſome that we have heard of, who while there was any likelyhood of the *Royal Authority* of this Nation recovering it ſelf, then they cry'd out upon *Kingly Government* as *Illegal, Tyrannical and Antichriſtian*; but when the King was murdered, and the Power came into their own Hands, then it was lawful for the Saints to exerciſe that Power, which was not fit to be enjoyed by the Wicked of the World: So theſe Men make the moſt excellent Chriſtians to be like a pack of Hypocrites. The *Heathens* every where asked them, as may be ſeen in *Lactantius*, *Arnobius*, *Minucius* and others, as well as *Origen*; *what is the matter with you Chriſtians, that you have no Images in your Churches? what if you dare not joyn with us in our Worſhip, why do not you make uſe of them in your own? Is it only Humour, Singularity, and Affectation of Novelty in You? If it be, you ſhew what manner of Men you are.* No truly; ſay they, gravely and ſeriouſly, we do it not becauſe *we dare not do it*; for we are afraid of Diſpleaſing and Diſhonouring God by it, and we will on that Account rather chooſe to die than do it. Upon ſuch an anſwer, the Heathens might think them honeſt and ſimple Men, that did not know what to do with their Lives, who were ſo willing to part with them on ſuch eaſie terms. But if they had heard, the bottom of all this was, only a cunning and ſly Trick to undermine *Paganiſm*, and that they meant no ſuch thing, as though it were *unlawful in it ſelf*, but only *unlawful* till they had gotten the better of them; what would they have thought of ſuch Men? No otherwiſe, than that they were a Company of baſe Hypocrites, that pretended one thing and meant another; and that the Wicked of the World might not worſhip Images, but the Saints might, when they had the Power in their Heads, although before they declaimed againſt it, as the moſt vile, mean, and unworthy way of Worſhip, that ever came into the Hands of Men; that there could be *no Religion, where it obtained*; that it was worſe than the worſhip of Beaſts; that it was more reaſonable to worſhip the Artificers themſelves than the Images made by them; that Rats and Mice had leſs Folly than Mankind, for they had no fears of what Men fell down before, with trembling and great ſhews of Devotion. Theſe, and many ſuch things as theſe, the Fathers ſpeak freely, openly, frequently, on all Occaſions, in all Places againſt the worſhip of Images; and after all this, was no more meant by it but only this, *Thou O Heathen muſt not worſhip Images, but I may?* And why not as well (might the *Heathen* reply) *Thou muſt not commit Adultery, but I may? Does the nature of the Commands you boaſt ſo much of alter with Mens Perſons? Is that indeed lawful for you that is not for us? Where doth the Law of* Moſes *ſay,* thou ſhalt not Worſhip the Images that *we worſhip*, but thou mayſt worſhip the Images that *Chriſtians* Worſhip? *And if the Law makes no Difference, either leave off your fooliſh babbling againſt our Images, or condemn your own. For to our underſtanding, yours are as much againſt the Law as ours are.*

And ſo the *Primitive Chriſtians* thought, who very honeſtly and ſincerely declared as much in their Words and Actions; witneſs not only the Opinions of all the Writers in behalf of Chriſtianity, (not one excepted) that ever had occaſion to mention this matter; but the Decree of as good a Council as was to be had at that time; I mean the *Eliberitan*, in the famous Canon to that purpoſe, Can. 36. *It pleaſeth us to have no Pictures in Churches, leſt that which is worſhipped be painted upon Walls.* It is a pleaſant thing to ſee what work our Adverſaries make with this Innocent Canon; ſometimes, *it is a meer Forgery of Hereticks.* I wonder ſuch Men do not ſay the ſame of the Second Commandment) ſometimes, the *Biſhops that met there were not ſo wiſe as they ſhould have been*; (no nor *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, nor *Chriſt* and the *Primitive Chriſtians* in this matter) ſometimes, *that they ſpake only againſt Pictures upon Walls* becauſe the Salt-Peter of the Walls would be apt to deface them; or *becauſe in caſe of Per-* §. 2.

ſecution, they could not do as *Rachel did*, carry their *Teraphim* along with them); but that which *Petavius* ſticks to, is, *that the Memory of Heathen Idolatry was yet freſh, and therefore it was not thought expedient to have Images in the Oratories or Temples of Chriſtians.* So that, after all the Tricks and Shifts of our Adverſaries, the thing it ſelf is yielded to us, *viz.* that this Canon is againſt *ſuch Images, as are now uſed in and worſhppied the Roman Church.* But, ſaith he, the reaſon doth not hold ſtill, *for then the Memory of Heathen Idolatry was not out of Mens Minds.* It is a wonderful thing to me, that theſe *Spaniſh Biſhops* ſhould be able to tell their own Reaſon no better than ſo. You ſay, *you will have no Images in Churches: Why ſo I beſeech you?* Leſt that, ſay they, which is worſhipped be painted upon Walls: *worſhipped by whom? Do you mean by Heathens?* no, we ſpeak of the *Churches of Chriſtians. But why may not that which is worſhipped be painted?* We think that Reaſon enough to any Man, that conſiders *the Being worſhipped, and that which is painted,* and the mighty Diſparagement to an infinite inviſible Being to be drawn in Lines and Colours with a deſign to Honour him thereby. This to me ſeems a Reaſon that holds equally at all times. For was the *Being Worſhipped* more unfit to be drawn ſo ſoon after *Heathen Idolatry*, than he would be afterwards? Methinks it had been much better done then, while the skilful Artificers were Living. *But thoſe were Heathen Idolaters*; ſuppoſe they were, you muſt make uſe of them, or none, if that which *Tertullian* and others ſay, hold true, *that it is forbidden to Chriſtians to make Images*; which ſurely they would never have ſaid, if they had thought the time would come, when the *Heathen Idolatry* ſhould be forgotten, and then the *Chriſtians* might worſhip Images. *Well, but all this is only againſt Pictures upon Walls, but for all that,* ſaith *Bellarmine*, *they might have Images in Frames, or upon Veils.* It ſeems then that which is *adored, might be painted well enough, provided it be not upon a Wall*; but methinks, it is more repugnant to an *infinite Being* to be confined within a Frame, than to be *drawn upon a Wall*: and the Decree is, *to have no Pictures in Churches*; but if they were in Frames, or upon Veils, would they not be in Churches ſtill? What made *Epiphanius* then ſo angry at ſeeing an Image upon a Veil at *Anablatha*? Was not *Heathen Idolatry forgotten enough yet*? It ſeems not, for it was coming in again under other Pretences. But that good Man's Spirit was ſtirred within him at the Apprehenſion of it, and could not be quiet, till he had rent aſunder the Veil, and written to the Biſhop of *Hieruſalem* to prevent the like Enormity. One would have thought by this time the *jealouſie of Offence might have been worn out*, the *Heathen Idolatry* being ſuppreſſed; but yet it ſeems *Epiphanius* did not underſtand his *Chriſtian Liberty* in this Matter. Nay ſo far from it, that he plainly and poſitively Affirms, *that ſuch an Image though upon a Veil and not the Walls, was* contra Autoritatem Scripturarum, contra Religionem noſtram, *againſt the Law of God, and the Chriſtian Religion. But it may be, this was ſome Heathen Idol, or Image of a Falſe God*; no, ſo far from it, that *Epiphanius could not tell whether it was an Image of Chriſt, or of ſome Saint*; but this he could tell, *that he was ſure it was againſt the Authority of the Scriptures.* And was *Epiphanius* ſo great a Dunce to imagine a thing indifferent in it ſelf, and applyed to a due object of Worſhip, ſhould be directly oppoſite to the *Law of God*? Men

Petav. de Incarn. l. 15. *c.* 14. *ſect.* 8.

Bell. de Imag. l. 2. *c.* 9.

Epiph. ep. ad Joh. Hieroſolym

may talk of the Fathers, and magnifie the Fathers, and ſeem to make the Authority of the Fathers next to infallible; and yet there are none who expoſe them more to contempt, than they who give ſuch anſwers as theſe, ſo directly againſt the plaineſt ſenſe and meaning of their Words. I confeſs, thoſe ſpeak more conſonantly to their Principles, who reject the *Authority of this Epiſtle*, at leaſt of this part of it; but there is not the leaſt Colour or Pretence for it, from any *M S.* and *Petavius* ingeniouſly confeſſeth, *that he ſees no Ground to believe this part added to the former Epiſtle.* God be thanked, there is *ſome little Ingenuity* yet left in the World: and which is the greater wonder, among the *Jeſuits* too; for not only *Petavius*, but *Sirmondus* owns the *Epiſtle* of *Epiphanius* to be *Genuine*, quoting it to prove the Antiquity of Veils at the entrance of the Church. If it be good for that purpoſe, it is I am ſure as good for ours; and ſo it was thought to be, by thoſe who were no *Iconoclaſts*, I mean the Author of the *Caroline Books*, and the *Gallican Biſhops* who made uſe of this Teſtimony, although themſelves were againſt *rending of painted Veils.* But commend me to the plain Honeſty of *John Damaſcen*, who ſaith, *one Swallow makes no Summer*; and of *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, who tells us, *that* Epiphanius *was an Iconoclaſt*, (i. e. a terrible *Hereteck* with a hard name) *materially ſo but not formally, becauſe the Church had not determined the contrary.* It ſeems it was no matter, what the *Law*, or *Chriſtian Religion* had determined; for thoſe were the things *Epiphanius* took for his Grounds. But he, good Man, was a little too hot in this Matter, and did not conſider, that when the *Pagan Idolatry* was ſufficiently out of Mens Minds, then it would be very lawful to have Chriſt or Saints not only drawn upon Veils, or Screens, but to have juſt ſuch Statues as the Pagans had; and to give them the *very ſame worſhip which the Prototypes deſerve*; provided, that the People have forgotten *Mercury*, *Apollo*, and *Hercules*; and put St. *Francis*, or St. *Ignatius*, or St. *Chriſtopher*, or St. *Thomas Beckett* inſtead of them. O the *Divine Power of Names!* for that which would have been *Idolatry*, *downright Paganiſh Idolatry* under the former Names, becomes *good Catholick Worſhip* under the latter. But I do not ſee that any of the *Primitive Chriſtians* did ever think, that the change of Names, or Perſons would have wrought ſuch Wonders; but that the worſhip of Images would have continued the ſame thing, whatever Names had been given to them. And what pleaſant Stories ſoever *Epiphanius* the *Deacon* tells in the Second *Council of Nice*, concerning the Diſciples of the Elder *Epiphanius*, placing his Image in a Church dedicated to him in *Cyprus*, yet *Petavius* confeſſes, that *in his time there were do Images in the Churches of* Cyprus, which he takes to be the reaſon of his mighty Zeal againſt them. Any thing rather than that which himſelf gives, *viz.* the Authority of Scriptures, and the *Chriſtian Religion.*

Sirmond. in Concil. Narbon. p. 616.

Caro. M. de Imag. l. 4. *c.* 25. *Synod. Pariſ. c.* 6.

Damſc. tract. 1.

Alphonſ. à Caſtro v. Imago. p. 572.

VII. Synod. Act. 6.

In the *Theodoſian Code* we find a Law of *Theodoſius M.* againſt the ſeveral Parts of the *Heathen Idolatry*, the *Sacrifices*, *Libations*, *Incenſe*, *Lights*, *&c.* and after the reſt, it comes particularly to their worſhip of Images in theſe Words, *Si quis vero mortali opere facta, & ævum paſſura ſimulachra impoſito ture venerabitur, (ac ridiculo exemplo metuens ſubito quæ pro ſe ſimulaverit) vel redimita vitis arbore, vel erectâ effoſſis arâ ceſpitibus vanas imagines, humiliore licet muneris præmio, tamen plena Religionis injuriâ honorare temptaverit, is utpote violatæ Reli-*

Cod. Theodoſ. 16 *tit.* 10. *n.* 12.

gionis reus eâ domo ſeu Poſſeſſione multabitur in quâ eum Gentilitiâ conſtiterit Superſtitione famulatum. The meaning whereof is, that it was the Forfeiture of Houſe and Land for any Man to offer Incenſe to Images made by Men, and that *were of a periſhing Nature*; or that hung their Garlands on Trees, or *raiſed Altars of Turf before their Images*; for although the coſt were leſs, yet the *Violation of Religion* was the ſame. This Conſtitution I grant doth reſpect *Heathen Images*, but I ſay it proceeds upon ſuch Grounds which are common to all Images, unleſs they be ſuch as *drop from Heaven*; ſuch as the Image of *Edeſſa*, and the reſt mentioned by *Gretſer*, or that of *Diana* of *Epheſus*, or ſome few others that were pretended to have a *Divine Original*; for ſuch as theſe the Conſtitution doth not reach, being *Divine* and *Immortal*, but for all others I do not ſee how they can eſcape the Reaſon of this Law. And it is altogether as ridiculous for *Chriſtians* to worſhip the *things they have formed*, as it was for the *Heathens* to do it: (where *T. G.* may learn the Signification and *Etymology* of *ſimulachrum à ſimulando*; for *ſimulare* is the ſame with *effigiare*, as the *Scholiaſt* on that Conſtitution tells him.) In the ſame Conſtitution, they are called *ſenſu carentia ſimulachra*, which are words put in on purpoſe to ſhew how ſtupid and ſeneleſs the worſhip of them is, and are not all Images among *Chriſtians* ſo? Have they not *Eyes and ſee not*, and *Ears and hear not*, as well as the *Heathen Images*? Or do they worſhip only *living* and *ſenſible Images*? *moving* I grant ſometimes they do; ſuch as *Themiſtius* upon *Ariſtotle* tells us that *Dædalus* made, that moved by the help of *Quickſilver*; or *Springs*, ſuch as the *Holy Rood of Boxtel* in *Kent*, whoſe ſecret Engines for moving the Eyes and Lips were laid open, and an *Anatomy Lecture* read upon them at *Pauls Croſs* in *Henry* the Eighths time by *Biſhop Fiſher*.

Themiſt. in Ariſtot. de an. p. 68. *col.* 2. *Lambards peramb. of Kent in Boxtel. Herberts Hen.* 8. *p.* 432.

§. 3.

2. That Notion of Idolatry which the *Heathens* were charged with by the *Primitive Chriſtians*, may be common to *Chriſtians* with them. Therefore if the fear of Idolatry kept them from the worſhip of Images, and the ſame fear may juſtly continue where ever Images are worſhipped, the *Chriſtians* then rejecting of Images, was not upon any reaſon peculiar to that Age of the Church. If Men by being *Chriſtians* were uncapable of being Idolaters without renouncing *Chriſtianity*, there were ſome pretence for laying aſide the Fears and Jealouſies of *Idolatry*, when the *Chriſtian Religion* had prevailed in the World. But St. *Paul* ſuppoſes that *Chriſtians* continuing ſo might be Idolaters, *Neither be ye Idolaters as were ſome of them.* Yet theſe were the *Perſons who were baptized unto Moſes in the Cloud and the Sea*; *and did all eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat, and Drink the ſame ſpiritual Drink (for they drank of that Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt.)* Which Water they drank of, both before and after their Idolatry (and ſince the Water followed them,) at the very time of Committing it; ſo that thoſe Perſons are ſaid to be *partakers of Chriſt*; who were charged with Idolatry, and therefore St. *Paul* is far from ſuppoſing that Idolatry and the Profeſſion of *Chriſtianity* are inconſiſtent with each other. But it is ſaid *that there can be no Idolatry to the Images of Chriſt, becauſe the true object of Worſhip is honoured by them*; *nor to the Images of Saints, ſo long as Men take them for Saints, that is, God's Creatures*; *and give only an Inferior Worſhip to them.* If

1 Cor. 10. 7.
v. 2, 3, 4.

this be true, there appears to be little danger of Idolatry among thoſe who do not renounce Chriſtianity. But againſt this Plea I put in theſe Exceptions.

1 That upon the ſame grounds all the Wiſer *Heathens* muſt be cleared from *Idolatry*. For, 1. They owned the true *Object* of *Divine Worſhip*, viz. *One Supreme God*, as I have at large proved in the former Diſcourſes: both, thoſe that went on the *Platonick Hypotheſis* of one *Supreme Deity, and others Inferior*; and thoſe who believed *one God to be worſhipped under different Repreſentations*. The former was the Principle which *Julian* went upon and the latter *Platoniſts*, who oppoſed Chriſtianity to the utmoſt: the other was the Principle of the *Stoicks* and others; and particularly owned by *Maximus Madaurenſis*, who ſaith, *that the Heathens did worſhip one God under ſeveral Names, thereby to expreſs his ſeveral Powers diffuſed through the World*. Now upon this Suppoſition, that where there is a *true Object of Worſhip* repreſented, there can be no Idolatry in Worſhipping the Repreſentation, I challenge any Man to ſhew how the *Heathens* that went on theſe Principles were chargeable with Idolatry. For is Chriſt any otherwiſe a *right Object of Worſhip*, than as he is believed to be the *True God*? If then there can be no Idolatry towards an Image of Chriſt, neither can there be towards any Repreſentation of the *True God*.

St. Aug. Epiſt. 43.

2. The *Heathens* did aſſert the Difference between God and his Creatures, as I have already proved, that they looked on the *Inferior Deities*, as dependent on the *Supreme Being Created and Governed by Him*: So that if the Acknowledgement of *Saints* to be *Gods Creatures*, doth hinder Men from committing Idolatry, it muſt do the ſame for all thoſe who owned a *Subordination of Deities*; which takes in the far greateſt part of the *Heathen World*.

3. They allowed the *different degrees of Worſhip* ſuitable to the *Excellencies* of the *Objects*; as *Sovereign Worſhip* to the *Supreme God*, *Inferior Worſhip* to the Gods under Him, and ſo proportionably till they came to their Heroes or Deified Perſons to whom they allowed the loweſt kind and degree of Worſhip. For it is a palpable Miſtake in any who think they did give the ſame degrees of Honour and Worſhip to all. *Plutarch* ſaith, *That* Plato *did put a difference between the Worſhip of* Cœleſtial *Gods and Dæmons; and ſo did* Xenocrates *between the Worſhip of Gods and good Dæmons, and thoſe ſowre and moroſe, and vindictive Spirits which lived in the Air.* *Plato*, he tells us, *made it the Office of good Dæmons to carry Mens Prayers to the Gods, and to bring from them Oracles, and other Divine Gifts: and ſo their Worſhip muſt be ſuitable to their Imployment, which is in Inferior to that of the Cæleſtial Deities, whoſe Station and Employment was more immediately under the Supreme God.* *Apuleius* thus reckons up the order of *Deities* according to *Plato*. 1. The *Supreme God, the Author and Ruler of all.* 2. The *Cæleſtial Deities, Spiritual, Immortal, Good, and Infinitely Happy; to whom the Government of things is committed next under God; but becauſe they ſuppoſed no immediate Communication between theſe Cæleſtial Gods and Men, therefore they ranked between them and Men.* 3. *Dæmons, as Interceſſors between the Gods and Men, who were ſubſervient to the Cæleſtial Gods.* 4. *The loweſt ſort of Dæmons*, he ſaith, *are Souls diſcharged of the Body; which if they take care of their Poſterity, are called Lares, or domeſtick Gods (Lar,* in the old *Hetruſcan Language*, ſignifies a *Prince*, thence the *Lares* are the *Gods of Families) and thoſe who were*

Plut. Iſide & Oſiride p. 361.

Apul. de DeoSocrat

good had the Title of Gods for Honours ſake conferred upon them, as he ſpeaks. But he confeſſes, *That there was a peculiar Honour belonging to the Supreme God*, *Cum ſit ſummi Deorum hic honor proprius*; and him they did ſolemnly Invocate, as not only appears by frequent Paſſages in Boeth. de Conſ. Philoſ. l. 3. p. 139. *Plato*, but by that of *Boethius*; *For*, as *Plato* ſaith, *we ought to invocate the Divine Aſſiſtance in the leaſt Affairs*; *therefore in ſo great a Matter*, invocandum rerum omnium Patrem, *we ought to call upon God the Father of all things*. Next after him they prayed to the *Cæleſtial Deities*; which Prayers, the *Inferior order of Spirits* was to carry up, and to bring down Anſwers. So that the addreſſes were made to the *Cæleſtial Deities*; which the *Aereal Dæmons* carried to them, ſaith *Apuleius*, to *keep a due Diſtance between Gods and Men*. And although the other *Platoniſts* differ from *Apuleius* in the manner of reckoning up the ſeveral orders of *Inferior Deities*, as may be ſeen in *Alcinous*, *Proclus*, *Jamblichus*, and others; yet they all agree in making one *Supreme God*, the *Firſt Author and Cauſe of all things*, and therefore making an *Infinite Diſtance* between him and his Creatures; and that there are ſeveral Degrees of the Beings that are to be worſhipped under him; ſome as the Beſtowers of Bleſſings but ſubordinate to the Supreme, and others only as *Interceſſors between the Gods and* Diog. Laert. vit. Pytha. *Men*. *Diogenes Laertius* ſaith of *Pythagoras*, *That he charged his Diſciples*, *not to give equal degrees of Honour to the Gods and Heroes*. Herod. in Euterpe. *Herodotus* ſaith of the *Greeks*, *That they worſhipped* Hercules *two Ways*, *one as an immortal Deity*, *and ſo they ſacrificed to him*; *and another as a Hero*, Iſocr. encom. Helen *and ſo they celebrated his Memory*. *Iſocrates* diſtinguiſheth between the Honours of Heroes and Gods, when he ſpeaks of *Menelaus* and *Helena*: but the Diſtinction is no where more fully expreſſed than in the *Greek Inſcription* upon the *Statue of Regilla*, Wife to *Herodes Atticus*, Salmaſ. Not. ed Inſcript p 81 as *Salmaſius* thinks, which was ſet up in his Temple at *Triopium*, and taken from the Statue it ſelf by *Sirmondus*; where it is ſaid, *That ſhe had neither the honour of a Mortal, nor yet that which was proper to the Gods*. ου δὲ ἱερὰ θνητοῖς, ἀτὰρ οὐδὲ θεοῖσιν ὅμοια. If any ask wherein Lil. Gyrald. Synt. Deorum 17. p 501. the Difference of theſe Honours lay; *Lilius Gyraldus* ſaith, *That the Gods were worſhipped to the Eaſt*, *the Heroes to the Weſt*. Voſſius de Idol. l. 1. c. 12. *Voſſius thinks*, *That among the* Greeks *and* Romans, *it lay in having their Images carried in the publick Proceſſions*, *but without Sacrifices*; *and their names put into the Saliar Hymns at* Rome; *and inſerted into the Peplus of* Minerva *at* Athens. Heſych. v. ἡρῷον. *Heſychius* makes the Honour of a Hero to lie in a Temple, a Statue, and a Fountain; but *Plutarch* in the Life of *Alexander* ſaith, *That he ſent to the Oracle of* Ammon *to know whether* Hephæſtion *ſhould be made a God or no*; *the Oracle anſwered*, *That they ſhould Honour him and Sacrifice to him as to a Hero*; whence we obſerve that the *material Act of Sacrifice*, as T. G. ſpeaks, *might be common to Gods*, *and Heroes*, *but the inward Intention of the Mind made the great Difference between their Worſhip*, beſides that which is expreſſed in the *Inſcription* of *Regilla*, viz. that the Honour of one ſort was looked on as a *voluntary Act*, but the other was a *neceſſary Duty*; they might Sacrifice and Pray to the Heroes (who were the *Beati* amongſt them) but no Man was abſolutely bound to do it; but thoſe who were Salmaſ. not p. 113. Devout and Religious would: as *Salmaſius* there explains the Words of the Inſcription. And it is obſerved by the *Criticks*, that among the *Greeks* ἀποθεοῦν and ἐναγίζειν are words of a *Different Importance*, i.e. in the Language of the *Court of Rome*, to Beautify and to Canonize. For I perceive the *Heathen Heroes* did ſtand upon their Preferment as well as the *Roman Saints*, and thoſe who had been Beatified a competent time, came to be Canonized at laſt: So *Plutarch* ſaith, of *Iſis* and *Oſiris*, *Hercules* and *Bacchus*, that for their Vertues, of good Dæmons they were promoted to Deities; and of *Lampſaca*, *That ſhe had at firſt only Heroical Honour given her, and afterwards came to Divine.* It ſeems by the *Inſcription of Herodes*, and by the Teſtament of *Epicteta* extant in *Greek* in the Collection of Inſcriptions, that it was in the power of particular Families to keep Feſtival Days in Honour of ſome of their own Family, and to give *Heroical Honours* to them. In that noble Inſcription at *Venice*, we find three Days appointed every Year to be kept, and a Confraternity eſtabliſhed for that purpoſe with the Laws of it; the firſt day to be obſerved in Honour of the Muſes, and Sacrifices to be offered to them as Deities; the Second and Third in Honour of the Heroes of the Family; between which Honour, and that of Deities, they ſhewed the difference by the diſtance of time between them and the preference given to the other. But wherein ſoever the Difference lay, that there was a Diſtinction acknowledged among them appears, by this paſſage of *Valerius* in his Excellent Oration extent in *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſ.* *I call*, ſaith he, *the Gods to witneſs, whoſe Temples, and Altars, our Family hath worſhipped with common Sacrifices; and next after them, I call the Genii of our Anceſtors, to whom we give* δευτέρας τιμὰς *the Second Honours next to the Gods* (as *Celſus* calls thoſe τὰς προσηκούσας τιμὰς *the due Honours that belong to the lower Dæmons*; which he contends ought to be given to them). From which we take notice, that the *Heathens* did not confound all *Degrees of Divine Worſhip*, giving to the loweſt object the ſame which they ſuppoſed to be due to the *Cæleſtial Deities*, or the *Supreme God:* So that if the diſtinction of *Divine Worſhip* will excuſe from *Idolatry*, the *Heathens* were not to blame for it.

Plut. de Iſide & Oſiride p. 361.

Plut. de præcl. fact. Mulier.. p. 255.

Inſcript. Antiq. p. 216.

Dionyſ. Halic. Antiq. Rom. l. 11. *p.* 696.

Orig. l. 8. *c. Celſ. p.* 414.

2. If this pretence doth excuſe from Idolatry, *the Carpocratian Hereticks* were unjuſtly charged by *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, and St. *Auguſtine*; for they are ſaid, *To worſhip the Images of Chriſt together with the Philoſophers,* Pythagoras, Plato, *and* Ariſtotle. Wherein lay the fault of theſe *Hereticks?* was it only in *joyning the Philoſophers together with Chriſt?* If that had been all, it had been eaſie to have ſaid *That they worſhipped the Philoſophers together with Chriſt*; but they take particular notice of it as a thing *unuſual and blameworthy, that they worſhipped the Images of Chriſt, which they pretended to have had from* Pilat: which had been no wonder, if there had been as many *Images of Chriſt* then extant, as *Feuardentius* pretends, *viz. the Image of Chriſt taken by* Nicodemus (not I ſuppoſe when he came by Night to our Saviour) that at *Edeſſa*, beſides thoſe which St. *Luke* drew of Him; if there had been ſo many Images abroad of Him in Veneration among Chriſtians, why ſhould this be pitched upon as a peculiar thing of theſe *Gnoſticks*, *That they had ſome Images painted, others made of other matters, which they crowned and ſet forth, or worſhipped as the Heathens did, among which was an Image of Chriſt*, as *Irenæus* Reports it? And ſuppoſing they had worſhipped the Image of Chriſt as the *Gentiles* did worſhip their Images, wherein were they to blame if the Honour given to the Image be not the Honour of the Image, but of that which is repreſented by it? And ſince Chriſt deſerves our higheſt Worſhip, on this pretence they deſerved no blame at all in giving Divine Worſhip of the higheſt Degree to the Image of Chriſt.

Iren. l. 1. *c.* 24. *Epiph. hær.* 27. *Aug. de hæreſ. c.* 7.

good had the Title of Gods for Honours ſake conferred upon them, as he ſpeaks. But he confeſſes, *That there was a peculiar Honour belonging to the Supreme God, Cum ſit ſummi Deorum hic honor proprius*; and him they did ſolemnly Invocate, as not only appears by frequent Paſſages in *Plato*, but by that of *Boethius*; *For*, as *Plato* ſaith, *we ought to invocate the Divine Aſſiſtance in the leaſt Affairs*; *therefore in ſo great a Matter*, invocandum rerum omnium Patrem, *we ought to call upon God the Father of all things*. Next after him they prayed to the *Cæleſtial Deities*; which Prayers, the *Inferior order of Spirits* was to carry up, and to bring down Anſwers. So that the addreſſes were made to the *Cæleſtial Deities*; which the *Aereal Dæmons* carried to them, ſaith *Apuleius*, to *keep a due Diſtance between Gods and Men*. And although the other *Platoniſts* differ from *Apuleius* in the manner of reckoning up the ſeveral orders of *Inferior Deities*, as may be ſeen in *Alcinous*, *Proclus*, *Jamblichus*, and others; yet they all agree in making one *Supreme God*, the *Firſt Author and Cauſe of all things*, and therefore making an *Infinite Diſtance* between him and his Creatures; and that there are ſeveral Degrees of the Beings that are to be worſhipped under him; ſome as the Beſtowers of Bleſſings but ſubordinate to the Supreme, and others only as *Interceſſors between the Gods and Men*. *Diogenes Laertius* ſaith of *Pythagoras*, *That he charged his Diſciples, not to give equal degrees of Honour to the Gods and Heroes*. *Herodotus* ſaith of the *Greeks*, *That they worſhipped* Hercules *two Ways, one as an immortal Deity, and ſo they ſacrificed to him*; *and another as a Hero, and ſo they celebrated his Memory*. *Iſocrates* diſtinguiſheth between the Honours of Heroes and Gods, when he ſpeaks of *Menelaus* and *Helena*: but the Diſtinction is no where more fully expreſſed than in the *Greek Inſcription* upon the *Statue of Regilla*, Wife to *Herodes Atticus*, as *Salmaſius* thinks, which was ſet up in his Temple at *Triopium*, and taken from the Statue it ſelf by *Sirmondus*; where it is ſaid, *That ſhe had neither the honour of a Mortal, nor yet that which was proper to the Gods*. ου δὲ ἱερὰ θνητοῖς, ἀτὰρ οὐδὲ θεοῖσιν ὅμοια. If any ask wherein the Difference of theſe Honours lay; *Lilius Gyraldus* ſaith, *That the Gods were worſhipped to the Eaſt, the Heroes to the Weſt*. *Voſſius thinks*, *That among the* Greeks *and* Romans, *it lay in having their Images carried in the publick Proceſſions, but without Sacrifices*; *and their names put into the Saliar Hymns at* Rome; *and inſerted into the Peplus of* Minerva *at* Athens. *Heſychius* makes the Honour of a Hero to lie in a Temple, a Statue, and a Fountain; but *Plutarch* in the Life of *Alexander* ſaith, *That he ſent to the Oracle of* Ammon *to know whether* Hephæſtion *ſhould be made a God or no*; *the Oracle anſwered*, *That they ſhould Honour him and Sacrifice to him as to a Hero*; whence we obſerve that the *material Act of Sacrifice*, as T. G. ſpeaks, *might be common to Gods, and Heroes, but the inward Intention of the Mind made the great Difference between their Worſhip*, beſides that which is expreſſed in the *Inſcription* of *Regilla*, viz. that the Honour of one ſort was looked on as a *voluntary Act*, but the other was a *neceſſary Duty*; they might Sacrifice and Pray to the Heroes (who were the *Beati* amongſt them) but no Man was abſolutely bound to do it; but thoſe who were Devout and Religious would: as *Salmaſius* there explains the Words of the Inſcription. And it is obſerved by the *Criticks*, that among the *Greeks* ἀποθεοῦν and ἐναγίζειν are words of a *Different Importance*, i.e. in the Language of the *Court of Rome*, to Beautify and to Canonize. For I perceive the

Boeth. de Conſ. Philoſ. l. 3. *p.* 139.

Diog. Laer vit. Pytha.

Herod. in Euterpe.

Iſocr. encom. Helen

Salmaſ. Not. ed Inſcript p 81

Lil. Gyrald. Synt. Deorum 17. *p* 501.

Voſſius de Idol. l. 1. *c.* 12.

Heſych. v. ϖάνοψ.

Salmaſ. not p. 118.

the *Heathen Heroes* did ſtand upon their Preferment as well as the *Roman Saints*, and thoſe who had been Beatified a competent time, came to be Canonized at laſt: So *Plutarch* ſaith, of *Iſis* and *Oſiris*, *Hercules* and *Bacchus*, that for their Vertues, of good Dæmons they were promoted to Deities; and of *Lampſaca*, *That ſhe had at firſt only Heroical Honour given her, and afterwards came to Divine.* It ſeems by the *Inſcription of Herodes*, and by the Teſtament of *Epicteta* extant in *Greek* in the Collection of Inſcriptions, that it was in the power of particular Families to keep Feſtival Days in Honour of ſome of their own Family, and to give *Heroical Honours* to them. In that noble Inſcription at *Venice*, we find three Days appointed every Year to be kept, and a Confraternity eſtabliſhed for that purpoſe with the Laws of it; the firſt day to be obſerved in Honour of the Muſes, and Sacrifices to be offered to them as Deities; the Second and Third in Honour of the Heroes of the Family; between which Honour, and that of Deities, they ſhewed the difference by the diſtance of time between them and the preference given to the other. But wherein ſoever the Difference lay, that there was a Diſtinction acknowledged among them appears, by this paſſage of *Valerius* in his Excellent Oration extent in *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſ.* *I call*, ſaith he, *the Gods to witneſs, whoſe Temples, and Altars, our Family hath worſhipped with common Sacrifices; and next after them, I call the Genii of our Anceſtors, to whom we give* δευτέρας τιμὰς *the Second Honours next to the Gods* (as *Celſus* calls thoſe τὰς προσηκούσας τιμὰς *the due Honours that belong to the lower Dæmons*; which he contends ought to be given to them). From which we take notice, that the *Heathens* did not confound all *Degrees of Divine Worſhip*, giving to the loweſt object the ſame which they ſuppoſed to be due to the *Cæleſtial Deities*, or the *Supreme God:* So that if the diſtinction of *Divine Worſhip* will excuſe from *Idolatry*, the *Heathens* were not to blame for it.

Plut. de Iſide & Oſiride p. 361.
Plut. de præcl. fact. Mulier.. p. 255.
Inſcript. Antiq. p. 216.
Dionyſ. Halic. Antiq. Rom. l. 11. p. 696.
Orig. l. 8. c. Celſ. p. 414.

2. If this pretence doth excuſe from Idolatry, *the Carpocratian Hereticks* were unjuſtly charged by *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, and St. *Auguſtine*; for they are ſaid, *To worſhip the Images of Chriſt together with the Philoſophers*, Pythagoras, Plato, *and* Ariſtotle. Wherein lay the fault of theſe *Hereticks?* was it only in *joyning the Philoſophers together with Chriſt?* If that had been all, it had been eaſie to have ſaid *That they worſhipped the Philoſophers together with Chriſt*; but they take particular notice of it as a thing *unuſual and blameworthy, that they worſhipped the Images of Chriſt, which they pretended to have had from* Pilat: which had been no wonder, if there had been as many *Images of Chriſt* then extant, as *Feuardentius* pretends, *viz. the Image of Chriſt taken by* Nicodemus (not I ſuppoſe when he came by Night to our Saviour) that at *Edeſſa*, beſides thoſe which St. *Luke* drew of Him; if there had been ſo many Images abroad of Him in Veneration among Chriſtians, why ſhould this be pitched upon as a peculiar thing of theſe *Gnoſticks*, *That they had ſome Images painted, others made of other matters, which they crowned and ſet forth, or worſhipped as the Heathens did, among which was an Image of Chriſt*, as *Irenæus* Reports it? And ſuppoſing they had worſhipped the Image of Chriſt as the *Gentiles* did worſhip their Images, wherein were they to blame if the Honour given to the Image be not the Honour of the Image, but of that which is repreſented by it? And ſince Chriſt deſerves our higheſt Worſhip, on this pretence they deſerved no blame at all in giving Divine Worſhip of the higheſt Degree to the Image of Chriſt.

Iren. l. 1. c. 24.
Epiph. hær. 27.
Aug. de hæreſ. c. 7.

3. The

3. The Primitive Chriſtians did utterly refuſe to worſhip the Images of Emperors, although they were acknowledged to be *God*'s *Creatures*; therefore I ſay, according to their Senſe, acknowledging the Saints to be *God*'s *Creatures*, is not a ſufficient ground to excuſe the Worſhip of the Images of Saints from Idolatry. As in *Pliny*'s Epiſtle to *Trajan* (mentioned before) one of the Tryals of *Chriſtians* was, whether they would *Imagini tuæ thure ac vino ſupplicare*; uſe the *Religious Rites* that were then Cuſtomary, of *Incenſe*, *Libation*, and *Supplication* before the Emperor's Image; this *Minucius* calls *ad imagines ſupplicare, to pray before their Images:* which *Pliny* ſaith, *No true Chriſtian could ever be brought to:* but would rather *ſuffer Martyrdom* than do it. St. *Hierome* ſpeaking of *Nebuchadnezzar*'s *Image*, ſaith, *Statuam ſeu Imaginem cultores Dei adorare non debent*; *the Worſhippers of God ought not to worſhip an Image*; *Let*, ſaith he, *the Judges and Magiſtrates take notice of this, that worſhip the Emperor's Statues*; *that they do that which the three Children pleaſed God by not doing.* By which we ſee, it was not only the Statues of *Heathen Emperors*, which the *Chriſtians refuſed to give Religious Worſhip to*; but of the moſt pious and *Chriſtian*; which out of the Flattery of Princes, thoſe who expected, or received Honours, were willing to continue under *Chriſtian Emperors*; but it was at laſt abſolutely forbidden by a Conſtitution of *Theodoſius*; of which I have ſpoken already, in the Diſcourſe about the *Nature of Divine Worſhip*. But upon what reaſon came this to be accounted unlawful among *Chriſtians*; if it were lawful to worſhip the Images of *Saints*, ſuppoſing them to be *God*'s *Creatures?* Is it poſſible they ſhould think the *Emperors* to be otherwiſe? I do not think that the Souldiers who were trepann'd by *Julian*, to offer Incenſe to his Image at the receiving the *Donative* (and after they underſtood what they did, were ready to run mad with Indignation at themſelves, crying out in the Streets, *We are Chriſtians*, and ran to the Emperour, deſiring they might ſuffer Martyrdom for the *Chriſtian Faith*, which they were ſuppoſed to deny by that act of theirs, as *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *Theodoret* relate the ſtory) did imagine that *Julian* was any other than one of *God*'s *Creatures*; or that they had any belief of his being a *God*; but the *Chriſtians* looked on the act it ſelf of *Offering Incenſe*, as unlawful to be done to the Image of any *Creature*; or to the Image it ſelf, becauſe it was a *Creature*, and that of the meaneſt ſort, *viz.* the *Work of Mens Hands*.

Hieron. in c. 3. Daniel.

Greg. Nazianz. invect. 1. in Jul. Theod. hiſt. l. 3. c. 16, 17.

4. It is not enough for any of *God*'s *Creatures* to be worſhipped under the *Notion* of *Saints*; if any worſhip be given to them, which is above the rank of *Creatures*, *i. e.* any of that worſhip which belongs to God. For none can have greater confidence of the *Saintſhip* of any Perſons whoſe Images they worſhipped, (thoſe excepted which are revealed in Scripture) than many of the *Heathens* had of the goodneſs of the *Deities* which they worſhipped. And if we obſerve the method, which *Origen*, St. *Cyril*, St. *Auguſtine* and other *Chriſtian Writers* took to prove them to be *Evil Spirits* which they worſhipped, we ſhall find the great Argument was from the Nature of the Worſhip given to them. For, ſay they, we find in Scripture that *good Angels* have refuſed that worſhip which they ſeem ſo deſirous of; and therefore there is juſt reaſon to ſuſpect that theſe are not *good Angels*; (although they firmly believed them to be ſo, and *Hierocles* ſaith, *God forbid we ſhould worſhip any other*; And the *Heathens* in St. *Au-*

Hierocl. in aur. Carm. Aug. in Pſal. 96.

guſtine, ſay peremptorily, *they did not worſhip Devils, but Angels and the Servants of the Great God.)* So ſay I, as to thoſe who are worſhipped under the name of *Saints* or *Angels*, if in, or at their Images ſuch things are ſpoken or done, which tend to the Encouraging that worſhip which the *Primitive Chriſtians* refuſed as *Idolatry*, there is the ſame Reaſon ſtill to ſuſpect thoſe are not good but evil *Spirits*; under whoſe Name or Repreſentation ſoever they appear. For it is as eaſie for them to play the ſame tricks among *Chriſtians*, which they did among *Heathens*; for then they pretended to be *Good Spirits*, and why may they not do the ſame ſtill? If we have a fuller Diſcovery of their deſign to impoſe upon the World, the folly of Men is ſo much the greater to be abuſed by them; and the *Gentiles* were in that reſpect far more excuſable than *Chriſtians*, becauſe God had not diſcovered the Cheat and Artifices of *Evil Spirits* to them, ſo as he hath done to us by the *Chriſtian Religion*. Whatever pretence of *Miracles*, or *Viſions*, or *Appearances* there be, if the deſign of them be to advance a way of worſhip contrary to the *Law of God*, we have the ſame reaſon to believe that *Evil Spirits* are the Cauſes of them, as the *Primitive Chriſtians* had, that *Evil Spirits* were worſhipped by the *Heathens* under the notion of *Good*.

5. The *Arrians* believed Chriſt to be a Creature, and yet were charged with Idolatry by the Fathers. If it be ſaid, *that they did give a higher degree of Worſhip to Chriſt, than any do to Saints*; I anſwer, that they did only give a *Degree* of *Worſhip* proportionable to the *Degrees* of *Excellency* ſuppoſed to be in him, far above any other *Creatures* whatſoever. But ſtill that *worſhip was inferior* to that which they gave to God the Father, according to the Opinion of thoſe Perſons I diſpute againſt. For *if it be impoſſible for a Man that believes the incomparable Diſtance between God and the moſt Excellent of his Creatures, to attribute the Honour due to God alone to any Creature*; then, ſay I, it is impoſſible for thoſe who believe one God the Father, to give to the Son whom they ſuppoſed to be a *Creature*, the Honour which was peculiar to God. It muſt be therefore on their own Suppoſition, an *Inferior* and *Subordinate Honour*; and at the higheſt ſuch as the *Platoniſts* gave to their *Cæleſtial Deities*. And although the *Arians* did *invocate Chriſt, and put their truſt in him*; yet they ſtill ſuppoſed him to be a *Creature*, and thereſore believed that all the Power and Authority he had, was given to him; ſo that the Worſhip they gave to Chriſt muſt be Inferior to that Honour they gave to the *Supreme God*, whom they believed to be *Supreme*, *Abſolute*, and *Independent*. But notwithſtanding all this, the Fathers by Multitudes of Teſtimonies already produced do condemn the *Arrians* as guilty of *Idolatry*: and therefore they could not believe, that the owning of *Saints* to be *God's Creatures* did alter the State of the Controverſie, and make ſuch *Chriſtians* uncapable of *Idolatry*.

§. 4. 2. I come to the *Second Period*, wherein *Images were brought into the Chriſtian Church*, but no worſhip allowed to be given to them. And I am ſo far from thinking, *that the forbearance of the Uſe of Images, was from the fear of Complyance with the* Pagan *Idolatry*, that I much rather believe the introducing of Images was out of Complyance with the *Gentile Worſhip*. For *Euſebius* in that memorable Teſtimony concerning the Statue at *Paneas*, or *Cæſarea Philippi*, *which* he ſaith, *was ſaid to be the Image of Chriſt and the Syrophœnician Woman*, doth attri-

Euſeb. Eccleſ. hiſt. l. 7. *c.* 18.

3. The Primitive Chriſtians did utterly refuſe to worſhip the Images of Emperors, although they were acknowledged to be *God's Creatures*; therefore I ſay, according to their Senſe, acknowledging the Saints to be *God*'s *Creatures*, is not a ſufficient ground to excuſe the Worſhip of the Images of Saints from Idolatry. As in *Pliny*'s Epiſtle to *Trajan* (mentioned before) one of the Tryals of *Chriſtians* was, whether they would *Imagini tua thure ac vino ſupplicare*; uſe the *Religious Rites* that were then Cuſtomary, of *Incenſe*, *Libation*, and *Supplication* before the Emperor's Image; this *Minucius* calls *ad imagines ſupplicare, to pray before their Images*: which *Pliny* ſaith, *No true Chriſtian could ever be brought to*: but would rather *ſuffer Martyrdom* than do it. St. *Hierome* ſpeaking of *Nebuchadnezzar*'s *Image*, ſaith, *Statuam ſeu Imaginem cultores Dei adorare non debent*; *the Worſhippers of God ought not to worſhip an Image*; *Let*, ſaith he, *the Judges and Magiſtrates take notice of this, that worſhip the Emperor*'s *Statues*; *that they do that which the three Children pleaſed God by not doing.* By which we ſee, it was not only the Statues of *Heathen Emperors*, which the *Chriſtians refuſed to give Religious Worſhip to*; but of the moſt pious and *Chriſtian*; which out of the Flattery of Princes, thoſe who expected, or received Honours, were willing to continue under *Chriſtian Emperors*; but it was at laſt abſolutely forbidden by a Conſtitution of *Theodoſius*; of which I have ſpoken already, in the Diſcourſe about the *Nature of Divine Worſhip*. But upon what reaſon came this to be accounted unlawful among *Chriſtians*; if it were lawful to worſhip the Images of *Saints*, ſuppoſing them to be *God*'s *Creatures*? Is it poſſible they ſhould think the *Emperors* to be otherwiſe? I do not think that the Souldiers who were trepann'd by *Julian*, to offer Incenſe to his Image at the receiving the *Donative* (and after they underſtood what they did, were ready to run mad with Indignation at themſelves, crying out in the Streets, *We are Chriſtians*, and ran to the Emperour, deſiring they might ſuffer Martyrdom for the *Chriſtian Faith*, which they were ſuppoſed to deny by that act of theirs, as *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *Theodoret* relate the ſtory) did imagine that *Julian* was any other than one of *God*'s *Creatures*; or that they had any belief of his being a *God*; but the *Chriſtians* looked on the act it ſelf of *Offering Incenſe*, as unlawful to be done to the Image of any *Creature*; or to the Image it ſelf, becauſe it was a *Creature*, and that of the meaneſt ſort, *viz.* the *Work of Mens Hands*.

Hieron. in c. 3. Daniel.

Greg. Nazianz. invect. 1. in Jul. Theod. hiſt. l. 3. c. 16, 17.

4. It is not enough for any of *God's Creatures* to be worſhipped under the *Notion* of *Saints*; if any worſhip be given to them, which is above the rank of *Creatures*, *i. e.* any of that worſhip which belongs to God. For none can have greater confidence of the *Saintſhip* of any Perſons whoſe Images they worſhipped, (thoſe excepted which are revealed in Scripture) than many of the *Heathens* had of the goodneſs of the *Deities* which they worſhipped. And if we obſerve the method, which *Origen*, St. *Cyril*, St. *Auguſtine* and other *Chriſtian Writers* took to prove them to be *Evil Spirits* which they worſhipped, we ſhall find the great Argument was from the Nature of the Worſhip given to them. For, ſay they, we find in Scripture that *good Angels* have refuſed that worſhip which they ſeem ſo deſirous of; and therefore there is juſt reaſon to ſuſpect that theſe are not *good Angels*; (although they firmly believed them to be ſo, and *Hierocles* ſaith, *God forbid we ſhould worſhip any other*; And the *Heathens* in St. *Auguſtine*

Hierocl. in aur. Carm. Aug. in Pſal. 96.

guſtine, ſay peremptorily, *they did not worſhip Devils, but Angels and the Servants of the Great God.)* So ſay I, as to thoſe who are worſhipped under the name of *Saints* or *Angels*, if in, or at their Images ſuch things are ſpoken or done, which tend to the Encouraging that worſhip which the *Primitive Chriſtians* refuſed as *Idolatry*, there is the ſame Reaſon ſtill to ſuſpect thoſe are not good but evil *Spirits*; under whoſe Name or Repreſentation ſoever they appear. For it is as eaſie for them to play the ſame tricks among *Chriſtians*, which they did among *Heathens*; for then they pretended to be *Good Spirits*, and why may they not do the ſame ſtill? If we have a fuller Diſcovery of their deſign to impoſe upon the World, the folly of Men is ſo much the greater to be abuſed by them; and the *Gentiles* were in that reſpect far more excuſable than *Chriſtians*, becauſe God had not diſcovered the Cheat and Artifices of *Evil Spirits* to them, ſo as he hath done to us by the *Chriſtian Religion*. Whatever pretence of *Miracles*, or *Viſions*, or *Appearances* there be, if the deſign of them be to advance a way of worſhip contrary to the *Law of God*, we have the ſame reaſon to believe that *Evil Spirits* are the Cauſes of them, as the *Primitive Chriſtians* had, that *Evil Spirits* were worſhipped by the *Heathens* under the notion of *Good*.

5. The *Arrians* believed Chriſt to be a Creature, and yet were charged with Idolatry by the Fathers. If it be ſaid, *that they did give a higher degree of Worſhip to Chriſt, than any do to Saints*; I anſwer, that they did only give a *Degree* of *Worſhip* proportionable to the *Degrees* of *Excellency* ſuppoſed to be in him, far above any other *Creatures* whatſoever. But ſtill that *worſhip was inferior* to that which they gave to God the Father, according to the Opinion of thoſe Perſons I diſpute againſt. For *if it be impoſſible for a Man that believes the incomparable Diſtance between God and the moſt Excellent of his Creatures, to attribute the Honour due to God alone to any Creature*; then, ſay I, it is impoſſible for thoſe who believe one God the Father, to give to the Son whom they ſuppoſed to be a *Creature*, the Honour which was peculiar to God. It muſt be therefore on their own Suppoſition, an *Inferior* and *Subordinate Honour*; and at the higheſt ſuch as the *Platoniſts* gave to their *Cæleſtial Deities*. And although the *Arians* did *invocate Chriſt, and put their truſt in him*; yet they ſtill ſuppoſed him to be a *Creature*, and therefore believed that all the Power and Authority he had, was given to him; ſo that the Worſhip they gave to Chriſt muſt be Inferior to that Honour they gave to the *Supreme God*, whom they believed to be *Supreme*, *Abſolute*, and *Independent*. But notwithſtanding all this, the Fathers by Multitudes of Teſtimonies already produced do condemn the *Arrians* as guilty of *Idolatry*: and therefore they could not believe, that the owning of *Saints* to be *God's Creatures* did alter the State of the Controverſie, and make ſuch *Chriſtians* uncapable of *Idolatry*.

§. 4.

2. I come to the *Second Period*, wherein *Images were brought into the Chriſtian Church*, but no worſhip allowed to be given to them. And I am ſo far from thinking, *that the forbearance of the Uſe of Images, was from the fear of Complyance with the Pagan Idolatry*, that I much rather believe the introducing of Images was out of Complyance with the *Gentile Worſhip*. For *Euſebius* in that memorable Teſtimony concerning the Statue at *Paneas*, or *Cæſarea Philippi*, *which* he ſaith, *was ſaid to be the Image of Chriſt and the Syrophœnician Woman*, doth attribute

Euſeb. Eccleſ. hiſt. l. 7. c. 18.

bute the *preſerving the Images of Chriſt and* Peter *and* Paul *to a Heathen Cuſtom*, which, he ſaith, was done ἀπαραφυλάκτως, *i. e.* ſaith *Valeſius*, *inconſideratè & imprudenter*, *contra veterem diſciplinam*, *incautè*: very *unadviſedly*, and againſt *the Ancient Rules of the Church*. And yet (to my great Amazement) this Place of *Euſebius* is on all Occaſions produced to juſtifie the *Antiquity* and *Worſhip* of *Images*: if it had been only brought to prove, that *Heatheniſh Cuſtoms* did by degrees creep into the *Chriſtian Church*, after it obtained Eaſe and Proſperity, it were a ſufficient proof of it. Not that I think, this Image was ever intended for *Chriſt* or the *Syrophœnitcian Woman*, but becauſe *Euſebius* ſaith, *the People had gotten ſuch a Tradition among them*; and were then willing to turn their Images to the Stories of the Goſpel. Where they finding a *Syrophœnician Woman* making her addreſs to our *Saviour*; and a *Tradition* being among them that ſhe was of this Place, and there finding two Images of Braſs, the one in a Form of a *Supplicant upon her Knees with her Hands ſtretched out*; *and the other over againſt her with a Hand extended to receive her*, the common People ſeeing theſe Figures to agree ſo luckily with the Story of the Goſpel, preſently concluded theſe muſt be the very Images of *Chriſt* and the *Woman*; and that the *Woman*, out of meer gratitude, upon her return Home was at this great Expence of two *Braſs Statues*; although the Goſpel ſaith, *ſhe had ſpent all that ſhe had on Phyſicians* before her miraculous Cure: And it would have been another Miracle, for ſuch an Image of *Chriſt* to have ſtood untouched in a *Gentile* City during ſo many Perſecutions of *Chriſtians*, eſpecially when *Aſterius* in *Photius* ſaith, *this very Statue was demoliſhed by* Maximinus. I confeſs it ſeems moſt probable to me, to have been the Image of the City *Paneas ſupplicating to the Emperor*; for I find the very ſame Repreſentations in the Ancient Coins; particularly thoſe of *Achaia*, *Bithynia*, *Macedonia*, and *Hiſpania*; wherein the *Provinces* are repreſented in the Form of a *Woman Supplicating*, and the *Emperor Hadrian* in the ſame Habit and Poſture, as the Image at *Paneas* is deſcribed by *Euſebius*. And that which adds more probability to this Conjecture, is, that *Bithynia* is ſo repreſented, becauſe of the kindneſs done by *Hadrian* to *Nicomedia in the reſtoring of it after its fall by an Earthquake*, and *Cæſarea* is ſaid by *Euſebius to have ſuffered by an Earthquake at the ſame time*; and after ſuch a Favour to the City, it was no wonder to have two ſuch *Braſs Statues* erected for the *Emperor*'s Honour. But ſuppoſing this Tradition were true, it ſignifies no more, *than that this Gentile Cuſtom was obſerved by a Syrophœnician Woman in a Gentile City*; and what is this to the *Worſhip of Images in Chriſtian Churches?* For *Euſebius* doth plainly ſpeak of *Gentiles* when he ſaith, *it is not to be wondred that thoſe Gentiles who received benefits by our Saviour ſhould do theſe things*; *when*, ſaith he, *we ſee the Images of his Apoſtles* Paul *and* Peter *and Chriſt himſelf*, *preſerved in Pictures being done in Colours*, *it being their Cuſtom to honour their Benefactors after this Manner*. I appeal to any Man of common Senſe, whether *Euſebius* doth not herein ſpeak of a meer *Gentile Cuſtom*; but *Baronius* in ſpight of the *Greek* will have it thus, *quod majores noſtri ad Gentilis conſuetudinis ſimilitudinem quàm proximè accedentes*; at which Place, *Iſ. Caſaubon* ſets this Marginal Note, *Græca lege & miraberis*; but, ſuppoſe this were the ſenſe of *Euſebius*, what is to be gained by it, ſave only, that the *bringing of Images among Chriſtians was a meer Imitation of Gentiliſm*, and introducing the *Heathen Cuſtoms*

Mark 5. 43.

Phot. Cod. 271.

Imperatorum Numiſm. collect à Duce Croyo edit. Gaſp. Gevart. Tab. 39. *n.* 17, 18, 21, 22. *Patini Numiſm. p.* 194. *Euſeb. Chron. n.* 2144.

Baron. ad A. D. 57. *n.* 112.

into the *Chriſtian Church?* Yet *Baronius* hath ſomething more to ſay for this Image, viz. *that being placed in the* Diaconicon *or Veſtry of the Church of* Paneas, *it was there worſhipped by Chriſtians*, for which he quotes *Nicephorus*; whom at other times he rejects as a *Fabulous Writer.* And it is obſervable, that *Philoſtorgius* (out of whom *Nicephorus* takes the other Circumſtances of his Relation) is ſo far from ſaying any thing of the Worſhip of this Image, that he *ſaith expreſly the contrary*, σέβοντες μὲν ἢ προσκυνοῦντες ὀυδαμῶς *giving no manner of Worſhip to it*; to which he adds the reaſon for it; *becauſe it is not lawful for Chriſtians to worſhip either Braſs or any other matter*; no not although this Image were believed to repreſent *Chriſt* after his *Incarnation.* What ſhall be ſaid to ſuch an *Author* who not only omits ſo conſiderable a paſſage but puts in Words of his own directly contrary to his Meaning? The *Author* of the *Caroline Book*, ſaith, that *allowing this Story to be true* (which by comparing the Relation of *Aſterius* in *Photius*, with what *Euſebius*, *Sozemen*, and the reſt ſay, there ſeems to be ſome reaſon to ſuſpect) *yet it ſignifies nothing to the Worſhip of Images*; *ſuch a Statue being erected by a weak Ignorant Woman, to expreſs her gratitude after the beſt Faſhion among the Gentiles*; *and what doth this ſignifie to the Church of God? and ſuppoſing the miraculous Cures to be wrought by the Herb that grew at the foot of the Statue*; *yet that doth not prove any Worſhip of Images, but that Men ought to leave their former Idols, and embrace the true Faith*; *for*, ſaith he, *according to the Apoſtle ſigns are not for Believers, but for Unbelievers.* But if we allow the Story as it is reported by *Sozomen, That the Chriſtians gathered up the broken Fragments of the Statue, and laid them up in the Church*, I grant it proves that thoſe *Chriſtians* did not abhor the uſe of Images, although there be no proof of any Worſhip they gave to them: and this ſeems to be as much as *Petavius* thinks can be made of this Story.

Nicephor. l. 10. *c.* 30.

Philoſtorg. Eccleſ. hiſt. l. 7. *c.* 3.

Caroli Lib de Imagin. l. 4. *c.* 15. *Phot. Cod.* 271.

Sozom. l. 5. *c.* 21.

Petav. de Incarn. l. 15. *c.* 13. *n.* 4. 5.

But *Baronius* is not content with the *Syrophœnician Woman's Example* in this matter of Images, but he produces the *Apoſtles Council at Antioch*, and a *venerable Decree* made by them there, which commands *Chriſtians to make Images of Chriſt inſtead of Heathen Idols*; but our comfort is, that *Petavius* diſcards this as a meer *Forgery, as moſt of the things of the latter Greeks*, he ſaith, *are*; and yet *Baronius* ſaith, this *Canon* is made uſe of by the *Second Nicene Council*; which ſhews what excellent *Authorities* that *Council* relyed upon. *Nicolas de Clemangis* is ſo far from thinking there was any *Apoſtolical Decree* in this Matter, that he ſaith, *the Univerſal Church did decree for the ſake of the Gentile Converts, that there ſhould be no Images at all in Churches*; *which Decree*, he ſaith, *was afterwards repealed.* I would he had told us by what *Authority*; and why other *Commandments* and *Decrees* might not be repealed as well as that?

Baron. ad A. D. 57. *n.* 111.

Pet. l. 15. *c.* 14. *n.* 4.

Nic. de Clemangis de Novis celebrat. non inſtituend. p. 151.

The firſt Authentick Teſtimony of any thing like Images among *Chriſtians*, is that of the *painted Chalices in Tertullian*; *wherein Chriſt was repreſented under the Emblem of a Shepherd with a Sheep on his Back*; (as it was very uſual among the *Romans* to have *Emblematical Figures* on there *Cups)* but was ever any Man ſo weak among them, not to diſtinguiſh between the *Ornaments* of their *Cups* and *Glaſſes*, and their *Sacred Images?* How ridiculous would that Man have been, that ſhould have proved at that time that *Chriſtians* worſhipped Images, becauſe they made uſe of *painted Glaſſes?* If this ſignifies any thing why do they quarrel with us, that have painted *Glaſs Win-*

Tertul. de Pudic. c. 7. & 10.

dows in our *Churches?* All that can be inferred from hence is, that the *Church* at that time did not think *Emblematical Figures* unlawful *Ornaments of Cups or Chalices*; and do we think otherwiſe? This I confeſs doth ſufficiently prove that the *Roman Church* did think *Ornamental Images Lawful*; but it doth no more prove the *Worſhip of Images*, than the very ſame *Emblem* often uſed before *Proteſtant Books*, doth prove that thoſe *Books* are *worſhipped* by us.

I cannot find any thing more that looks like any Evidence for *Images* for the firſt Three Hundred Years; afterwards, there began to be ſome Appearances of ſome, in ſome Places; but they met with different Entertainment, according to the ſeveral Apprehenſions of Men. For although the whole *Chriſtian Church* agreed in *refuſing to worſhip Images*; yet they were of ſeveral Opinions as to the Uſe of them. Some followed the ſtrict Opinion of *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, who thought the *very making of Images unlawful*; others thought it not unlawful to make them, but to *uſe them in Churches*, as the *Eliberitan Biſhops*, and *Epiphanius*; others thought it not unlawful, to have Images there provided *no Worſhip were given to them*. It is ridiculous to bring St. *Hierom*'s *Saucomaria*, for any other purpoſe, than to prove *that the Apoſtles Images were then ſeen upon their common Drinking Cups*, of which he ſpeaks; as any one may eaſily ſee that reads the paſſage, and the ſport he makes with *Canthelius* about it: Which will prove as much towards the Worſhip of Images, as having the *Apoſtles Pictures* on a Pack of Cards would do. St. Hieron. in John. 4.

Whatever the Cuſtom was in *Tertullian*'s Time (if at leaſt he ſpeaks of the *Sacred Chalices)* we are ſure in St. *Auguſtine*'s time there were no Images of Mankind on the *Sacred Veſſels*. *For although theſe*, ſaith he, *are conſecrated to a ſacred uſe, and are the work of Men's Hands; yet they have not a Mouth and ſpeak not, nor Eyes and ſee not, as the Heathen Images had*; and afterwards ſaith, *that the Humane Figure doth more to deceive Mankind, as to their Worſhip, than the want of ſenſe doth to correct their Error; and the great cauſe of the Madneſs of Idolatry is, that the likeneſs to a living Being prevails more on the Affections of miſerable Men to worſhip them, than their Knowledge that they are not living doth to the Contempt of them.* Is it poſſible ſuch a Man as St. *Auſtin* was, could uſe ſuch Expreſſions as theſe, if in his time there had been any Images then uſed or worſhipped in Chriſtian Churches? What need he have ſo much as mentioned the *Sacred Utenſils*, if there had been *Sacred Images?* And how could he have urged thoſe things againſt *Heathen Images*, which would altogether have held as well againſt *Chriſtian*? For it was not the Opinion of the *Heathens* he diſputed againſt, ſo much as the *Proneneſs of Men to be ſeduced to worſhip ſuch Repreſentations, which they find to be like themſelves.* To this *Bellarmine* Anſwers, *that St.* Auguſtine *doth not ſay there were no Images in Churches, but only that the humane ſhape of Images did tend much to increaſe their Error who worſhipped them for Gods.* But would any Man of Common Senſe have uſed thoſe Arguments againſt Images, which do not ſuppoſe them already *worſhipped for Gods*; but imply the *danger of being ſeduced to that Worſhip where-ever they are*, in caſe there were ſuch Images in Chriſtian Churches? The *Worſhip* St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks againſt, is *Adoring, or Praying looking on an Image, (Quis autem adorat vel orat intuens ſimulachrum) which whoſoever doth*, ſaith he, *is ſo affected as to think he is heard by that he prays before, and may receive help by it*;

S. Aug. in Pſ. 113.

Bellarm. de Imag. l. 2. c. 9.

it; and yet theſe Perſons St. *Auguſtine* diſputes againſt, declare *that they did not worſhip their Images for Gods, but only as the Signs or Repreſentations of that Being which they worſhipped.* Which St. *Auguſtine* ſhews to be a moſt unlikely thing, *becauſe the manner of addreſs, and the Figure of their Images did ſhew that they did apprehend ſomething more than meer Signs in them whatever they pretended.* I do not deny that there were Pictures abroad in St. *Auguſtine*'s time, of *Chriſt*, and *Peter* and *Paul*, for himſelf doth mention them; but he declares ſo *little Reverence* for them, that he ſaith *they deſerved to be deceived who looked on them as Books to be inſtructed by; and it was no wonder to ſee Feigners of falſe Doctrines to be led aſide by Painters.* By which it is plain, St. *Auguſtine* doth not think *Pictures* and *Images* to be ſuch *good helps* for the *Ignorant*, as was afterwards pretended. And for thoſe, *who worſhipped Pictures*, St. *Auguſtine* doth not deny that there were ſuch in his Time, but, he reckons them among the *Ignorant and Superſtitious, who by their Practices did diſhonour their Profeſſion of Chriſtianity.* So that although we grant in the time of St. *Auguſtine* there were ſeveral *Pictures of Holy Men* mentioned in *Scripture in ſeveral Places*, yet there is no clear Evidence that they were then brought into the *African Churches* any more than into thoſe of *Cyprus* or *Paleſtine*; but they were in the latter end of the Fourth *Century* in ſome of the more *Eaſtern Churches*, as appears by the *Teſtimonies of Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Aſterius* produced by *Petavius* and others. And it is a very probable Conjecture of *Daillé*, that in thoſe Parts of *Pontus* and *Cappadocia*, they were firſt introduced, out of a Complyance with *Gentiliſm*; and in Imitation of the Practice of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, whom *Nyſſen* commends *for changing the Heathen Feſtivals into Chriſtian, the better to draw the Heathens to Chriſtianity*; which ſeemed a very plauſible Pretence, but was attended with very bad Succeſs, when *Chriſtianity* came to be by this means, but *Reformed Paganiſm*, as to the matter of *Divine Worſhip*. This ſame Principle in all Probability brought the *Pictures of Martyrs* and others into the *Churches of Italy*, of which *Prudentius* and *Paulinus* ſpeak; and this latter confeſſeth, it was a *rare Cuſtom* in his time to have *Pictures in Churches*,

Aug. de conſenſ. Evangel. l. 1. c. 10.

Aug. de Moribus Eccleſ. Cath. c. 34

Petav. de Incar. l. 15. c. 13. n. 7. Dallæ. de Imag. l. 3. c. 4.

Nyſſen. vit. Greg. Thaumat.

Prudent. περὶ στεφ. hymn. 9. Paulin. ep. 12.

———Pingere Sanctas
Raro More Domus.

and thought it neceſſary to make an *Apology* for it, which he doth by ſaying, *he looked on this as a good means to draw the rude and barbarous People from their Heathen Cuſtoms, changing the pleaſure of Pictures for that of drinking at the Sepulchres of Martyrs*; but there is not the leaſt intimation of any *Worſhip* then given to them.

Poem. Nat. 9. p. 614.

§. 5. 3. After that the Uſe of Images had prevailed both in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Parts, Men came by degrees to the worſhip of them: Which is the Third *Period* obſervable in this *Controverſie*. As to which there are theſe Things remarkable,

1. That it began firſt among the *Ignorant and Superſtitious People*; of whom St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks in his time, that they were the *Worſhippers of Pictures*; and afterwards in the *Epiſtle of Gregorius M. to Serenus Biſhop of Marſeilles* it is obſervable, that the People began to worſhip the Images in *Churches* in perfect Oppoſition to *Serenus their Biſhop*;

Greg. Ep. l. 9. ep. 9.

dows in our *Churches?* All that can be inferred from hence is, that the *Church* at that time did not think *Emblematical Figures* unlawful *Ornaments of Cups or Chalices*; and do we think otherwiſe? This I confeſs doth ſufficiently prove that the *Roman Church* did think *Ornamental Images Lawful*; but it doth no more prove the *Worſhip of Images*, than the very ſame *Emblem* often uſed before *Proteſtant Books*, doth prove that thoſe *Books* are *worſhipped* by us.

I cannot find any thing more that looks like any Evidence for *Images* for the firſt Three Hundred Years; afterwards, there began to be ſome Appearances of ſome, in ſome Places; but they met with different Entertainment, according to the ſeveral Apprehenſions of Men. For although the whole *Chriſtian Church* agreed in *refuſing to worſhip Images*; yet they were of ſeveral Opinions as to the Uſe of them. Some followed the ſtrict Opinion of *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, who thought the *very making of Images unlawful*; others thought it not unlawful to make them, but to *uſe them in Churches*, as the *Eliberitan Biſhops*, and *Epiphanius*; others thought it not unlawful, to have Images there provided *no Worſhip were given to them.* It is ridiculous to bring St. *Hierom*'s *Saucomariæ*, for any other purpoſe, than to prove *that the Apoſtles Images were then ſeen upon their common Drinking Cups*, of which he ſpeaks; as any one may eaſily ſee that reads the paſſage, and the ſport he makes with *Canthelius* about it: Which will prove as much towards the Worſhip of Images, as having the *Apoſtles Pictures* on a Pack of Cards would do.

St. Hieron. in John. 4.

Whatever the Cuſtom was in *Tertullian*'s Time (if at leaſt he ſpeaks of the *Sacred Chalices*) we are ſure in St. *Auguſtine*'s time there were no Images of Mankind on the *Sacred Veſſels*. *For although theſe*, ſaith he, *are conſecrated to a ſacred uſe, and are the work of Men's Hands; yet they have not a Mouth and ſpeak not, nor Eyes and ſee not, as the Heathen Images had*; and afterwards ſaith, *that the Humane Figure doth more to deceive Mankind, as to their Worſhip, than the want of ſenſe doth to correct their Error; and the great cauſe of the Madneſs of Idolatry is, that the likeneſs to a living Being prevails more on the Affections of miſerable Men to worſhip them, than their Knowledge that they are not living doth to the Contempt of them.* Is it poſſible ſuch a Man as St. *Auſtin* was, could uſe ſuch Expreſſions as theſe, if in his time there had been any Images then uſed or worſhipped in Chriſtian Churches? What need he have ſo much as mentioned the *Sacred Vtenſils*, if there had been *Sacred Images?* And how could he have urged thoſe things againſt *Heathen Images*, which would altogether have held as well againſt *Chriſtian*? For it was not the Opinion of the *Heathens* he diſputed againſt, ſo much as the *Proneneſs of Men to be ſeduced to worſhip ſuch Repreſentations, which they find to be like themſelves.* To this *Bellarmine* Anſwers, *that St.* Auguſtine *doth not ſay there were no Images in Churches, but only that the humane ſhape of Images did tend much to increaſe their Error who worſhipped them for Gods.* But would any Man of Common Senſe have uſed thoſe Arguments againſt Images, which do not ſuppoſe them already *worſhipped for Gods*; but imply the *danger of being ſeduced to that Worſhip where-ever they are*, in caſe there were ſuch Images in Chriſtian Churches? The *Worſhip* St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks againſt, is *Adoring, or Praying looking on an Image, (Quis autem adorat vel orat intuens ſimulachrum) which whoſoever doth*, ſaith he, *is ſo affected as to think he is heard by that he prays before, and may receive help by*

S. Aug. in Pſ. 113.

Bellarm. de Imag. l. 2. c. 9.

it; and yet theſe Perſons St. *Auguſtine* diſputes againſt, declare *that they did not worſhip their Images for Gods, but only as the Signs or Repreſentations of that Being which they worſhipped.* Which St. *Auguſtine* ſhews to be a moſt unlikely thing, *becauſe the manner of addreſs, and the Figure of their Images did ſhew that they did apprehend ſomething more than meer Signs in them whatever they pretended.* I do not deny that there were Pictures abroad in St. *Auguſtine*'s time, of *Chriſt*, and *Peter* and *Paul*, for himſelf doth mention them; but he declares ſo *little Reverence* for them, that he ſaith *they deſerved to be deceived who looked on them as Books to be inſtructed by*; *and it was no wonder to ſee Feigners of falſe Doctrines to be led aſide by Painters.* By which it is plain, St. *Auguſtine* doth not think *Pictures* and *Images* to be ſuch *good helps* for the *Ignorant*, as was afterwards pretended. And for thoſe, *who worſhipped Pictures*, St. *Auguſtine* doth not deny that there were ſuch in his Time, but, he reckons them among the *Ignorant and Superſtitious, who by their Practices did diſhonour their Profeſſion of Chriſtianity.* So that although we grant in the time of St. *Auguſtine* there were ſeveral *Pictures of Holy Men* mentioned in *Scripture* in *ſeveral Places*, yet there is no clear Evidence that they were then brought into the *African Churches* any more than into thoſe of *Cyprus* or *Paleſtine*; but they were in the latter end of the Fourth *Century* in ſome of the more *Eaſtern Churches*, as appears by the *Teſtimonies of Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Aſterius* produced by *Petavius* and others. And it is a very probable Conjecture of *Daillé*, that in thoſe Parts of *Pontus* and *Cappadocia*, they were firſt introduced, out of a Complyance with *Gentiliſm*; and in Imitation of the Practice of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, whom *Nyſſen* commends *for changing the Heathen Feſtivals into Chriſtian, the better to draw the Heathens to Chriſtianity*; which ſeemed a very plauſible Pretence, but was attended with very bad Succeſs, when *Chriſtianity* came to be by this means, but *Reformed Paganiſm*, as to the matter of *Divine Worſhip*. This ſame Principle in all Probability brought the *Pictures of Martyrs* and others into the *Churches of Italy*, of which *Prudentius* and *Paulinus* ſpeak; and this latter confeſſeth, it was a *rare Cuſtom* in his time to have *Pictures in Churches*,

Aug. de conſenſ. Evangel. l. 1. c. 10.

Aug. de Moribus Eccleſ. Cath. c. 34

Petav. de Incar. l. 15. *c.* 13. *n.* 7. *Dallæ. de Imag. l.* 3. *c.* 4.

Nyſſen. vit. Greg. Thaumat.

Prudent. ϖεὶ ϛεφ. *hymn.* 9. *Paulin. ep.* 12.

> ——— *Pingere Sanctas*
> *Raro More Domus.*

and thought it neceſſary to make an *Apology* for it, which he doth by ſaying, *he looked on this as a good means to draw the rude and barbarous People from their Heathen Cuſtoms, changing the pleaſure of Pictures for that of drinking at the Sepulchres of Martyrs*; but there is not the leaſt intimation of any *Worſhip* then given to them.

Poem. Nat. 9. *p.* 614.

3. After that the Uſe of Images had prevailed both in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Parts, Men came by degrees to the worſhip of them: Which is the Third *Period* obſervable in this *Controverſie*. As to which there are theſe Things remarkable, §. 5.

1. That it began firſt among the *Ignorant and Superſtitious People*; of whom St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks in his time, that they were the *Worſhippers of Pictures*; and afterwards in the *Epiſtle of Gregorius M. to Serenus Biſhop of Marſeilles* it is obſervable, that the People began to worſhip the Images in *Churches* in perfect Oppoſition to *Serenus their Biſhop*;

Greg. Ep. l. 9. *ep.* 9.

Biſhop; who was ſo much diſpleaſed at it, that he *demoliſhed* them, and *brake them in Pieces*: which act of his ſo exaſperated them, that *they ſeparated from his Communion.* The News of this coming to *Rome* (probably from ſome of theſe *Schiſmaticks*, who always loved to take *Sanctuary in Rome*, and appeal thither againſt their *Biſhops*,) the *Pope* writes to the *Biſhop* about it by one *Cyriacus*, he ſlights the *Pope's* Letters, *as if he could not believe they were written by him*; *Gregory* being nettled at this, writes again to him; and reproves him for breaking down the Images, but commends him for not allowing the Worſhip of them. So that we find the firſt Beginning of the Worſhip of Images in theſe *Weſtern* Parts to have been by the Folly and Superſtition of the People expreſly againſt the Will of their own Biſhop
Bell. de Imag. l. 2. c. 16.
and the Biſhop of *Rome*. *Bellarmine* ſaith, *that* Gregory *only reproved the Superſtitious Worſhip of Images*, i. e. *that by which they are worſhipped as Gods*. Which is a deſperate ſhift in a bad Cauſe: For if *Gregory* had intended any kind of Worſhip to be given to Images, could he not have expreſſed it himſelf? He ſpeaks plain enough about this matter in all other things, why did he not in diſtinguiſhing what worſhip was to be given to Images, and what not? *We praiſed you*; ſaith he, *that you forbad the Worſhip of Images* (ſo *adorari* muſt be rendred, and not according to the Modern Senſe of *Romiſh Authors* who would againſt all Senſe and Reaſon *Appropriate* that Word to *Soveraign Worſhip*) *but we reprehended you for breaking them. It is one thing to worſhip an Image, and another thing to learn by it what is to be worſhipped. That ought not to be broken down which was ſet up in Churches not to be worſhipped, but* only *to inſtruct the Minds of the Ignorant.* Would any Man of Common Senſe have ſaid this, that did allow any worſhip of Images? Would *Bellarmine*, or *T. G.* or any that embrace the *Second Nicene and Tridentine Council*, have ſaid *that Images are ſet up in Churches* ad inſtruendas ſolumodo mentes neſcientium; *only to inſtruct the Ignorant?* Nay *Gregory* goes yet farther, and tells *Sorenus*, *he ought to call his People together, and ſhew them from Scripture that it is not lawful to worſhip the work of Men's Hands, becauſe it is written, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Which very Place *Anaſtaſius Biſhop of Theopolis*, in his Epiſtle produced in the
Concil. Nicen. 2. act. 4.
Second Nicene Council, thus expounds; *Mark*, ſaith he, *only is joyned to ſerve, and not to worſhip, adorare quidem licet, ſervire nequaquam*, ſaith the *Latin Tranſlation* there; *Worſhip of other things is lawful but not the Service*, which is directly contrary to what *Gregory* ſaith, who makes *the Worſhip of any other thing unlawful from theſe Words*; and to conclude all, *Gregory* ſaith, *forbid not thoſe who would make Images*; adorare verò Imagines modis omnibus devita, *but by all means avoid the Worſhip of them.* What! no *kind of Worſhip to be allowed them?* no *diſtinction of an Inferior, Honorary, Relative Worſhip*? no, not the leaſt tittle tending that Way. But our *Adverſaries* run from this *Epiſtle* to another to *Secundinus* to help them out, where they ſay *Gregory* approves the *Worſhip of Images*; to which no other anſwer is needful, than that all that *paſſage* is wanting in the *Ancient M. S.* as Dr. *James* hath atteſted up-
James Corrupt. of the Fathers, *pa.* 2. *p.* 76.
on a diligent Examination of them: and however, ought to be interpreted according to his deliberate Sentence in the *Epiſtle* to *Serenus*, where he not only delivers his Judgment, but backs it with the *ſtrongeſt Reaſon.*

2. That the *Worſhip of Images* no ſooner prevailed, but it was objected againſt the *Chriſtians* by the *Jews* and *Gentiles*. Thus it appears in the *Apology of Leontius Biſhop of Neapolis in Cyprus*, written againſt the *Jews*, and read in the *Second Nicene Council* (and if the *Teſtimony of Conſtantinus Biſhop of Conſtantia in Cyprus* there Extant, may be taken, he flouriſhed in the time of *Mauricius*) in which the *Jew* is introduced, *upbraiding the Chriſtians with breaking the Commandment of God in the Worſhip of Images*, and *Leontius* is put to miſerable Shifts to defend it. And in the Diſpute between the *Jew* and the *Chriſtian* in the Fifth *Action* of that *Council*; the *Jew* ſaith, *I am ſcandalized at You Chriſtians, becauſe you Worſhip Images, expreſly againſt the Command of God.* And in the *Diſcourſe* of *John Biſhop of Theſſalonica*, the *Gentile* ſaith, *Do not You Chriſtians not only paint the Images of Your Saints, and Worſhip them, but even the Image of your God too? ſo likewiſe think, that we do not Worſhip the Images themſelves, but thoſe incorporeal Powers which are worſhipped through them.* And this learned *Biſhop* to make out the *Diſparity* between the *Heathens* and them flies to this lamentable Refuge, *that they did not believe the Angels to be incorporeal as the Gentiles did, and therefore might better make Images of them.* Which is not the thing I now obſerve; but only, that as ſoon as the Worſhip of Images began, the *Chriſtians* were ſufficiently upbraided with it, by their Enemies; and therefore it is moſt unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that if the ſame Worſhip had prevailed before, the *Jews* and *Gentiles* would not have objected the ſame thing; when there were Men that wanted neither Advantages, nor ill Will to do it.

Concil. Nicen. 2. *act.* 4. *p.* 235.

Act. 5. *p.* 355.

p. 354.

3. That when the *Controverſie* about the *Worſhip of Images* grew hot, the defenders of them made uſe of *Treaſon* and *Rebellion* to maintain their *Cauſe*. It would make one wonder to ſee how a late pretended Author of the *Hiſtory* of the *Iconoclaſts*, in Engliſh hath endeavoured to accommodate that *Hiſtory* to our *Reformation in England*, making *Henry* 8. to be *Leo Iſauricus* and Queen *Mary* to be *Irene*, (which is not much for her Honour.) But ſuppoſe *Henry* 8. to be *Leo*, on whoſe ſide lay the *charge of Rebellion*, which it is moſt certain the *Pope and his Adherents* were guilty of towards *Leo*? For *Gregory* 2. confeſſes in his *Epiſtle* to *Leo*, *that the People rebelled againſt him, out of zeal to their Images*; and *Onuphrius* ſaith, *that by reaſon of* Leo's *Oppoſition to Images, the Pope deprived him of the remainder of the Empire in* Italy. And this worthy Hiſtorian himſelf ſaith, *that the Romans and others then ſubject to* Leo *did not only throw down his Statues from the high Places and Pillars whereon they ſtood, but would no longer pay him any Tribute or obey his Orders*; and he confeſſes afterwards, *that upon the Pope's Inſtigation they began a Defenſive Conſpiracy for Religion*; (Juſt ſuch another as the *Iriſh Rebellion*; which that Author hath heard of) *only this was far more bloody and cruel than the other.* But P. T. is concerned for the *Pope's Honour*, ſaying, *that what the Pope intended only for a Defenſive Confederacy for Religion*, (ſore againſt the Pope's Will) *proved an Offenſive Conſpiracy againſt the Emperor's Temporal Right*; *in ſo much that all Italy renounced his Dominion.* Was the forbidding the paying Tribute to the Emperor only a *Defenſive Confederacy for Religion?* Yet this *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, *Zonaras*, *Cedrenus*, *Glycas*, *Theophanes*, *Sigebert*, *Otto Friſingenſis*, *Conradus Urſpergenſis*, *Sigonius*, *Rubeus and Ciacconius* all agree to have been done by the

Hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts pretended to be publiſhed *A D.*1671 but written 1674. or rather extracted out of *Maimbourgs French Hiſtory.*

Greg. 2. *epiſt.* 1.

Onuphr. Annot. in vit. Greg. 2.

Hiſtory of Iconocl. *p.* 44.

p. 47.

Anaſtaſ. hiſtor. p. 134.

Zonar. Annal. To. 3. *p.* 85.

Cedern. hiſt. To. 1. *p.* 453.

Michel. Glyc. Annal. part 4. p. 281. Theophan. hiſt. p. 338. Sigebert. ad A. 728. Otto Friſing. l. 5. c. 18. Urſperg. ad A. 718. Sigonius de Regno Ital. l. 3. Rubei Hiſt. Raven. l. 4. Ciaccon. vit. Greg.

* Hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts, p. 54.

Pope, upon the Emperors declaring againſt the *Worſhip of Images.* But I need go no farther than this * *Hiſtorian*, who delivers this for the Doctrine of this *Pope* in a *Synod* at *Rome* on behalf of *Images*, viz. *That it is againſt reaſon to believe, God would have a multitude of Men*, or *all Mankind to be damned rather than reſiſt with Arms, Falſe Doctrine favoured by one or a few Sovereigns ſeeing Chriſt dyed rather to* ſave Souls *than to* Humour Sovereigns. Moſt Primitive and Catholick Doctrine! and happily applyed to the *Worſhip of Images*. But he goes on, as if he had been giving Inſtructions for another *Rebellion*; *that the Rule whereby they ought to judge of the time and lawfulneſs of their Reſiſtance, muſt not be their own Fancies, but a real Danger of altering the Catholick Faith, and the Sovereigns actual endeavours to do it.* So that according to this Bleſſed Doctrine, a *Rebellion* on the account of *Religion*, is a *Juſt and Holy War*; and is it not eaſie to diſcern what ſuch Men would be at, who deliver this as the Doctrine of their *Head* of the *Church* in a *Council of Biſhops?* If *Gregory* 2. ſaid ſuch things, he did but ſpeak agreeably to his Actings; if he did not, we know at leaſt the mind of this *Hiſtorian*; who ſeems to have calculated his Hiſtory for a *Meridian* nearer Home.

4. It is obſervable, how great and apparent a change was made in the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the *Roman Church* in this matter of *Images*, between the time of the two *Gregories*, the *Firſt*, and the *Second*, *i. e.* between *A. D.* 604. wherein the *firſt Gregory* died, and *A. D.* 714. wherein the Second was made *Pope*. It would afford a Man ſome pleaſure to compare the *Epiſtle* of *Gregorius M.* to *Serenus*, with thoſe of *Gregory* 2. to the *Emperor Leo*, and yet both theſe according to the *Roman* Pretence *Infallible Heads* of the *Church*. We have already ſeen what the former *Gregory*'s Opinion was, let us now compare it with his Name-ſakes. He charges the *Emperor Leo* with uſing the very ſame Words that his Predeceſſor had done in this Matter, viz. *that we are not to worſhip the Work of Men's Hands*; *whereas*, ſaith he, very wiſely, *thoſe Words were ſpoken in Scripture for the ſake of ſuch Paganiſh Idolaters, who worſhipped Golden and Silver, and Wooden Animals* (the *Pope* calls them ζῶα) and ſaid, *theſe are thy Gods, and there is no other God beſides:* (as though there ever had been ſuch Fools in the World!) *and for the ſake of theſe Works of the Devils Hands we are commanded not to worſhip them: but whatever is made by Men for the Honour of God ought to be worſhipped*, in ſpight of his Prdeceſſors Definition to the contrary in the very ſame Caſe. And then he tells a very worſhipful Story of the *Pictures that were taken of Chriſt and his Apoſtles by their Diſciples*; *and of the Image Chriſt ſent for a Preſent to the King of* Edeſſa; it is great Pity the *Veronica* was forgotten by him; but that piece of *Antiquity* was not yet known. Then, *he bids the Emperor go among the Boys at School, and if he ſhould ſay among them that he was an Enemy to Images, they would throw their Table-books at his Head*; becauſe Children always love pictures; and a little after, he ſaith, *he was like* Ozias *the King of the Jews that deſtroyed the Brazen Serpent.* It ſeems the *Bible* was then a *Book* not much ſtudyed by the *Head of the Church*: for was it indeed *Ozias* that demoliſhed the *Brazen Serpent?* and was this ſuch a reproach to *Leo* to be compared to good *Hezekiah?* And ſo very learnedly he falls to the commending the *Brazen Serpent*, *and enveighing againſt that inſolent King that broke it in Pieces?* Was not this a hopeful Piece of *Infallibility!* After this, our Learned Hiſtorian ſaith, *the Pope declared him not only an Heretick, but*

Greg. 2. epiſt. 1. ad Leon.

Hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts, p. 55.

but an Hereſiarch; for what I beſeech him? for being of the ſame Opinion as to the *Worſhip of Images*, that his *Predeceſſor Gregory* had been of? But ſee how the caſe is altered in a Hundred Years! In my Mind, the *Emperor Leo* asked a very pertinent *Queſtion* of the Pope; *How comes it to paſs that the Six General Councils never ſaid a word of Images, if they were ſuch neceſſary Things?* And the *Pope* made as *impertinent an Anſwer*; *And why*, ſaith the Pope, *did they ſay nothing of Eating and Drinking?* it ſeems *Images* in his Opinion were as neceſſary to *Religion*, as *Meat and Drink* to our *Bodies*; *for*, he ſaith, *the Fathers carried their Images to Council with them, and travelled with them*; and I ſuppoſe *ſlept* with them too, as *Children* do with their *Babies*.

Greg. 2. ep. 2.

5. The *Artifices* and *Methods* ought to be obſerved whereby ſuch a cauſe as the *Worſhip of Images*, was advanced and defended. For being deſtitute of any colour from *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, or *Antiquity*, there was a neceſſity of making uſe of other means to ſupply the want of theſe. Such as,

§. 6.

1. Repreſenting their *Adverſaries* to the greateſt Diſadvantage; which is done to purpoſe in the Fifth Action of the Second *Nicene Council*. The demoliſhing of Images was condemned in *Serenus* by *Gregory* as an Act only of *Intemperate Zeal and Indiſcretion*; but now it was become *Hereſy, worſe than Hereſy, Judaiſm, Samaritaniſm, Manichaiſm*, nay worſe than all theſe. This *Taraſius* offers to prove in the beginning of that *Action*, from St. *Cyril*, he compares them with *Nebuchadnezzar*, who *deſtroyed the Cherubim*; from *Simeon Stylites*, to the *Samaritans*; and *John* the pretended *Vicar* of the *Oriental Biſhops* ſaith, *the Samaritans are worſe than other Hereticks*; *therefore they ought to be called Samaritans*; and *Conſtantinus Biſhop of Conſtantia in Cyprus* ſaith, *they are worſe than Samaritans*. Afterwards the ſame *John* ſaith, *ſee how clearly we have demonſtrated that the Accuſers of Chriſtians* (in this matter of *Images*) *are Partakers with* Nebuchadonoſor, *and Samaritans, and Jews and Gentiles and Manichees, and thoſe who denyed that Chriſt was come in the Fleſh*. Why? what is the matter? what Article of the *Chriſtian Faith* have they denied? What! have they renounced *Chriſtianity*, and been *circumciſed!* No: but worſe; being *Chriſtians* they call the *Worſhip of Images Idolatry*. O dangerous *Hereſy*, and *horrible Blaſphemy!* But it may be worth our while to conſider a little the account which *Taraſius* deſires *John* to give the *Council* of the beginning of this moſt deteſtable *Hereſy*; viz. *that after the Death of* Solyman Caliph *of the* Arabs, Homar *ſucceeded him, after whom followed* Ezid *or* Jezid *a vain Man*; *in his time there was at* Tiberias *one* Sarantapechys *a Leader of the Jews, and a Magician*; *who promiſed long Life to the* Caliph *on Condition he would do what he would have him*; *which he preſently undertook with great Promiſes of Rewards to him*; *then the Jew required an Edict for the demoliſhing and defacing all the Images in the Chriſtian Churches*; *which was accordingly executed by the Jews and Arabs. The News of which excited the Biſhop of* Nacolia, *and thoſe about him to do the ſame thing*; *but* Jezid *lived not above two Years and a half after*; *and his Son* Ulid *deſtroyed this Jew, and the Images were again reſtored*. This was the Story told and approved in the *Council*; but *Zonaras* ſaith, *they were two Jews who perſwaded* Jezid *to publiſh his Edict againſt Images, and that he dyed within the Year*; *and that his Son ſeeking to puniſh them, they were fled into* Iſauria, *where they met with* Leo *then a*

Concil. Nicen. 2. p. 347. ed. Labb.
p. 349.
p. 370.
p. 383.
p. 386.
Zonar Annal. Tom. 3. p. 84.

young Man to whom they foretold the Empire, and made him promiſe them that when he came to it, he would do one thing for them: Which one thing proved to be the Deſtruction of Images; and they challenging their Promiſe when he was now Emperor gave the occaſion to the terrible Perſecution of Images. *Cedrenus* ſaith, *That a few Years before the Reign of* Leo, *ſome Jews of* Laodicea *in* Phœnicia *went to* Jezid, *and obtained the Edict againſt Images*, and then he tells the reſt of the Story, as *Zonaras* did. *Theophanes* ſaith, *It was but one Jew of* Laodicea, *and that* Jezid *died before the Edict was Publiſhed in all Parts of his Dominions*, and ſaith, *this was in the ſeventh Year of the Empire of* Leo. *Conſtantius Manaſſes*, and *Michael Glycas* only mention *the Jews foretelling the Empire to him, and putting him upon the Deſtruction of Images*, without the other Circumſtances. Let the Reader now judge whether this be not a probable Story; and purpoſely invented to caſt the odium of rejecting the worſhip of Images on the *Jews* and *Saracens*, as though it could never have come from any *Chriſtian*. *It was one Jew*, ſaith the Vicar of the *Oriental Biſhops*; they were *two Jews or more*, ſay the *Greek Hiſtorians*. It was a *Jew* of *Tiberias*, ſaith *John*; *No*, ſaith *Cedrenus*, *they were two Jews of* Laodicea; *but one* ſaith *Theophanes*. *Theſe Jews met with* Leo *when he was a young Man, and foretold the Empire to him*, ſay *Zonaras*, *Manaſſes* and *Glycas*; *but a few Years before the Reign of* Leo, ſaith *Cedrenus*; *nay*, ſaith *Theophanes*, *it was in the ſeventh Year of* Leo; *in the eighth*, ſaith *Baronius*, *for* Jezid *did not Reign before*. Was there ever a more conſiſtent Story than this? But the Author of the late Hiſtory of the *Iconoclaſts*, thinks he hath found out a *Salvo* for theſe Contradictions. For he makes *two ſeveral Edicts under two* Jezids *that were* Chaliphs; *the former of the two Jews about* A. D. 686. *who were the Men that foretold the Empire to* Leo; *and the other of* Sarantapechys *to* Jezid *the ſecond in the time of* Leo; this he hath borrowed from the *French Author*, as he hath done all his Quotations (and I much queſtion by his manner of citing them, whether he ever ſaw the Books he quotes in his Life.) But this is ſaid without the leaſt Shadow of Proof; for no one of all the *Hiſtorians* ever mention *two Edicts* of the *ſeveral Jezids*; but all pretend to tell the very ſame Story. And it is probable that the *two Jews* who foretold the *Empire* to *Leo*, A. D. *686.* ſhould come to *Conſtantinople* to *Leo*, after *A. D.* 723. when *Leo* began to oppoſe Images, meerly with a Deſign to extirpate Images, without propoſing any other Advantage to themſelves by the Emperor, as the *Greek Hiſtorians* ſay? *Credat Judæus*. They are a ſort of People, that know how to improve ſuch an Advantage to better Purpoſes; and their zeal againſt Images was never ſo great as the love of their own Profit. But our *Engliſh Hiſtorian* is not content with the Fables of the *Greeks*; but he makes more of his own. For, he ſaith, *Theſe were Samaritan Sectaries, who were more preciſe than the reſt of the Jews, and were much troubled at the Cherubims in the Temple, and more at the reſpect which the Chriſtians tendered to the Images of Chriſt and his Saints.* I never ſaw a more pitiful Pretender to Hiſtory than this Author; who, if he offers to add to, or vary from his *Original*, he makes the Matter worſe than he found it. For not one of his Authors in the Margin, ſay they were *Samaritans* but only *Hebrews*, as *Zonaras*, and *Cedrenus*; his other Authors *Elmacinus*, and the *Chronicon Orientale* have not one word about it, where they mention *Jezid* the *Chaliph* of

Cedren. hiſt. To. 1. *p.* 450.

Theoph. Chronog. p. 336.

Conſt. Manaſſ. p. 86. *Mic. Glyc. Annal. part.* 4. *p.* 281.

Baron. A. 723. *n.* 17, 21. Hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts, *p.* 28, 33.

of *Arabia*. And yet granting they were *Samaritans*, there is not the leaſt ground for his ſaying, *they were more preciſe in this matter of Images than the reſt of the Jews*; for *Epiphanius* himſelf, whom he quotes, ſuſpects them of *ſecret Idolatry in Mount Gerizim*, and the *Jews* generally charge them with it; for they ſay, they worſhip the *Image of a Dove on Mount Gerizim*; which *Maimonides* affirms of them with great Confidence, and *Obadias Bartenora*, with ſeveral others. It was therefore very unhappy for this *Hiſtorian* to pitch upon the *Samaritan Sectaries* of all others, as the *Beginners* of the Hereſie of the *Iconoclaſts*. And was it not luckily done to begin a Hiſtory with ſo palpable a Falſhood? But this was a pretty Artifice to poſſeſs his Reader at the Entrance, that none but *Samaritan Sectaries* could be Enemies to the Worſhip of Images; which he knew to have been the Method of the ſecond *Council* of *Nice*: Only he purſued it with greater Ignorance than they.

Epiphan. l. 1. *hæreſ. Samarit.* P. 25.

Exercit. Anti-Morin. Sect. 16.

2. By *fabulous Stories* and lying *Miracles*. Of the former we have many Inſtances in the Actions of that *famous Council*; but I ſhall only mention that out of the *Limonarion* of the pretended *Sophronius* about the *Spirit* of *Fornication* haunting a Monk who had an *Image* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*; to whom the Devil ſaid, *If thou wilt not worſhip that Image, I will trouble thee no more.* But the Devil would not tell him this great Secret till he had ſolemnly promiſed him, he would reveal it to no body. The Monk next day told it to the Abbot *Theodore*, who aſſured him *he had better go into all the Stews in the City, than leave off the Worſhip of that Image*; with which the Monk went away much comforted. But the Devil ſoon after charged him with Perjury; the Monk replied, *he had forſworn to God and not to him.* Upon which *John Vicar* of the *Oriental Biſhops*, ſaid, *It was better to forſwear ones ſelf, than to keep an Oath for the deſtruction of Images*. And concerning Miracles, it is obſervable, that *Taraſius* confeſſes, *That their Images did work none in their Days: Becauſe Miracles were for Unbelievers*; and yet *Manzo* a *Biſhop* there preſent, ſaith, *He was cured of a Diſeaſe by laying an Image of Chriſt upon the part affected. Bellarmin* and *Baronius* ſay, the *Miracle* of the *Image* at *Berytus* was done in thoſe times; and yet after the reading the ſtory (which made the good Fathers weep) *Taraſius* ſaith thoſe words, which make this Story, by comparing theſe circumſtances together, appear a meer *Fabulous Impoſtor*. For in the Council of *Nice*, the Story is reported as written by S. *Athanaſius* near four hundred Years before; but not only thoſe Authors but *Sigebert* ſaith it was done *A. D.* 765. and *Lambecius* undertakes to prove that this Story was never written by S. *Athanaſius*. But moſt remarkable is the Paſſage which *Eutychius* the Patriarch of *Alexandria* relates concerning the occaſion of *Theophilus* the Emperor's extirpating *Images* out of Churches. *One of the Courtiers had told him there was an Image of the Bleſſed Virgin, from whoſe Breaſts there dropt Milk upon her Day; but Search being made the Cheat was diſcovered, the Church Officers executed, and all Images prohibited*. If all the Impoſtors of this kind were dealt with after the ſame manner, there would be *fewer pretences to Miracles* wrought by Images than there are.

Concil. Nicen. 2. *act.* 4. *p.* 251.

p. 223.

p. 258.

Bell. de ſcript. Eccleſ. in Athanaſ. Baron. ad A. 787. *n.* 29.

Sigeb. Chron. ad A. 765. *Lambec. Comment. de Biblioth. Vindobon. l.* 1. *p.* 124, &c. *Eutychii An. To.* 2. *p.* 448.

3. By crying up thoſe for Martyrs, who ſuffered for the *worſhip of Images*, and oppoſing the *Imperial Edicts* for pulling them down. Thus Pope *Gregory* 2. in his Epiſtle to *Leo* magnifies the Zeal of the *Women*

Greg. 2. *ep.* 1. *ad Leon.*

who killed the Emperor's Officer who was ſent to demoliſh the Image of Chriſt called Antiphoneta, and afterwards ſuffered themſelves for the Tumult they raiſed in the City. But this was not the only Act of Zeal in the Women in this *good Cauſe*; for as *Baronius* relates it, out of the Acts of *Stephanus* extant in *Damaſcene*'s Works, *When a new Patriarch was ſet up in the room of* Germanus, *they ſhook off all Modeſty, and ran into the Church, and threw Stones at the Patriarch, and called him Hireling, Wolf, and what not.* One need not wonder at the mighty Zeal of the Women in this Cauſe, for as Pope *Gregory* notably obſerves on behalf of Images, *the Women were wont to take the little Children in their Arms, and ſhew them this and the other Image*; which contributed mightily to the Infallibility of *Oral Tradition*: When the Women and Nurſes could point with their Fingers to the Articles of Faith elegantly expreſſed in Pictures, which the Children did delight to look upon. The great number of Martyrs in this Cauſe, of which *Baronius* glories, conſiſted chiefly of Women and Monks, who were the moſt zealous Champions in it. And the late *Hiſtorian* can hardly abſtain from making the *Empreſs Irene* a *Martyr* in this Cauſe; for in his *Epiſtle* to the *Queen* (a *Lady* of ſo incomparably greater *Vertue* and *Goodneſs*, that it is an affront to her *Majeſty* to commend ſuch an one to her *Protection)* he had the boldneſs to tell her *that the only imputation which aſſaults thoſe Princeſſes repute* (viz. *Irene and Theodora) was their Piety in reſtoring the Religious Uſe and Veneration of Holy Images to the Eaſtern Empire.* What can be expected from ſuch an *Hiſtorian*, who durſt in the face of the World tell her *Majeſty* ſo impudent a falſhood? For *Zonaras*, *Cedrenus*, *Glycas*, *Theophanes*, *Conſtantinus Manaſſes*, although *Friends* to the *Worſhip of Images*, yet all accuſe *Irene of Intolerable Ambition and Cruelty* to her *Son*, the *Emperor Conſtantine*, and to all his *Kindred*. Nay *Baronius* himſelf (who minceth the matter as much as may be) ſaith, *That if ſhe uſed thoſe Cruelties to her Son, out of a deſire of Empire,* as the *Greek Hiſtorians* ſay ſhe did, *ſhe was worſe than* Agrippina: but *Conſt. Manaſſes*, as zealous as any for *Images*, makes her *worſe than a Tiger, or Lion, or Bear, or Dragon for her Cruelty; and he can think of no Parallel for her among Women but* Medea. And was not this an Excellent *Confeſſor* at leaſt, if not a *Martyr* in this Cauſe? a *Perſon* fit to be commended to her *Majeſties Protection, as one that ſuffered only under the Imputation of her zeal for Images?* But if any be given up to *believe Lyes*, ſome muſt be firſt given up *to tell them*. And if this doughty Hiſtorian hath any *Honour* or *Conſcience* left, he ought to beg her *Majeſty*'s Pardon, for offering ſuch an Affront to her. But what had *Queen Mary* deſerved at his Hands, that in his *Key* to his *Hiſtory*, he ſhould compare her to the *Empreſs Irene?*

Baron. ad A. 726. n. 12.

Greg. 2. ep. 2.

Hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts Epiſtle Dedicat. *p.* 3. 5.

Zonar. Annal. To. 4. *p.* 97. *Cedern. p.* 473. *Glyc. p.* 285. *Theop. p.* 398. *Manaſſ. p.* 90, 91. *Baron. ad A.* 796. *n.* 8

Pref. p. 21.

4. By *pretending to Antiquity*. This might juſtly be wondred at in ſo clear Evidence to the contrary, as I have made to appear in this Matter: But however, among the *Ignorant and Superſtitious Multitude*, the very pretending to it goes a great way. Thus the *Patriarch Germanus* boaſted of *Fathers and Councils for Image-worſhip to the Emperor Leo*; but what *Fathers*, or *Councils* did the *aged Patriarch* mean? Why did he not name and produce them to ſtop the *Emperor*'s proceedings againſt *Images? Baronius* confeſſeth, *there were no Councils which had approved the Worſhip of Images by any Canon; but becauſe they never condemned it, being conſtantly practiſed, it was ſufficient.* All the miſchief is,

Acta Steph Jun. apud Damaſcen

Baron. ad A. 726. *n.* 6.

is, this *conſtant Practice* is as far from being proved as the *Definition of Councils*. If the *Picture* Chriſt *ſent to* Abgarus *King of Edeſſa*, or thoſe drawn by St. *Luke*, or the forged *Canon* of the *Council* of *Antioch*; or the counterfeit *Authority* of St. *Athanaſius* about the Image at *Berytus*; if ſuch Evidences as theſe will do the Buſineſs; they have abundance of *Antiquity* on their ſide: But if we be not ſatisfied with theſe, they will call us *Hereticks*, or it may be, *Samaritan Sectaries*, and that is all we are to expect in this Matter.

5. The *Council of Nice* had a Trick beyond this, *viz. Burning, or Suppreſſing* all the *Writings* that were againſt them. The *Pope's Deputies* in the Fifth *Action* made the *Motion*, which was received and *conſented* to by the *Council*: and they made a *Canon* to that purpoſe, *That all Writings againſt Images ſhould be brought in to the Patriarch* of Conſtantinople, *under pain of Anathema if a Laick, or Depoſition, if in Orders* (and this without any Limitation as to *Authors or Time,) and there to be diſpoſed of among Heretical Books*. So that it is to be wondred, ſo much *Evidence* ſhould yet be left in the *Monuments of Antiquity* againſt the *Worſhip of Images*.

Concil. Nic 2. *Act.* 5. *p.* 387. *Concil. Nic. Can.* 9

§. 7. As to what concerns the matter of *Argument* for the *Worſhip of Images* produced in this *Age*, I muſt leave that to its proper Place; and proceed to the laſt *Period*, as to this *Controverſie*, which is neceſſary for diſcerning the *Hiſtory* and the *State* of it, *viz*.

4. *When the Doctrine and Practice of Image-worſhip* was ſettled upon the *Principles* allowed and defended in the *Roman Church*. Wherein I ſhall do theſe two things.

1. I ſhall ſhew what *Additions* have been to this *Doctrine* and *Practice* ſince the *Nicene Council*.

2. Wherein the preſent *Practice* of *Image-worſhip* in the *Roman Church* doth conſiſt, and upon what *Principles* it is defended.

1. For the *Additions* that have been made in this matter ſince the *Nicene Council*. And thoſe lie eſpecially in two Things.

1. In making *Images* of *God* the *Father*, and the *Holy Trinity*. 2. In the *manner* of *Worſhip* given to *Images*.

1. In making *Images* of *God* the *Father* and the *Trinity*. It is eaſie to obſerve how much the moſt earneſt Pleaders for *Images* did then abhor the making of any *Image of God*. So *Gregory* 2. in his Epiſtle to *Leo* ſaith expreſly, *They made no Images of God, becauſe it is impoſſible to paint or deſcribe him; but if we had ſeen or known him, as we have done his Son, we might have painted and repreſented him too, as well as his Son. We make no Image or Likeneſs of the inviſible Deity*, ſaith the *Patriarch Germanus, whom the higheſt Orders of Angels are not able to comprehend. If we cannot paint the Soul*, ſaith *Damaſcen, how much leſs can we repreſent God by an Image, who gave that Being to the Soul which cannot be painted? What Image can be made of him, who is Inviſible, Incorporeal, without Quantity, Magnitude, or Form? We ſhould err indeed*, ſaith he, *if we ſhould make an Image of God who cannot be ſeen; and the ſame he repeats in other Places, who is there, in his Senſes*, ſaith *Stephanus* Junior, *that would go about to paint the Divine Nature, which is Immaterial and Incomprehenſible? For if we cannot repreſent him in our Minds, how much leſs can we paint him in Colours?* Now theſe *Four, Gregory, Germanus, Damaſcen*, and *Stephanus* were the moſt renouned Champions for the *Defence of Images*; and did certainly ſpeak the Senſe of the *Church* at that

Greg. 2. *ep. ad Leon. Aug.*

German. epiſt. ad Joh. Synad in act. 4. *Concil. Nic. p.* 291

Damaſcen. orat. 1. *de Imag. p.* 747. *Orat.* 2. *p.* 759. *Orat.* 3. *p.* 767, 768

Acta Steph Jun. apud Damaſ. p. 805.

that time: To the ſame purpoſe ſpeak *Joh. Theſſalonicenſis*, *Leontius*, and others in the *Nicene Council*. The Greek Author of the Book of the Uſe of *Images* according to the Senſe of the *Second Council of Nice* (publiſhed by *Morellius* and *Fronto Ducæus*) goes farther, for he ſaith, *That no Images are to be made of God, and if any Man go about it, he is to ſuffer Death as a Pagan.* By which it appears that according to the Senſe of this *Council*, the making any *Images of God* was looked on as a part of *Heathen Idolatry*. But when a Breach is once made, the Waters do not ſtop juſt at the Mark which the firſt Makers of the Breach deſigned: Other Men thought they had as much reaſon to go a little farther, as they had to go thus far. Thence by degrees the *Images of God the Father*, and the *Holy Trinity* came into the *Roman Church*, and the making of theſe Images defended upon Reaſons which ſeemed to them as plauſible, as thoſe for the *Images of Chriſt* upon his appearing in our *Nature*; for ſo God the Father might be repreſented not in his Nature, but as he is ſaid to have appeared in the *Scriptures*. *Baronius*, in his Marginal Notes on the Epiſtle of *Gregory*, ſaith, *Afterwards it came into uſe to make Images of God the Father, and of the Trinity; not that they fall under our View, but as they appeared in Holy Writ; for what can be Deſcribed, may be Painted*; to the ſame Purpoſe he ſpeaks in another place. It ſeems then by the Confeſſion of *Baronius*, no *Images* of God the *Father* were in uſe then, becauſe they did not think them Lawful; *when they firſt came into uſe*, Chriſtianus Lupus profeſſes, *that he knows not*; *but*, he ſaith, *There were none ſuch in the Roman Church in the time of* Nicolaus 1. But *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, and *others*, produce an Argument for the *Lawfulneſs* of them, from the *general Practice of their Church, which*, they ſay, *would not have ſuffered ſuch an univerſal Cuſtom, if ſuch Images had been Unlawful.* Bernardus Pujol, *Profeſſor of Divinity in Perpignan*, ſaith, *not only that the Images of the Trinity are univerſally received among Catholicks, but that they are allowed by the Council of* Trent, *and doth ſuppoſe the uſe of them as a thing certain and undoubted*; *and* ſaith, *that ſuch Images are to be Worſhipped. For*, ſaith he, *as the Mind is excited by the Image of Chriſt, or the Saints, ſo may Devotion be raiſed by ſuch an Image of the Deity.* Yſambertus ſaith, *That they who give Caution concerning the doing of a thing, as the Council of* Trent *doth about the Images of God, are to be underſtood to approve the thing it ſelf*: And he ſaith, *The Opinion about the Lawfulneſs of ſuch Images is ſo certain, that to ſay otherwiſe is Raſhneſs; and the common Practice of the Church for a long time hath been to have ſuch Images in Churches, and they were never reproved either by the Pope, or ſo much as a Provincial Synod.* *Vaſquez* goes farther, ſaying, *That the Lawfulneſs of Images of the Trinity is proved by the moſt frequent Practice of the Church, which commonly at* Rome *and other Places, doth ſet forth the Image of the Trinity to be Worſhipped by the People.* *Arriaga* ſaith, *That it is ſo certain that theſe Images are Lawful, that to ſay to the contrary is not only Raſhneſs, but a plain Errour; for God cannot be ſuppoſed to ſuffer his Univerſal Church to err in a matter of ſuch Moment.* *Tannerus* aſſerts, *That it is not only Lawful to make Images of God and the Trinity, but to propoſe them as Objects of Worſhip; which*, he ſaith, *is the common Opinion of their Divines, and he proves it*, as the reſt do, *from the Practice of their Church, and the Council of* Trent. *Neither are ſuch Images*, ſaith Cajetan, *only for ſhew, as the Cherubims were in the Temple; but they are ſet up that they may be Worſhipped, as the Practice of the Church ſhews.*

Conc. Nic. 2. *act.* 4, 5, 6, 7. *Biblioth. Patrum Gr. Lat. To.* 1. *p.* 737.

Baron. ad A. D. 726. *n.*

Ad A. 765. *n.* 8.

Chriſtian. Lup. not. in Canon. Conc. Sept. diſſert. c. 5. *p.* 1175.

Bell. de Imag. l. 2. *c.* 8.

Pujol de ſacr. Adora. cultu diſp. 3. *ſect.* 4 *p.* 250, 252.

Yſambert. de Myſter. Inc. ad q. 25. *diſp.* 2. *art.* 6.

Vaſq. ad 3. *Aq. diſp.* 103. *c.* 3.

Arriaga ad 3. *Th. diſp.* 5. *ſect.* 1.

Tann. To. 3. *diſp.* 5. *q.* 2. *dub.* 3.

Suar. in Aq. 3. *p. To.* 1. *q.* 25. *diſp.* 54. *ſect* 2.

Cajet. in Aq. 3. *q.* 25. *act.* 3.

In the *Proceſſionale* of *Sarum*, I find a *Rubrick* for *the incenſing the Image of the Holy Trinity:* which clearly manifeſts the Practice of *worſhipping the Image* of the *Trinity*.

Proceſſion. ſecund. uſum Sarum 1555. *fol.* 16.

Now in this matter, I ſay, there is a plain *Innovation* ſince the ſecond *Nicene Council*, which thought ſuch *Images* utterly *unlawful*, as *Petavius* proves, from the Teſtimonies before-mentioned.

Petav. de Incar. l. 15 *c.* 14. *n.* 1.

§. 8.

T. G. *p.* 115.

But *T. G.* ſaith, *That* Germanus *and* Damaſcen, and conſequently the reſt, *only ſpake againſt ſuch Images, as are ſuppoſed to repreſent the Divinity in it ſelf*; *with whom they fully agree in this matter, and think all ſuch Images of the Divinity unlawful.* To which I anſwer, (1.) This is plainly contrary to their meaning; for they ſhew that it was unlawful to make any Image of God till the *Incarnation of Chriſt*, as might be at large proved from all their *Teſtimonies.* Now this Aſſertion would ſignifie nothing, if they thought it lawful to make any Image of God from the manner of his *Appearances.* For then it was as lawful to make Images of God before as after the *Incarnation of Chriſt.* And one of the Arguments of *Damaſcen* and the reſt for the Images of Chriſt, although he were God, was *to ſhew the reality of his Humane Nature*, againſt thoſe who ſaid he took only the *appearance* of it. But if an *appearance* of *God* were ſufficient ground for an Image, then this Argument did prove nothing at all. And yet the *Council* of *Nice* lays ſo great weight upon it, as to conclude thoſe who reject Images to deny the *reality* of *Chriſt's Humane Nature.* They went therefore upon this Principle, that no meer appearance is a ſufficient ground for the Image of a Perſon; for in caſe it be a meer appearance, the repreſentation that is made is only of the Appearance it ſelf, and not of the *Perſon* who never aſſumed that *likeneſs*, which he appeared in, to any *Perſonal Union*; but ſay they, when the Humane Nature was *perſonally united* to the *Godhead*, then it was lawful to make a *repreſentation* of that *Perſon* by an Image of his *Humane Nature.* How far this will hold, as to an Object of *Divine Worſhip*, muſt be diſcuſſed afterwards, but from hence it appears, that they did not ſpeak only againſt ſuch Images which repreſent the *Divinity in it ſelf*, but againſt ſuch as were made of any *appearance* of him. And it is obſervable that the ancient *Schoolmen*, ſuch as *Alexander Hales*, *Aquinas*, *Bonaventure* and *Marſilius*, do all agree that any *Repreſentation* of *God* was forbidden before the *Incarnation of Chriſt*; from whence it follows, that they could not think any *Repreſentations* of God from his *Appearances* to have been lawful under the Law. And there can be no reaſon given why the *Repreſentation* of *God* from an *Appearance* ſhould have been more unlawful then, than under the *Goſpel.* (2.) This would only hold then againſt *Anthropomorphites*, or thoſe who ſuppoſed the *Divinity* to be *really like their Images*; of which ſort I have ſhewn how very few there were among the Heathens themſelves; and if this had been their Meaning, they ſhould not have made all Images of God unlawful, but have given them Cautions not to think the *Divinity* to be like them. But whatever the Conceptions of Men were, they declare in general, *all Images of God to be unlawful*; which the *Church* of *Rome* is ſo far from doing, that the *Council* of *Trent* allows ſome kind of *Repreſentations* of *God* from his *Appearances*; and the conſtant Practice of that Church ſhews, that they picture *God* the *Father* as an *Old Man*, not only in their *Books*, but in *Places* of *Worſhip*, and with a de-

Alex. Hales p. 3. *q.* 30. *m.* 3. *art.* 3. *Aquin. p.* 3. *q.* 25. *a.* 3. *reſp. adj. Bonav. l.* 3. *d.* 9. *q.* 2. *Marſ. l.* 3. *q.* 8. *a.* 2.

Conc. Trident. ſeſſ. 25. *de Imag.*

a deſign to worſhip Him under that *Repreſentation*; which was a thing the great *Patrons* of *Images* in the time of the ſecond *Council* of *Nice* profeſſed to abhor. (3.) Thoſe *Images* of *God* which are allowed in the *Roman Church* are confeſſed by their own Authors to be apt to induce Men to think *God to be like* to them. *Joh. Heſſelius*, a *Divine* of great Reputation in the *Council* of *Trent*, confeſſes, *That from the Images of God in Humane Shape Men may eaſily fall into the Error of the* Anthropomorphites; *eſpecially the more ignorant, for whoſe ſake eſpecially thoſe Images are made.* It being not ſo eaſie for them to underſtand *Metaphorical* and *Analogical Repreſentations*; but it being very natural for them to judge of things according to the moſt common and ſenſible Repreſentations of them. And if they were all *Anthropomorphites* in the *Roman Church*, I wonder what other Repreſentation they could make of *God* the *Father* than that which is uſed and allowed, and worſhipped among them. If there be then ſo much Danger in that Opinion as *T. G.* intimates, how can that Church poſſibly be excuſed, that gives ſuch Occaſions to the People to fall into it? *He that goes about to expreſs the inviſible Nature of God by an artificial Image, ſins grievouſly, and makes an Idol*, ſaith *Sanders*; but how is it poſſible for a Man to expreſs the *inviſible Nature of God* by an *Image*, otherwiſe than it is done in the *Church* of *Rome*? How did the *Heathens* do it otherwiſe according to T. G. than by making the *Image* of *God* in the *Likeneſs* of *Man*? *But* T. G. ſaith, *Men may conceive the Deity otherwiſe than it is, and ſo go about to make an Image to repreſent it, which is Folly and Madneſs*, and ſo it is to make ſuch an Anſwer; for then all the *Folly* and *Madneſs* in making the groſſeſt *Images* of *God* doth not lie in the *Images* themſelves, but in the *Imagination* of the *Perſons* that make them. Is it not as great in thoſe that worſhip them with ſuch an *Imagination*? If it be, then whatever the Deſign of the Makers was, if they be apt to beget ſuch *Imaginations* in thoſe who ſee and worſhip them, they are in that reſpect as unlawful as *T. G.* ſuppoſes any *Images* of *God* among the *Heathens* to have been. (4.) What doth *T. G.* mean, when he makes thoſe *Images unlawful which repreſent the Divinity in it ſelf, and not thoſe which repreſent God as he appeared*? Can the meer *Eſſence* of any thing be repreſented by an *Image*? Is it poſſible to repreſent any Being otherwiſe than as it appears? But it may be *T. G.* hath found out the way of *painting Eſſences*; (if he hath, he deſerves to have the Patent for it, not only for himſelf, but for his Heirs and Executors.) For he allows it to be the peculiar Privilege of an *Infinite Being that it cannot be repreſented as it is in it ſelf*; then all other things may be repreſented *as they are in themſelves*, in oppoſition to the manner of their Appearance; or elſe the diſtinction ſignifies nothing. *Petrus Thyræus*, a Man highly commended by *Poſſevin* for his Explication of this Matter, ſaith, *The meaning is, that an Image doth not repreſent the Nature, but the Perſon that is viſible*; *for*, ſaith he, *When we ſee the Image of a Man, we do not ſay we ſee a Reaſonable Creature, but a Man.* Very well! And ſo in the Image of the *Deity* we do not ſee the *Divine Nature*, but the *Divine Perſon*, or in ſuch a way as he became *Viſible*. *The Inviſible Nature of God cannot be repreſented in an Image*; (and can the *Inviſible Nature* of Man?) *Therefore*, ſaith he, *it is no Injury to God to be* Painted *by an Image*, no more upon theſe Principles than to a Man. *Bellarmin* proves the Lawfulneſs of making *Images of God*, *becauſe Man is ſaid to be the*

Image

Heſſel. in Catech.

Sander. de honor. Imag. ador. c. 4.

Poſſevin. biblioth. l. 8. *c.* 16.

Bell. de Imag. l. 2. *c.* 8.

Image of God ; *and he may be painted, therefore the Image of God may be too*; *for that which is the Image of the Image is likewiſe the Image of the Exemplar, thoſe which agree in the third agreeing among themſelves.* To this ſome anſwered that Man was not the *Image* of *God* as to his *Body*, but as to his *Soul* which *could not be Painted*; but *Bellarmin* takes off this anſwer, by ſaying, *That then a Man could not be painted*; *for he is not a Man in regard of his outward Lineaments, but in regard of his Subſtance, and eſpecially his Soul*; *but notwithſtanding the Soul cannot be painted, yet a Man may truly and properly be ſaid to be painted, bebecauſe the Figure and Colours of an Image do repreſent the whole Man*; *otherwiſe*, ſaith he, *a thing painted could never ſeem to be the true Thing, as* Zeuxis *his Grapes did which deceived the Birds.* Therefore according to *Bellarnine's* reaſoning, That which repreſents a Being according to *outward appearance*, although it have an *inviſible Nature*, yet it is a *true* and *real Repreſentation*, and repreſents it *as it is in it ſelf*; and as far as it is poſſible for an *Image* to *repreſent* any thing. Wherein then lies the difference between making the *Picture* of a *Man*, and the *Image* of *God?* If it be ſaid, *That the Image of God is very ſhort, imperfect, and obſcure*, is not the ſame thing to be ſaid of the *Picture* of a *Man*, which can only repreſent his outward Features without any Deſcription of his inward *Subſtance* or *Soul?* If it be farther ſaid, *That there is a real Reſemblance between a Picture of a Man, and his outward Lineaments, but there is none between God and the Image of a Man.* Then I ask what *Bellarmin's* Argument doth ſignifie towards the proving the *lawfulneſs* of making an *Image* of *God?* For if *God* may be *painted* becauſe Man may, who is the *Image of God*; (for the *Image* of the *Image* is the *Image* of the *Exemplar*,) then it follows that Man is the *Image* of *God*, as *he may be painted*, and ſo *God* and *Man* muſt agree in that common thing which is a *capacity of being repreſented*, which cannot be ſuppoſed without as *real* a *reſemblance* between *God* and his *Image*, as between a *Man* and his *Picture*.

But T. G. tells us, *That they abhor the very thoughts of making any ſuch likeneſs of God, and all that the Council of* Trent *allows, is only making Repreſentations of ſome Apparition or Action of God in a way proportionable to our Humane Conception.* I anſwer (1.) It is no great ſign of *their abhorring the thoughts of any ſuch likeneſs of God*, to ſee ſuch Arguments made uſe of to prove the lawfulneſs of making *Images* of *God* which do imply it. (2.) Thoſe *Images* of *God* which are the moſt uſed and allowed in the *Roman Church*, have been thought by *Wiſe Men* of their *own Church* to imply ſuch a *Likeneſs*. *Molanus* and *Thyræus* mention four ſorts of *Images* of the *Trinity*, that have been uſed in the *Roman Church*. 1. That of an *Old Man* for *God* the *Father*, and of *Chriſt* in *Humane Nature*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt* in the *Form* of a *Dove*. 2. That of *three Perſons* of *equal Age and Stature*. 3. That of an *Image* of the *Bleſſed Virgin, in the Belly of which was repreſented the Holy Trinity*: This *Joh. Gerſon* ſaith *he ſaw in the Carmelites Church*; and ſaith, *there were others like it*; and *Molanus* ſaith, *he had ſeen ſuch a one himſelf among the Carthuſians*. 4. That *of one Head with three Faces, or one Body and three Heads*; which *Molanus* ſaith, *is much more common than the other, and is wont to be ſet before the Office of the Holy Trinity*; theſe *two latter* thoſe Authors do not allow, becauſe the former of them tends to a dangerous Errour, viz. *That the whole Trinity was Incarnate of the Bleſſed Virgin*, and the *latter*, *Molanus* ſaith, *was an Invention of the*

TG.p.69.

Molanus de Picturis, c. 3.
Thyræ. apud Poſſivin. biblioth. l. 8. *c.* 16.
Gerſon. ſerm. in nativit. Dom. To 4. p. 620.

Devil, (it ſeems then there was one Invention of the *Devil* at leaſt to be ſeen in the *Maſs-Book*;) *for*, ſaith he, *the Devil once appeared with three Heads to a Monk, telling him he was the Trinity.* But the two former they allow and defend; *Waldenſis*, ſaith *Molanus*, *with a great deal of Learning defends that of the three Perſons from the appearance of the Three to* Abraham; and *Thyræus* juſtifieth the firſt, and the moſt common from the *Authority* of the *Church*, the *Conſent* of *Fathers*, and the *Holy Scriptures.* And yet *Pope John* 22. as *Aventinus* relates it, *condemned ſome to the Fire as Anthropomorphites, and Enemies to Religion, for making the very ſame Repreſentation of the Trinity*, which he defends, being only *of God as an Old Man, and of the Son as a Young Man, and of the Holy Ghoſt under the picture of a Dove. Tſambertus* takes notice of this Story; but, he ſaith, *They were ſuch Images as were according to the Mind of the Anthropomorphites*; whereas *Aventinus* ſaith expreſly, *They were no other than ſuch as are uſed and allowed in the Roman Church*; by which *Tſambertus* ſaith, *There is no more danger of Mens being led into a falſe Opinion of God, than there is by the Scripture.* And upon this ground the danger doth not lie in *making* any *Repreſentations* of *God*, but in entertaining a falſe Opinion of thoſe *Repreſentations*; and the Scripture inſtead of forbidding Men to make any ſimilitude of God, ſhould only have forbidden Men to entertain any *erroneous Conceit* of any *Image* of him. But, *if the Church take care to prevent ſuch an Opinion*, as he ſaith ſhe doth, the other *Image with three Faces and one Head, or one Body and three Heads* might be juſtified on the ſame reaſon that the other is. Whereas the *Roman Catechiſm* ſaith, *That* Moſes *did therefore wiſely ſay, that they ſaw no ſimilitude of God, leſt they ſhould be led aſide by Errour, and make an Image of the Divinity, and give the Honour due to God to a Creature.* From whence it follows, that all Images that tend to ſuch an Errour are forbidden, and all Worſhip given to ſuch Images is *Idolatry.* And it is farther obſervable, that the Image allowed in the *Roman Church* for *God* the *Father* is juſt ſuch a one as S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *It is Wickedneſs for Chriſtians to make for God and to place in a Temple.* And I would deſire of *T. G.* to tell me what other Image of God the greateſt *Anthropomorphites* would make, than that which is moſt common among them? And if there be ſuch danger in Men's conceptions of a Deity from any Images of God, they give as much occaſion for it as ever any People did: So much, that all Men of any Ingenuity have cried Shame upon them, but to very little purpoſe. *Abulenſis, Durandus* and *Pereſius* are cited by *Bellarmin* himſelf, as *condemning any Images of God*: And which is obſervable, they do not condemn ſuch Images as repreſent God in *himſelf*, as T. G. ſpeaks, *but ſuch as were in uſe in the Roman Church. Durandus* ſaith, *It is a fooliſh thing either to make or to worſhip ſuch Images*, viz. *of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, after the former manner; and which is yet more, he quotes *Damaſcen* againſt this ſort of Images, ſaying, *That it was Impiety and Madneſs to make them*, and ſo doth *Pereſius* too. *Thuanus* mentions this Paſſage relating to this matter, that *A. D.* 1562. *The Queen Mother of* France *by the advice of two Biſhops and theſe three Divines*, Butillerius, Eſpencæus, *and* Picherellus, *declared, That all Images of the Trinity ſhould be taken out of Churches and other Places, as forbidden by Scripture, Councils, and Fathers:* And yet theſe were ſuch Images which *T. G.* pleads for; but this ſoon came to nothing, as all good Purpoſes of *Reformation* among them have ever done.

Waldenſ. To. 3. tit. 19. c. 155.

Avent. Annal. Boior. l. 7. *p.* 751.

Tſambert. de Myſt. Incarn. ad q. 25. *diſp.* 3. *art.* 7.

Catech. Rom. part. 3. *n.* 12.

Aug. de fide & ſymb. c. 7.

Durand. in ſent. l. 3. *diſt.* 9. *q.* 2. *n.* 15.

Pereſ. de tradit. part 3. *p.* 118. *ed Colon.*

Thuan. Hiſt. l. 28.

If it be ſaid, as it is by *Tſambertus*, *that theſe are not properly Images of God, but of his Appearance in a viſible Form,* I anſwer, (1.) This *Tſamb. ad q. 25. diſp. 3. art. 4.* doth not mend the Matter; for we are ſpeaking of an *Image* of the *Father* as a *Perſon* in the *Trinity*, and whatever repreſents him as ſuch muſt repreſent him as *he is in himſelf*, and not barely in regard of a temporary *Appearance*; and as to ſuch an Image of *God* the *Father*, *T. G*'s Diſtinction will by no means reach. (2.) It is the common Opinion of the *Divines* in the *Roman Church*, that all the *Appearances* *Vaſquez ad q. 25. diſq. 103. art. 3. c. 3.* of *God* in the *Old Teſtament* were not of *God* himſelf, but of *Angels* in his ſtead. And *Clichtovæus* gives that as a *Reaſon* why all *Repreſentations* of *God* were unlawful in the Old Teſtament; *becauſe all Appearances were by Angels*, and thoſe *Angels were no more united to the Forms they aſſumed, than a Man's Body is to his Garments* *Clitchtov. in Damaſc. l. 4. c. 17.*; from whence it muſt follow, that all Repreſentations of *God* by ſuch *Appearances* is ſtill unlawful. (3.) Suppoſe this be a *Repreſentation* only of ſome *Appearance* of *God*, and ſo not of what *God is*, but of *what he did*. I ask then on what account ſuch an effect of *Divine Power* is made the *Object* of *Divine Adoration*? For we have ſeen already by the Confeſſion of their moſt eminent *Divines*, that the *Images* of the *Trinity* are propoſed among them *as Objects of Adoration*; now ſay I, how comes a meer *Creature*, ſuch as that *Apparition* was, to become the *Object* of *Divine Worſhip*? *Durandus* well ſaw the conſequence of this Aſſertion; for when he had ſaid, *That thoſe Corporeal Forms which are painted are no Repreſentations of the Divine Perſon which never aſſumed them*, but only *of thoſe very Forms themſelves in which he appeared*; *therefore*, ſaith he, *No more Reverence is due to them than is due to the Forms themſelves.* When *God* appeared in the *burning Buſh*, that *Fire* was then an Effect of *Divine Power*, and deſerved no *Worſhip* of *it ſelf*; how then can the Image of the *burning Buſh* be an *Object* of *Divine Worſhip*? If God did appear to *Daniel* as the *ancient of Days*, it muſt be either Dan. 7. 9. by the *Impreſſion* of ſuch an *Idea* upon his *Imagination*, or by aſſuming the Form of an *Old Man*; but either way this was but a *meer Creature*, and had no ſuch Perſonal *Union* to the *Godhead* to deſerve *Adoration*; how much leſs then doth the Image of this *Appearance* deſerve it? So that I cannot ſee how upon their own *Principles* they can be excuſed from *Idolatry*, who give proper *Divine Worſhip* to ſuch Images as theſe. *He commits Idolatry*, ſaith *Sanders*, *that propoſes any* Sander. de honor. *Imag. adorat.* c. 4. *Image to be worſhipped as the true Image of the Divine Nature*: If this be *Idolatry*, what is it then to give the higheſt ſort of *Worſhip* to the meer Repreſentation of a *Creature*? For thoſe Images which only ſet forth ſuch Appearances, are but the *Creatures* of *Creatures*, and ſo ſtill farther off from being the Object of *Adoration*. So that notwithſtanding all *T. G*'s Evaſions and Diſtinctions, we find that as to this matter of the Images of God and the *Trinity*, the Church of *Rome* is not only gone off from *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, and *Antiquity*, but from the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the ſecond *Council* of *Nice* too.

2. I now come to the Additions that have been made to the §. 9. *Council* of *Nice* by the *Church* of *Rome* as to the manner of *Worſhip* given to Images. For which I muſt conſider,

1. What that *Worſhip* was which the *Council* of *Nice* did give to Images?

2. What Additions have been made to it ſince that Time?

1. What that Worſhip was which the *Council of Nice* did give to Images? which will appear by theſe two Things.

1. That it defined *true* and *real Worſhip* to be given to Images. 2. That it was an *Inferior Worſhip*, and not *Latria*.

1. That it defined *true and real Worſhip*, to be given to *Images*; *i. e.* that *Images* were not only to be Signs and Helps to Memory, to call to mind or repreſent to us the *Object of Worſhip*; but that the *Acts of Worſhip* were to be performed to the Images themſelves. The former uſe of Images doth ſuppoſe them to be only of the nature of Books, which repreſent things to our Minds without any act of *Adoration* performed to that which is only an Inſtrument of *Intellection*; although the thing repreſented to the Mind be a *proper Object of Adoration*. As, if by reading a Book an *Idea of God* is repreſented to my Mind whom I ought to worſhip, yet no Man can Imagine that from hence I ſhould fall down upon my Knees out of Honour to the Book, or with a deſign to worſhip it. When a Man reads his Prayers out of a Book, and makes uſe of that only as a means or inſtrument to help his Underſtanding, and direct his Expreſſions; no Man can have any colour of Reaſon to ſay that he worſhips the Book, which he uſes for a quite different purpoſe. It is the ſame caſe as to Images, when they are uſed for no other end but barely to repreſent to the Mind an object of Worſhip; as a *Crucifix* may do our *Saviour*; then it is no more than an external *Note* or *Character*, and hath the ſame uſe that *Words* have. But thoſe who go no farther than thus, Concil. Nicæn. 2. Act. 7. p. 555. ſtand condemned and Anathematized by the *Second Council of Nice*. For that not only determines *with a great deal of Aſſurance that Images are to be ſet up in Churches and Houſes, and Ways, in order to the Worſhip of them*; but very freely *Anathematizes* all ſorts of *Diſſenters* either in *Judgment or Practice*. p. 577. *Anathema be to all thoſe who do not Salute the Holy and Venerable Images: Anathema to all Hereticks: Anathema to thoſe that follow the Council againſt Images. Anathema to them that do not ſalute the Images of Chriſt and his Saints.* *Epiphanius* in the Sixth *Seſſion* declares this to be the ſenſe of the Council; *Thoſe who ſay that Images are to be had* Act. 6. p. 242. *only for Memory and not for Worſhip or Salutation, are half-wicked, and partly true and partly falſe, they are ſo far right as they are for Images, but they are in the wrong as they are againſt the Worſhip of them. O the folly of theſe Men!* ſaith *Epiphanius*. But this is not all, for as it was not ſufficient to have Images for helps to *Memory*, ſo neither was it to give them ſome kind of *Honour* or *Reverence*; nothing but *Worſhip* would ſatisfie them. So the *Patriarch Taraſius*, ſaith in plain terms, *they who pretend to honour Images, and not to worſhip them, are guilty of* Act. 4. p. 247. *Hypocriſie, and Self-contradiction. For Worſhip*, ſaith he, *is a Symbol and Signification of Honour, therefore they who deny to worſhip them, do diſhonour them.* This was the *Patriarchal* way of arguing in this famous Council. And this he proves from the ſaying of *Anaſtaſius* Biſhop of *Theopolis*, *Let no Man be offended with the name of Adoration or Worſhip, for we worſhip Men and Angels, but do not ſerve them, and Worſhip is an Expreſſion of Honour.* And it would do one good at Heart, to ſee how all the *Reverend Fathers* clap their Hands for Joy at the ſubtle *Criticiſm* which it ſeems that Biſhop had diſcovered, viz. *that when our Saviour ſaid, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God and him Only ſhalt*

thou ſerve, that Only was not applyed to Worſhip but to Service. Mark that, cries the *Council, Only belongs to Service, and not to Worſhip, therefore although we may not ſerve Images, yet we may Worſhip them.* If the *Devil* had been ſo ſubtle, might not he have ſaid to our *Saviour*, Mark that, you are forbidden *Only to ſerve any elſe but God*, but you may *Worſhip me*, notwithſtanding that Command? The *Patriarch Taraſius* in his Epiſtle to *Conſtantine* and *Irene* expreſſes this Worſhip by the very ſame Word which is uſed to God; for, *when God ſaith, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve; he reſtrains Service to himſelf, but allows Worſhip to other things; therefore*, ſaith he, ὁμολογουμένως καὶ ἀναμφισβητήτως, *without the leaſt doubt or diſpute it is a thing acceptable and well-pleaſing to God, for us to worſhip and ſalute Images of Chriſt and the Bleſſed Virgin, and of the Holy Angels aud Saints. If any Man think otherwiſe, and have any doubt in his Mind, or any wavering*, περὶ τὴν τῶν σεπτῶν εἰκόνων προσκύνησιν, *about the Worſhip of the Venerable Images, the Holy and Oecumenical Synod hath Anathematized him; and what is an Anathema but a Separation from God?* And thus it becomes no leſs than Damnation to doubt of the Worſhip of Images. O bleſſed Change! from what it was in the Primitive times, when it was Damnation to worſhip them. This Worſhip he expreſſes in the ſame Epiſtle by *Kiſſing*, by *Bowing*, by *Proſtration*; all which he ſhews from the Signification of the *Word*, and the uſe of it in *Scripture*. And in the Definition of the *Council*, among the Acts of *Worſhip*, are reckoned *the Oblation of Incenſe and Lights, becauſe the Honour of the Image paſſes to the thing repreſented by it.* So that all external Acts of *Adoration* were by the *Definition* of this *Council* to be performed to Images; and the ſame have been practiſed by the *Approbation* of the *Roman Church*; wherein this *Council of Nice* is received as a *General Council*, and appealed to by the *Council of Trent*, ſuppoſing the Decrees of that *Council* to be ſtill in force. In the *Conſtitutions* of *Thomas Arundel Arichbiſhop of Canterbury* made in the *Convocation* of the Biſhops and Clergy begun at *St. Pauls*, 14 *Jan. A. D.* 1408. we have a particular Enumeration of the ſeveral *Acts of Worſhip* which were required to be performed to Images; and the Places and Reliques of the *Saints*, viz. *Proceſſions, Genuflections, bowing of the Body, Thurifications, Deoſculations, Oblations, Burnings of Lights, and Pilgrimages, and all other Forms and Modes of Worſhip which have been practiſed in the times of our Predeceſſors or in our own*; and this not only the People were required to *Practiſe*, but *the Clergy to teach and preach up the Worſhip of the Croſs and other Images with theſe acts of Adoration.* And this *Conſtitution* is extant in *Lyndwood* as part of the *Canon Law* then in Force; who in his Notes upon it, obſerves, *that offering Incenſe was a Sacrifice, as it was burnt upon the Altar, and a part of Latria, and therefore* he ſaith, *the ſame Incenſe was not uſed to the Clergy and People with that burnt upon the Altar, but of another ſort which was not conſecrated.* In the Records of the *Tower* is extant the Form of *Renunciation* impoſed on the *Lollards*, wherein are theſe Words concerning the *Worſhip of Images*, **I do ſwear to God and to all his Seynts upon this Holy Goſpell, that fro this day forward I ſhall Worſhip Images, with praying and offering unto them in the worſchop of the Seynts that they be made after.** And yet after all this plain Evidence, ſome have had the confidence to tell us, that they hardly worſhip Images in the *Roman Church*, but praying to them they abhor and deteſt. What Conſcientious Men were thoſe then who

Act. 7. p. 785.

Act. 7. p. 555.

Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. 25.

Spelman. Concil To. 2. p. 653. 666.

Lyndwood Provinc. l. 5. tit. de hæret. p. 160. 2

Clauſ. 19. R. 2. Spelman. p. 655.

made the poor *Lollards* ſwear to do that which they forbid them to do? But ſurely the Biſhops and Clergy then underſtood the *Doctrine* and *Practices* of the *Roman Church* as well as *T. G.* and his Brethren do at this Day; and having Authority in their Hands, were not ſo cautious and reſerved in this matter as ſome think it for their Intereſt to be at preſent.

§. 10. And it is obſervable, that thoſe Learned Men in the *Roman Church* who have been moſt nice and ſcrupulous in this matter of the worſhip of Images, have yet agreed with the reſt in the Practice of the outward *Acts* of *Worſhip* towards them. So *Vaſquez* obſerves concerning *Durandus*, *Holcot*, and *Picus Mirandula*, who ſpeak the moſt ſuſpiciouſly among them about the *Worſhip* of *Images*, *That they agreed with the Catholick Church in performing all external Acts of Adoration to Images, and that they differed only in the manner of ſpeaking from the reſt; and that the main thing the Council of* Nice *determined was the real Acts of Worſhip to be performed to Images, leaving the ſeveral ways of explaining the manner of giving them, and the names of this Worſhip at greater Liberty.* The ſame Cardinal *Lugo* ſaith, *That theſe Men differed from Hereticks, becauſe theſe utterly refuſe giving external Acts of Adoration to Images, which they allowed.* *Suarez* confeſſes *that ſome of the Hereticks Condemned by the Council of* Nice *did maintain the Uſe of Images for Memory, which* he ſaith, *appears by the Acts of the Council; and that all Catholicks agree in this Propoſition,* Imagines eſſe adorandas, *That Images are to be worſhipped, although ſome,* he ſaith, *do ſo explain that Worſhip as to differ little or nothing from Hereticks.* So Durandus, ſaith he, *openly teacheth that Images are not to be worſhipped, but only* impropriè & abuſivè, *improperly and abuſively, becauſe at their Preſence we call to Mind thoſe Objects repreſented by them, which are worſhipped before the Images, as if they were preſent, and on this account the Images are ſaid to be worſhipped.*

Vaſquez. diſp. 106. c. 1.

Lugo de Myſter. Incarn. diſp. 36. Sect. 2.

Suarez. in 3. p. q. 25. diſp. 54. ſect. 1.

Durand. in ſent. 3. diſt. 9 q. 2

It will contribute much to the underſtanding the State of this *Controverſie*, to ſhew a little more particularly what the Opinion of theſe Men was, and how it is condemned by the reſt as *ſavouring of Hereſie*, and *repugnant* to the *Council* of *Nice*, and the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church*. *Durandus* goes upon theſe grounds, 1. That Worſhip properly belongs to him in whom the *cauſe* of that *Worſhip* is, and by *accident* may be given to that which hath only a relation to that which is the *Cauſe*. 2. In him to whom proper Worſhip is given, we are to conſider both the *Perſon* to whom it is given, and the *Cauſe* for which; Worſhip is only properly given to the *Perſon*, and not to any part of him; the *Cauſe* is that from which the *Excellency* of the Perſon ariſes. 3. That *Supreme Worſhip* or *Latria* is due only to *God* for it ſelf, by reaſon of his Deity, becauſe the *Cauſe* of his Honour is only in God; but by accident the honour of *Latria* may belong to other things; Now, ſaith he, a thing may have relation to *God* two ways. 1. When it goes to make up the *ſame Perſon*, as the *Humanity* of *Chriſt*. 2. When it hath only an *extrinſecal relation* to Him, as *Chriſt's Mother*, or his *Image*. 4. That the *Humane Nature* of *Chriſt* hath only by *accident* the *honour* of *Latria* given to it, as being *part* of that *Perſon* who is worſhipped, who is the *Son* of *God*; but the *Humanity* it ſelf is not properly that which is *worſhipped*, nor is the *Cauſe* or *Reaſon* of that Worſhip, but only of an Inferiour. 5. Of thoſe things which have only an *extrinſecal Relation* to *God*, this is to be held in general, that either they deſerve *no Worſhip at all of themſelves*, as the *Croſs* and *Images*, or other inanimate things; or if they do, as the *Bleſſed Virgin*, it is an *inferior Worſhip*; of the firſt he determines that no *manner* of *Worſhip* doth belong to *them*, no not to the *Croſs* it ſelf, upon the account of any *Excellency* or *Contract* of *Chriſt*, for which he gives this reaſon, *That which is no ſubject capable of Holineſs or Vertue, cannot in it ſelf be the term of Adoration*, but the *Croſs* on which Chriſt did hang, was not a *Subject* capable of *Holineſs*, &c. *Nunquam ergo cruci Chriſti debetur aliquis honor niſi in quantum reducit in rememorationem Chriſti*; no kind of Honour is due to the *Croſs*, but as it calls *Chriſt* to our *remembrance*. 6. That although the conception of the Mind be of the thing repreſented upon ſight of an *Image*, there is ſtill a *real difference* in the thing, and in the conception between the *Image* and the *thing repreſented*; and therefore properly ſpeaking, the *ſame Worſhip* is never due to the *Image* that is to the Object repreſented by it. *But*, ſaith he, *becauſe we muſt ſpeak as the moſt do, the Image may be ſaid to be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip with the thing repreſented, becauſe at the preſence of the Image we worſhip the Object repreſented by it as if he were actually preſent.*

n. 14.

Holcot in his *Lectures* on the *Book* of *Wiſdom*, ſaith, *That in a large Sence we may be ſaid to worſhip the Image, becauſe by the Image we call Chriſt to Mind, and worſhip him before the Image: And therefore*, ſaith he, *I think it fitter to ſay, that I do not worſhip the Image of Chriſt, becauſe it is Wood, nor becauſe it is the Image of Chriſt, but that I worſhip Chriſt before his Image*; but he by no means alloweth, *that Latria in any ſence be given to an Image of Chriſt*. 1. *Becauſe Latria is the Worſhip due only to God, but no Image is God; and therefore it is a Contradiction to ſay, that Latria is due only to God, and yet that it is due to the Image of Chriſt, and to Chriſt*. 2. *Then the ſame Worſhip would be due to Chriſt and to a Stone, or to Chriſt and to a Creature*. 3. *He that gives to any thing the worſhip of Latria, confeſſeth that to be God; therefore a Man may as lawfully ſay the Image is God, as that it may be worſhipped with Latria; and conſequently that ſomething which is not God is God. Joh. Picus Mirandula* gave this for one of his Concluſions, *That neither the Croſs, nor any other Image is to be worſhipped with Latria after the way of* Thomas: This Concluſion was condemned, and he forced to write an *Apology* for it: Where he ſaith, *That the way of* Thomas *is dangerous, for the Image as an Image is diſtinct from the thing repreſented, therefore if as ſuch it terminates the Worſhip of Latria, it ſeems to follow that ſomething which is not God is worſhipped with Latria*: And he declares, *that he agrees with* Durandus *and* Holcot; *but withal*, he ſaith, *that this Concluſion of his was condemned as Scandalous, and againſt the Cuſtom of the Univerſal Church.* Yet he concludes his *Apology*, with ſaying, *That if he had univerſally condemned the Worſhip of Images, his Propoſition had been Heretical.* From whence it appears, that theſe Perſons who did agree in the *Practice*, yet becauſe they ſaid the *Images were to be worſhipped only improperly and abuſively*, were not thought to believe or do what the *Church required.* Therefore *Suarez* ſaith, (1.) *That it is* de fide, *or an Article of Faith*, imagines eſſe adorandas, *that Images are to be worſhipped, and that to be owned not in any limited and improper ſenſe, but abſolutely and ſimply; which Article*, he ſaith, *is founded in the Tradition and Definitions of the Church, and he proves it by the conſtant Practice of the Church.* (2.) *That Images are to be worſhipped not abuſively*

Holcot in Sap. c. 13. Lect. 138. p. 424.

Joh. Pic. Mirand. Apolog. p. 103.

Suarez ib.

Barth. Medina 3. p. q. 25. a. 3.

and improperly, but verè & propriè, *truly and properly, and that the contrary Opinion of* Durandus *is dangerous, raſh, and ſavouring of Hereſy.* So he ſaith, *Medina determines it, who reports that* Victoria *ſaid it was Heretical; and this Concluſion* he ſaith, *is commonly received among the Modern Divines; and he proves it from the Definitions of Councils; eſpecially the Second Council of Nice*, which *hath defined it under an Anathema. But*, he adds, *if Images were only to be worſhipped abuſively and improperly, the Worſhip of them was rather ſimply to be denied than affirmed; for an improper and abuſive Worſhip is no Worſhip at all; and they were not to be condemned for Hereticks, who allow the uſe of Images for Memory, and only deny their Worſhip.* To which he ſubjoyns this Reaſon, *either the Image truly and in it ſelf, is at leaſt the material object of Worſhip, total, or partial, or it is not; if it be, the thing is granted; if not, then in plain terms, the Image is not worſhipped. For it is neither the formal nor the material object of Worſhip; but only the occaſion or ſign exciting Men to worſhip the thing repreſented. And according to this Opinion, the Hereticks would ſpeak more properly than the Catholicks. For he that at the ſight of a beautiful Creature is excited to praiſe or love the Creator, cannot be ſaid to praiſe or love the Creature, although the Preſence of the Creature did raiſe that Devotion. Therefore*, ſaith he, *the* Nicene *Council did condemn this Opinion, when it condemned thoſe who ſaid that Images did only ſerve for Memory, which in truth is all the uſe that Opinion allows them; and when the* Nicene *Council declares the Worſhip given to Images not to be Latria; for if no more Worſhip be allowed, but only worſhipping the object in preſence of the Image, then the moſt perfect Latria may be given to Chriſt before the Image; and conſequently the Worſhip in that abuſive and improper ſenſe may be Latria, which the Council denies: and farther the ſame Council ſaith, that not only the exemplar may be worſhipped in the Image, but that the Image is to be worſhipped for the ſake of the exemplar, by which it determines the Image to be the object of Worſhip, although the Reaſon of it be the thing repreſented.* (3.) *Suarez* ſaith, *That not only the external acts of Adoration are to be performed towards Images, but the very intention of Worſhip to be directed towards them: For even* Durandus *himſelf did allow the external acts to be done towards them, and becauſe the inward intention he ſaid was directed to the Exemplar, therefore he ſaid the Images were only ſaid abuſively to be worſhipped.* For which *Aſſertion Suarez* gives theſe Reaſons, (1.) *The external Act without the intention of the Mind is no proper Worſhip, but only counterfeit. And* Leontius, *quoted in the Council of* Nice, *ſaith, In all worſhip the inward Intention is required.* (2.) *From many Paſſages in that Council, implying that the Intention of Worſhip ought to be about the Images, becauſe they are ſaid to deſerve Worſhip, and from the ſayings of* Epiphanius, Baſilius, Adrianus, Taraſius *there extant, and* Elias Cretenſis, *who ſaith he did perfectly worſhip them, which could not be without the inward Intention. And from the Council of* Trent, *which calls it due Honour and Worſhip; but it cannot be any true Honour without the inward Intention.* (3.) *To perform the external Acts of Worſhip before an Image, is either to worſhip it, or not: if it be, then the inward Intention is granted; but ſince there may be a Diſtinction between the Intention of Worſhip, and the Intention of performing the external Acts of Worſhip; in order to Worſhip it is not only neceſſary to perform the material Acts, but to do them with the Intention of giving Worſhip by them. Neither is it enough to ſay, that* there is an inward Intention, but the outward Acts are towards the Image, and the inward Intention to the Exemplar, *For*, ſaith *Suarez*, *as true Worſhip doth eſſentially require the intention of Worſhip, ſo the Worſhip of this or that particular thing doth require a proportionable Intention towards that thing: and the Worſhip of one thing cannot be ſaid to be the Worſhip of another thing diſtinct from it, unleſs it be ſome way participated by it; but the Image is a diſtinct thing from the Exemplar, therefore the Worſhip of the Exemplar cannot be ſaid to be the Worſhip of the Image, unleſs the Image do partake of the Worſhip, and conſequently there muſt be an Intention of giving Worſhip to the Image. This,* ſaith he, *may be illuſtrated by an Example; If a Man kiſs the Ground out of a meer Intention of giving Worſhip to God thereby, he cannot truly and properly be ſaid to worſhip the Ground about which the material Action is converſant, but only God to whom he directed his Worſhip. And all this he confirms by more Paſſages out of the* Nicene *Council, which,* he ſaith, *was not ſo regardleſs about the manner and names of Worſhip as* Vaſquez *imagined, but took great care to expreſs it ſelf ſo that true and proper Worſhip be given to Images; which it defines under an Anathema; and although it uſeth other Words of Salutation, Honour,* &c. *yet it makes theſe æquivalent to that real Worſhip which it doth expreſly require. Ambroſ. Catharinus* ſaith, *that the Opinion of thoſe who ſay Images are not truly and properly to be worſhipped, but God to be worſhipped before an Images, differs very little from thoſe who deny any worſhip of Images, and is repugnant to the Practice of the Church becauſe we direct our Geſtures, our Words and Signs of Adoration to the Images, to which likewiſe we burn Incenſe: And we worſhip the Croſs, ſaying,* O Crux ave, ſpes unica, *&c.* And he proves at large by the *Second Council of* Nice, *that true and real Worſhip was required to be given to Images;* and concludes *that Images are not meerly for Inſtruction, or Memory, or exciting Devotion, but that they are ſet up properly for Worſhip. Therefore if any Man asks another,* Súntne adorandæ Imagines? intrepidè reſpondeant, adorandæ. *Are Images to be worſhipped? let him anſwer without fear, they are. Becauſe,* ſaith he, *Images being ſet apart by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt for ſuch a ſacred uſe, do obtain ſuch a degree of Sanctification, that whoever violates them is guilty of Sacrilege and Treaſon againſt the Divine Majeſty. For,* ſaith he, *God himſelf is moſt truly believed to be preſent in them after a particular manner, and he ſhews his Power and Prrſence by them, uſing them often for Oracles; that after this manner our Saviours ſaying is fulfilled,* I am with you to the end of the World. *And for the ſake of this peculiar Preſence of God which we ſenſibly perceive (and if I ſhould deny that I had done it my ſelf I ſhould be a Lyar and ungrateful) Images do deſerve a peculiar Adoration, but ſhort of Latria, becauſe they are ſanctified for ſuch ſpiritual Offices. Naclantus,* another *Italian Biſhop,* and an Eminent Divine in the *Council of Trent* as well as *Catharinus,* ſaith, *That it is needleſs Caution for any to ſay, that they worſhip before the Image,* ſed & adorare imaginem ſine quo volueris ſcrupulo, *but they may ſay it roundly, and without the leaſt ſcruple that they worſhip the Image.* Bellarmine ſaith, *That the Images of Chriſt and the Saints are to be worſhipped, not only by accident and improperly, but by themſelves and properly, ſo that they terminate the Worſhip, as they are conſidered in themſelves, and not barely as they repreſent the Exemplar:* which he proves from the *Definition* of the *Council of Nice,* and the ſame Reaſons which are mentioned from *Suarez* before. *Dominicus* Soto another great Divine of the *Council* of *Trent,* determines poſitively, *That Images are not intended by the Church only for helps to Memory; for we do not worſhip the Scriptures or Names of Saints, which call*

Cathar. de cultu & ador. Imag. p. 133

p. 137, 138 139.

Naclan. enarr. in Ep. ad Rom. c. 1. *p.* 171.

Bell. de Imag. l. 2. *c.* 21.

Soto de Inſtit. & jure l. 2. *q.* 3. *art.* 2. *in fin.*

them

them to our Minds; *but as to Images we ought to think otherwiſe*, *for they do not only raiſe our Minds to worſhip thoſe who are repreſented by them*, ſed eaſdem ipſas debemus adorare, *we ought to worſhip the Images themſelves*; *for*, ſaith he, *the Church doth not ſay*, *We worſhip thee*, O *Chriſt*, *but thy Croſs*, *and* O Crux ave, ſpes unica, *&c.* whoſe words are repeated and approved by *Ferd. Veloſillus. Bernardus Pujol* lays down this Aſſertion, *The Image truly and properly is the matter of Adoration*, *and the Worſhip truly and properly is terminated upon it* : *Which*, he ſaith, *is plain from the ſeventh Council and from ſeveral others*, *and thoſe are Anathematized who deny it. And the definitions of Councils being abſolutely put*, *are properly to be underſtood*: *Therefore the Worſhip is truly and properly to be terminated on the Image* : *And not only the external but the internal Worſhip is*, he ſaith, *to be terminated on the Image*, which he proves likewiſe from the *ſecond Nicene Council*, *wherein it is not only required that Men do the outward Acts of Worſhip*, *but that they do them with Love and Affection. And when*, ſaith he, *the Council of* Trent *mentions the external Acts*, *it implies that the internal Worſhip is terminated upon the Images*; *for the external Acts have not the nature of Worſhip*, *but as they are ſigns of internal Worſhip. And to ſay that the Worſhip is terminated improperly and abuſively on the Image*, *is to make the Councils to ſpeak improperly and abuſively* ; *and thoſe who ſay that Images are improperly worſhipped*, *do not only err in the manner of ſpeaking*, *but in the thing it ſelf. Tannerus* ſaith, Abſque hæſitatione fatendum, imagines non ſolum venerandas & colendas, ſed etiam adorandas eſſe; *that we ſhould ſay it without Heſitation*, *that Images are not barely to be honoured or reverenced*, *but to be adored*; *which he likewiſe proves from ſeveral paſſages of the* Nicene *Synod. Yſambertus* delivers his Senſe in theſe Particulars, 1. *That the Worſhip of the thing repreſented before the Image is not properly worſhip of the Image*, *nor agreeable to the Definitions of Councils. For that*, ſaith he, *is only properly worſhipped*, *which terminates the Worſhip*, *and the Councils define ſuch a Worſhip of Images*, *which is terminated upon the Images*; which he proves from the *Council* of *Trent* as well as *Nice*, *becauſe it requires ſuch acts of Worſhip*, *which are terminated on the Images.* 2. *Adoration may be directed to the Image*, *as to the thing which terminates it*, *and to the Exemplar as the reaſon of it*; for which, beſides the Reaſons given by others, he gives this, *viz. When there are two things good and lawful*, *and there is no poſitive Precept to do them together*, *then it is lawful to do one without the other*; *but in the act of worſhipping the Image with the Exemplar*, *there are two good Acts*, viz. *The worſhip of the Image*, *and of the Exemplar*, *and there is no Precept of the Church to join thoſe together*, *therefore it is lawful to do one without the other. Eligius Baſſæus* deſires it may be obſerved, *That in the Worſhip of the Image*, *not only the Object is worſhipped*, *which is repreſented by it*, *but alſo the Image it ſelf*, *ſeeing that is properly worſhipped which is the term of Adoration*, *or the matter to which it is directed. This is the Catholick Verity*, ſaith *Sylvius*, *that Images are truly and properly to be worſhipped*, *ſo that the Honour is given not only to the Exemplar*, *but for the ſake of that to the Image*, *and this is defined*, he ſaith, *by the ſecond Council of* Nice. *Arriaga* lays down this as a certain Principle among Catholicks, *That Images are to be truly worſhipped*, *which all the Definitions of Councils do clearly manifeſt*, *which being in a dogmatical Point*, *and againſt Hereticks cannot without danger of error be explained in an abuſive and improper Senſe*: And he adds afterwards, *that the Opinion of* Durandus *ſeems manifeſtly condemned*

Veloſill. Adverten. Theol. Scholaſt. in 2. Tom. Aug. ad 9. quæſt. p. 332. ad fin.

Pujol de ſacro ador. cultu diſp. 3. ſect. 7. p. 2.

p. 311.

p. 314.

Tanner. To. 3. diſp. 5. q. 2. dub. 3. aſſert. 4.

Yſamber. de Myſter. Incarn. ad q. 25. diſp. 4.

Eligii Baſſæi Flores Theolog. Practic. v. Adorat. n. 10. ed. 1663.

Fr. Sylvius in 3. p. Th. q. 25. art. 3. q. 5.

Arriag. de Incarn. diſp. 56. ſect. 1.

Sect. 2.

ed by all thoſe Definitions of Councils which require true Worſhip to be given to Images: And he produces ſeveral Paſſages of the *Seventh Synod* to that purpoſe. *And it ſignifies nothing to their excuſe, that they perform the outward ſigns of Worſhip to Images; for,* ſaith he, *ſince they allow no proper Worſhip to them, the Images do only ſerve to excite the Memory;* which he thus farther confirms. *It is not credible that any Hereticks (ſuppoſing the object repreſented to deſerve Worſhip) ſhould imagine it lawful to worſhip that object without an Image, and unlawful to do it when the Memory of that object is excited upon the view of an Image, upon Suppoſition that no worſhip is intended to be given to the Image thereby. And it is not credible, that if this had been all the Councils had determined, that they ſhould never think of ſuch an eaſy way of ſatisfying diſſenters, as the declaring this to have been their ſenſe would have been. But the controverſie lay in another point,* viz. *that Images did not deſerve any immediate Worſhip, ſo as to have any Honour done to them, although conſidered only as the material Objects.* For, ſaith he, *if all the diſpute had been only about a Condition exciting Men to Adoration, it could not have come into Mens Heads to have ſaid, that becauſe Images were dead and inanimate things, they could not be a meer Phyſical condition of Adoration; which is all that* Durandus *allows them. Is any Man ſo ſenſleſs to ſay, that becauſe words are inanimate things, therefore they ought not to be excited to the worſhip of God at the hearing of them? and the caſe is the ſame of the Repreſentation made by the Eye or by the Ear. But when they denyed the Lawfulneſs of the Worſhip of them, they ſpake of true and real Worſhip which is immediately carried to the Images themſelves, and for this they made uſe of an Argument which hath an Appearance of Truth,* viz. *that Images being dead things have no Excellency to deſerve any real Worſhip from us. From whence it follows, that when the Fathers condemned theſe Hereticks; they did not determine that they might be uſed as a Condition of Worſhip; but that true and real Worſhip was to be given to them.*

Cardinal Lugo ſaith, *that to the Worſhip of Images, it is not only neceſſary that the external Act be performed to the Image, of Kiſſing or Bowing,* &c. *but there muſt be an inward Affection too which implies Submiſſion. For,* ſaith he, *Worſhip as all agree, is an Expreſſion of Submiſſion to the thing worſhipped; and it would be ridiculous to ſay that* Peter *is worſhipped by that token of Submiſſion which I ſhew to* Paul; *therefore to the worſhip of the Image, the outward Act muſt expreſs the inward Submiſſion of the Mind to it, or elſe we muſt deny the common Definition of Adoration, and make a new one.* And this he afterwards proves to have been the Definition of the Second *Council* of Nice, *who did decree that true and real Worſhip is to be given to Images as they are diſtinct from the Exemplar according to every thing that is required to the Nature of Worſhip.* Thus I have fully proved from the Acts of the *Council*, and the Judgment of ſo many of the moſt Learned and Eminent Divines of the *Roman Church*, that by the Decree of the *Nicene Council*, ſuch *true and real Worſhip* is to be given to *Images* as is terminated upon the *Images themſelves.*

Lugo de Myſter. Incarn. diſp. 36. ſect. 3. n. 37.

§. 11.

2. We are now to enquire what kind of *Worſhip* that was, which the Second *Council of Nice* did give to *Images:* which will appear by ſhewing theſe two Things. 1. That the *Worſhip* required was *higher* than meer *Reverence.* 2. That it was *lower* than *Latria.* (1.) That it was *higher* than meer *Reverence. T. G.* would inſinuate, *that all the*

T. G. p. 123, &c.

worſhip required by the Nicene *Council, was no more than the Reverence ſhewed to the Books of the Holy Goſpels, or the ſacred Vtenſils of the Altar*; for which he quotes the *definition of the Council*, wherein thoſe things are joyned together. And ſo they are in *Hadrian*'s Epiſtle extant in the *Council*, in the *Latin Tranſlation* (for the *Greek* hath another ſenſe) *Act. 2. p. 106. Damaſc. orat. 1. p. 749.* and in *Damaſcene*'s Oration; but to clear yet farther the State of the Queſtion, I ſhall ſhew, 1. The difference between the *Reverence* of theſe things, and the *Worſhip* of *Images*. 2. That the *Council* of *Nice* did put a difference between them.

1. For the *difference* between the *Reverence* of theſe things and the *Worſhip* of Images. Although no irrational or inanimate Being be ca- *Aquin. 2. 2. q. 103. art. 4. ad 3.* pable of that real Excellency to deſerve any Honour from us for its own ſake, as *Aquinas* determines; yet ſuch things may have a relation to matters of ſo high a Nature as to deſerve a different uſage and regard from other things, as the *Veſſels* of the *Church*, or the *Chalices* are not to be uſed for common *drinking*; which peculiarity of the uſe of ſuch things is that degree of Honour which belongs to them on the account of their being dedicated to ſacred Purpoſes. So S. *Auguſtin* *Aug. in Pſ. 113. conc. 2.* ſaith of the *ſacred Veſſels, That they are Conſecrated, and do become Holy by their Vſe, being ſeparated from common Service, and devoted to the miniſtry of Holy Things*; but he doth plainly diſtinguiſh the reſpect ſhewn to them from the worſhip of Images; for a little before he ſpeaks *of ſuch who did worſhip or pray looking upon an Image, and that thoſe who did ſo did behave themſelves as if they expected to be heard by the Image; but do we pray to the ſacred Vtenſils becauſe we make uſe of them in our Prayers to God?* Little did S. *Auſtin* think that *praying, looking upon Images*, and the *Reverence ſhewed to ſacred Veſſels on the account of their uſe*, ſhould be ranked together. *He that prays looking upon an Image*, doth either direct his *Adoration* to the Image, or to the *Perſon repreſented by the Image* as if he were *actually preſent*, and this is the true reaſon of the worſhip of Images; but no Man can pretend this as to the *Reverence* of *Holy things*, becauſe all their Holineſs conſiſts in a bare *extrinſecal denomination*, which affords no reaſon for any more than ſuch an Eſteem as belongs to *ſacred Things*, and not for any Act of Worſhip to be done to them. They who make the *Images themſelves* to be the *material Object* or *term* of *Adoration*, do yet ſay that the *formal Reaſon* of that *Worſhip* is to be taken from the *Object repreſented*; others ſay, that the *thing repreſented*, and *the Image are worſhipped with the ſame Act of Adoration*; but both ſorts do make the Repreſentation in an Image to be the ground and reaſon of the *Worſhip* given to it. Why then ſhould thoſe things which do not *repreſent* be worſhipped as thoſe that do? Are not Images appointed by the *Definition* of the *Nicene Council to be ſet up in Churches and in Highways*, on purpoſe for Worſhip? Are they not formed, and ſet forth with all Advantages to allure Men to the Worſhip of them? And after all this, is no more meant by their *Worſhip* than by the *Reverence* of *Holy Things*, which are deſigned for a *peculiar uſe*, and ſerve for other *ends* than to be worſhipped by us? If *Images* were ſet up in Churches only for *Memory* and *Inſtruction*, and were as much appointed by *God* to inform us of his *Will*, as the *Holy Scriptures* are, there were ſome colour of ſhewing a like regard to them as to the *Holy Bible*; but it is quite otherwiſe, they were never appointed for that Purpoſe, they are uncapable of doing it, and are ſet up for *Adoration*; and yet can the ſame Men who commanded their Worſhip have any Pretence for making the *Reverence*

to the *Bible*, and the *Worſhip* of *Images* to be alike? Beſides all this, is there no difference between a *Religious Reſpect* (if I may ſo call it) to *Sacred Places* and *Things*, and all the moſt ſolemn *Acts* of *Adoration* which were ever given to *Images* by the greateſt *Idolaters?* Such as *kneelings* before them, *proſtrations*, *praying with their Eyes fixed upon them*, as though they were ſpeaking to them; *burning Incenſe and Lights before them:* Which are as great *Teſtimonies* of *Worſhip* as were ever uſed by the groſſeſt and moſt ſottiſh *Idolaters*. I may rather ſay, there is no great difference between them and their *Images*, that can ſee no difference between ſuch Worſhip and the *Reverence* of *Holy things*.

2. That the *Council* of *Nice* did put a difference between theſe things. For however, to blind the buſineſs as much as might be, they put them together in the *Definition*, yet if we obſerve the ground on which it eſtabliſhed the worſhip of Images, was ſuch as referred to the things repreſented by them, and not any *ſacred uſe of them*; and thoſe expreſſed in the very ſame *Definition*. For, ſay they, *the honour of the Image paſſes to the Prototype, and he that worſhips the Image doth in that worſhip the thing repreſented.* By which they lay the foundation of the worſhip of Images upon a thing peculiar to them, and that doth not hold for the other things. And this reaſon here aſſigned runs through all the ſeveral Diſcourſes in that Synod, of *Hadrian*, *Theodorus*, *Taraſius*, *Germanus*, *Leontius*, and *Epiphanius*; and the very ſame reaſon is aſſigned by the *Council* of *Trent*. It is obſerved out of S. *Auguſtin*, *that the moſt ſacred things are only capable of Honour*, Honorem tanquam Religioſa poſſunt habere, where he ſpeaks of *the Elements of the Euchariſt*; but *Taraſius* in this *Council* of *Nice* pronounces them all *guilty of Hypocriſie, who would only give Honour and not Worſhip to Images*: By which it appears that the *Council* determined more than meer *Reverence* to be given to *Images*.

Concil. Nicen. 2. act. 7. p. 555.

Aug. de Trin. l. 3. *c.* 10.

Act. 4. *p.* 247.

2. That this Worſhip which the *Council* of *Nice* determined was lower than *Latria:* For ſo it follows in the Definition of the *Council*, *that they only meant an honorary Adoration, and not true Latria, which is only due to God.* *Taraſius* upon reading *Pope Hadrian's Epiſtle* declares his Conſent to the worſhip of Images aſſerted in it, *reſerving Latria and Faith to God alone.* To the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks *Conſtantinus Biſhop* of *Conſtantia* in *Cyprus* upon reading the Epiſtle of *Theodorus*; whoſe Words I grant were miſtaken by the Tranſlator of the *Council* into *Latin*, as appears by what he is charged with in the *Caroline Book*, and his Words in the *Acts* of the *Council*; *but it doth not therefore follow*, as T. G. would have it, *that the Council of* Francford *did miſtake the meaning of the* Nicene *Synod*. For the Author of the *Caroline Book* particularly obſerves, *that in thoſe Words* (as tranſlated) *He did contradict the Sayings of the reſt, but that unawares he had betrayed that which the reſt endeavoured to conceal*, viz. *That they gave the Worſhip proper to God, to Images; for however they denied it in words, they did it in their Actions.* So *Epiphanius* the *Deacon* ſaith, *that they often declared that they did not give Latria to Images*. Thus we ſee what the ſenſe of the ſecond *Council* of *Nice* was as to the *worſhip* of *Images*.

Act. 2. *p.* 127.

Act. 3. *p.* 187.

T. G. *p.* 142, 145.

Lib. Carol l. 3. *c.* 17.

Act. 6. *p.* 539.

§. 12. 2. I now come to the *Additions* which have been made to this Doctrine, in the *Roman Church*; when it was delivered as *good Catholick Doctrine*, that the worſhip of *Latria* was to be given to the *Images* of *Chriſt*. So *Thomas Aquinas* determines in ſeveral places, which are collected by *Simon Majolus*; and he goes upon theſe grounds, 1. *Be-*

cauſe no irrational Creature is capable of Worſhip, but with a reſpect to a rational Being. 2. *Becauſe Images are worſhipped on the account of their Repreſentation, therefore,* ſaith he, *they are to be worſhipped with the ſame worſhip with the thing repreſented.* 3. Becauſe *the motion of the Mind towards an Image, as an Image, is the ſame with the motion towards the thing repreſented.* 4. *Becauſe the Church in praying to the Croſs, ſpeaks to it as if it were Chriſt himſelf.* O Crux ave, ſpes unica. But how can this Doctrine be reconciled to the Definition of the *Council of Nice,* which determines expreſly contrary? *Eſtius* ſaith, *that St.* Thomas *never ſaw this Definition of the Council*; the ſame is ſaid by *Catharinus,* and *Sylvius*; for ſaith *Catharinus, If he had ſeen it he would have endeavoured to have reconciled his Opinion with the Decree of the Council*; which ſhews that he thought it conſiſtent with it. From whence I argue that the *Council of Nice* was not then received in the *Weſtern Church,* for if it had been, is it conceivable that ſo great a Doctor of the Church as *Aquinas,* ſhould either not have ſeen it, or if he had ſeen it, ſhould have contradicted the Definition of it. But *Aquinas* was not the firſt who aſſerted this Doctrine in the *Latin Church,* for *Alex. Hales,* who was his *Maſter,* ſaith as much in effect, although he doth not ſo openly apply the term of *Latria* to it; yet putting this Queſtion, *whether greater worſhip doth belong to the Croſs than to any Man?* he determines it *affirmatively*; and diſtinguiſhes *between the Dignity of a Thing, and the Dignity of an Image, and an Image having all its Excellency from the Object repreſented, all the Worſhip given to it is to be referred to the Prototype*; *now,* ſaith he, *Man having a proper Excellency can deſerve no more than* Dulia, and therefore the Croſs as it repreſents Chriſt muſt have the Worſhip of *Latria.* And it is conſiderable that *Alex. Hales,* as *Pitts* ſaith, writ his Summ by the Command of *Pope Innocent* 4. and in the time of *Alex.* 4. it was examined by ſeventy Divines and approved, and recommended to be taught in all *Univerſities. Card. Bonadventure* determines it roundly, *that as Chriſt himſelf from his Union to the Divinity is worſhipped with Latria, ſo is the Image of Chriſt as it repreſents him*; and concludes thus, *propterea Imagini Chriſti debet cultus Latriæ exhiberi. Rich. de Media Villa* who lived in the ſame *Century,* aſſerted the ſame Doctrine. And when *Durandus* oppoſed the Doctrine of *Thomas* on this Ground, *becauſe the Image and Prototype were two diſtinct Things, and therefore what belonged to the exemplar could not be attributed to the Image, however conſidered as an Image, and ſo the Worſhip due to the Exemplar could not be given to the Image,* yet he confeſſes the other was *the common received Opinion*; which was defended againſt *Durandus* by *Paludanus* and *Capreolus. Marſilius ab Ingen* ſpeaks his Mind freely in this Matter, ſaying, *that the Croſs as a ſign repreſenting the object of Worſhip, and as a medium of it is to be adored with Latria*; *and for this he appeals to the Practice of the Church,* O Crux *ave, ſpes unica, Auge piis juſtitiam, reiſque dona veniam*: Which three Things, ſaith he, *do properly belong to God, and therefore,* ſaith he, *it is properly the worſhip of Latria which the Church doth give to the Croſs as a Sign. Jacobus Almain* declares, *that Images are to be worſhipped with the ſame kind of Worſhip that the things repreſented are*: *becauſe no Image is to be worſhipped for any Sanctity or Vertue in it ſelf, but only for the ſake of the Object repreſented, otherwiſe it would be Idolatry. Gabriel Biel* likewiſe agrees, *that the Images of Chriſt which repreſent him are to be worſhipped with Latria*: but he found out the Diſtinction of a *twofold Latria,* 1. *Proper Latria, which is the Worſhip given to Chriſt as the Object repreſented upon the*

Pro defenſione ſacra. Imagin. Centur. 13 c. 14.

Aq. 3 *p. q.* 25. *art.* 3. *ad lib. ſent.* 3. *diſt.* 9. *q.* 2.

Eſt. in ſent l. 3. *diſt.* 9. *ſect.* 3.

Cathar. de Imag. p. 137.

Sylv. in 3. *p. q.* 25. *art.* 3. *q.* 5.

Alex. Hales 3 *p. q.* 30. *m.* 3. *art.* 3 *ſect.* 1.

Pitts de Scriptor. Ætat. 13. *A.* 1245.

Bonav. *in ſent.* 3. *diſt.* 9 *q.* 2.

Ric. de Media Villa in 3. *ſent. q.* 9. *art.* 2.

Palud. in 3. *d.* 9. *q.* 1. *Capreol.* 3. *d.* 9 *q.* 1. *art* 1. *concl.* 2. & 3.

Marſil. l. 3. *art.* 2. *q.* 8. *concl.* 1. & 3.

Almain. l. 3. *diſt.* 9. *concl.* 5.

Biel *in Canon. Miſſæ lect.* 49.

the ſight of an Image of him, and this is not *terminated* on the *Image*, but the *Exemplar*. 2. *Improper or analogical Latria*, which is the *worſhip of the Image as it repreſents*: So that to the ſame external Act of Worſhip he makes two internal Acts, whereof *one is terminated on the Image, the other on the Prototype*. *Thomas Waldenſis* ſaith, *That the Images conſidered in themſelves deſerve no Worſhip at all, but conſidered in relation to a higher Being, and in regard of their repreſentation, ſo they deſerve to be worſhipped; and if the Mind paſſes from the Image to the thing repreſented*, then he ſaith, *the Image and the Prototype are worſhipped with the ſame Act, which muſt be Latria as to the Image of Chriſt; but the Latria condemned by the* Nicene *Council, he would have to be the worſhipping the Images themſelves for Gods*: Which the Heathens themſelves, as appears by the Acts of that Synod, utterly denied *that they did* in the Diſcourſe of *John* of *Theſſalonica*. *We worſhip not*, ſaith the Heathen, *the Images, but through them the Spiritual Powers*. Angelus de Clavaſio *declares*, *That the Image of Chriſt is to be worſhipped with Latria as well as himſelf, and that the Croſs whereon Chriſt was Crucified was to be worſhipped with Latria both on the account of Repreſentation and Contact; therefore*, ſaith he, *we ſpeak and pray to the Croſs as to Chriſt himſelf*. The ſame is ſaid by *Bartholomæus Famus*, who was a *Dominican*, as the other a *Franciſcan*, (whereby we ſee it was no Opinion peculiar to the *Dominican Order* on the account of the Authority of *Thomas*) and by *Dionyſius* the *Carthuſian*, as well as *Antoninus* the *Dominican*. *Franciſcus Ferrarienſis* ſaith, *That when Latria is appropriated to God, it is to be underſtood* primò & per ſe, *primarily and for its own ſake; but if it be underſtood only ſecondarily and for anothers ſake, then*, ſaith he, *Latria may be given to an Image of Chriſt; for conſidering the Image as an Image, it is worſhipped with the ſame Act by which the Perſon repreſented is, and therefore ſince Latria is due to Chriſt, it muſt be ſo to the Image of Chriſt*. And he anſwers all the Arguments of *Durandus*, *Holcot*, and *Mirandula* by the help of the former Diſtinction, (as he might have done a hundred more) and he aſſerts, *That the Image and the Object repreſented make together one total Object of Adoration, whereof one part is the Reaſon why the Worſhip is terminated on the other; and that the Act of Adoration whereby God and the Image are worſhipped together, cannot be Latria in reſpect of one, and an inferior Worſhip in reſpect of the other, becauſe both the internal and external Acts are ſuch wherein the Worſhip of Latria doth properly conſiſt*: And to ſhew this to be the *Catholick Doctrine*, he proves it from the *Practice of the Catholick Church*, which makes *Genuflections*, *Proſtrations*, *Supplications*, and other Acts of *Latria* to the *Croſs*. Which was the true Reaſon of introducing this *Doctrine* of *Latria* to *Images* contrary to the Definition of the *Nicene Council*, becauſe they ſaw the conſtant Practice of the Church in the Worſhip of the Croſs could not be juſtified upon other grounds. The Church never owning any *Proſopopæia*, but expreſſing its *Devotions* to the *Croſs*, as really diſtinct from, although repreſenting the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*.

Waldenſ. To. 3. tit. 19. c. 156. n. 6, 7.

Concil. Nic. Act. 5. p. 354.

Summa Angelica. v. Adorat. n. 5, 6.

Barth. Fumi Armilla Aurea v. Adorat. n. 7.

Carthuſianus in ſent. l. 3. diſt. 9.

Antonin. Sum. 3. p. tit. 12. c. 9. Sect. 4.

Franc. Ferrar. in Th. c. Gentes l. 3. c. 120.

Card. Cajetan ſaith, *That the Act of Worſhip towards the Image of Chriſt, is truly and properly terminated on the Image; not in regard either of its Matter or Form, but as it performs the Office of an Image. So that Chriſt himſelf is the Reaſon of the Worſhip of the Image, and his being in the Image, is the Condition, by which the Reaſon of Worſhip doth excite Men to worſhip and terminate it*. But ſince Chriſt is not aſſerted to be really and Perſonally in the Image, but only by Repreſentation, *Cajetan* ought to have

Cajet. in Aq. 3. p. q. 25. art. 3.

have ſhewn, that an Union by meer *imagination* between Chriſt and the Image, is a ſufficient Condition for performing thoſe *Acts* of *Worſhip* to the Image which properly belong to *God* alone, which he hath not undertaken; but he ſhews againſt *Durandus*, *That if the Image of Chriſt were only worſhipped, as it puts us in mind of Chriſt, then any other thing which puts us in mind of him might be worſhipped as well as an Image. And the Practice of the Church ſhews, that it doth not worſhip the Croſs as a memorative Sign, but becauſe the Image of Chriſt is to be worſhipped with Latria, therefore it worſhips it.* Thus we ſee what the Judgment of the moſt Eminent and Learned Divines of the *Roman Church* was, concerning giving the Worſhip of *Latria* to Images before the *Council* of *Trent*, and upon what that Judgment was founded, *viz.* The Practice of the *Roman Church*, in the Worſhip of the *Croſs*.

§. 13. Let us now ſee whether this matter hath been otherwiſe determined by the *Council* of *Trent*, and whether the contrary Opinion hath obtained ſince. That wary *Council* knowing very well the Practice of their *Church*, and the *Opinion* of *Divines*, only determines *due Honour and Veneration to be given to Images; not for the ſake of any Divinity or Power inherent in them, for which they are to be worſhipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or that Truſt is to be put in the Images, as it was of old by the Heathens, who placed their hope in Idols; but becauſe the Honour which is done to them is referred to the Prototypes which they repreſent, ſo that by the Images which we kiſs, and before which we uncover our Heads, and fall down, we adore Chriſt and worſhip the Saints which they repreſent. Which hath been already decreed by Councils againſt the Oppoſers of Images, eſpecially the ſecond* Nicene *Synod.* Where we obſerve theſe things. 1. That all external Acts of *Adoration* are allowed to be done to Images, even the very ſame which were to be done to the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, if he were *actually preſent*, are to be done to his Image to adore him thereby. 2. That there is not the leaſt Intimation againſt giving the ſame kind and degree of Worſhip to the Image, which is given to Chriſt himſelf. And ſince the *Council* allows no proper Vertue in the Image for which it ſhould be worſhipped, but takes all from the *Repreſentation*, and ſuppoſes the Honour to paſs to the *Prototype*, *Vaſquez* thinks it's very evident, that the ſenſe of the *Council* was, *That the Image and the Exemplar were to be worſhipped with the ſame Act of Adoration, which as to the Image of Chriſt muſt be no leſs than Latria.* 3. After the *Council* of *Trent*, many of their moſt *Eminent Divines* have aſſerted the worſhip of *Latria* to be given to *Images*. *Dominicus Soto*, a Divine of the *Council* of *Trent* determines, *that every Image is to be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip that belongs to the thing repreſented; as the Image of God and Chriſt with* Latria, *and of the Bleſſed Virgin and other Saints with Doulia.* *Tarrianus*, another of the *Trent Divines* ſaith, *That the ſame Adoration belongs to the Image, and the Prototype; as that which is called Latria to Chriſt and his Image, but to Chriſt properly, and to the Image equivocally.* *Naclantus* a third Divine of that *Council* ſaith, *That if the Object repreſented ought to be worſhipped with Latria, ſo ought the Image too.* And what more reaſonable way can we have to underſtand the ſenſe of the *Council*, than from the Divines who were preſent, and managed the Debates of it? *Gretſer* hath a whole Chapter to prove, *that the Croſs is to be worſhipped with Latria.* *Card. Palæotus* ſaith, *That the ſame Worſhip*

Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. 25.

Vaſq. in 3. *p. diſp.* 108. *c.* 4.

Soto de juſtit. & *jure l.* 2. *q.* 3. *art.* 2. *in fin.*
Turrian. pro Canon. Apoſt. l. 1. *c.* 25.
Naclant. in Rom. 1. *p.* 171.
Gretſer. de Cruce l. 1. *c.* 49.
Palæot. de ſacr. & *prof. Imag. l.* 1. *c.* 32.

Worſhip which is given to the Prototype may be given to the Image, but with the different Degrees of Latria *and* Doulia, *&c. When*, ſaith he, *the Perſon of Chriſt is worſhipped without an Image, that Adoration is terminated upon his Eſſence and Perſon as in themſelves; but when he is worſhipped in an Image, then his Eſſence and Perſon is worſhipped as repreſented and being in that Image, although he be not really there, but according to his figure and ſimilitude. Gregory de Valentia* confeſſes it to be the *ſame Divine Worſhip they give to the Image of Chriſt that they do to the Prototype, becauſe the Image is worſhipped in the ſtead of Chriſt, but*, he ſaith, *it is given in a different reſpect to them both* : But beſides this, he allows an *inferior Worſhip* to the Image which is terminated on it ſelf. And in both theſe *Petrus Thyraus* agrees with him. *Cornelius Curtius* an *Auguſtinian*, contends for *Latria to be due to the very Nails of Chriſt's Croſs, by reaſon of the Contact of the Perſon of Chriſt, which Worſhip*, he ſaith, *was approved by the Church, when* Innocent VI. *appointed the Feſtival of the Soldier's Launce, and the Nails of the Croſs. Ludovicus de Paramo* the *Inquiſitor* of *Sicily* determines, *that the Croſs is to be worſhipped with no other Worſhip than that of Latria : And if it be taken as joyned with Chriſt in the Mind, it is to be worſhipped with a perfect Act of abſolute Latria, which belongs to Chriſt* per ſe, *and to the Croſs* concomitanter & per accidens; *but if it be taken as the material Object of Adoration, then it is only a Relative Latria for the ſake of Chriſt*. And he adds, *That an Image is truly and properly to be adored or coadored with the Exemplar*, which he proves from the *Council* of *Trent*. To which he ſubjoins a remarkable Story, *viz.* of one *Joh. Ægidius, Canon of* Sevil, *who was forced to make a publick retractation for denying the Adoration of the Croſs, which was judged to be contrary to the Practice of the Church, when it ſaith*, O Crux ave, ſpes unica, *and in another place*, Crucem tuam adoramus; and for ſaying *that God was to be worſhipped with Latria, and the Croſs with Doulia, which Propoſitions he rejected as Heretical*; and aſſerted *that the Croſs was to be worſhipped with the ſame worſhip of Latria that Chriſt himſelf is*. From whence *Lud. de Paramo* concludes, *that this Opinion is the moſt agreeable to the Catholick Faith*. Paulus Maria Quarti a Clericus Regularis, in his late *Commentaries* out the Rubricks of the *Miſſal*, agrees exactly with *Ludovicus à Paramo* in the manner of Adoration of the Croſs : And for Images of Chriſt, he ſaith, *That their Opinion is more probable who make it to be abſolute Latria, and not reductive and Analogical*. Gregorius Valentianus *in his Commentaries* on the Hymns declares his Conſent with S. *Thomas* about worſhipping the Croſs with *Latria*. *Layman* ſaith, *That we do not worſhip the Images of Chriſt with an abſolute Latria, becauſe they have no Divinity or rational Excellency in them, but with a relative Worſhip, whereby we worſhip the Image and Exemplar together, we ought to acknowledge that the Croſs and Images of Chriſt are worſhipped with Latria*. Eligius Baſſæus *a Capuchine*, agrees with *Layman*, *that this is not abſolute, but a relative Latria; but he determines that the Croſs, whatever matter it be made of, ought to be worſhipped with Latria as a Sign; but that very Croſs on which Chriſt did hang, not only as a Sign, but in regard of Contact of his Body; and ſo the Nail and Thorns, and Sponge*, and other things which touched his Body, except only *Judas his Lips*, and the *Aſs* he rode on to *Hieruſalem*, becauſe they did not partake of his Sanctity, as no doubt the *Nails* and the *Wood* of the *Croſs* did. But he hath yet a farther ſubtilty about this *Latria*, for, he ſaith, *That when the Image of Chriſt is the material Object of Worſhip, and Chriſt as repreſented the*

Greg. de Valent. de Idolol. l. 2. c. 7.

Pet. Thyræ. apud Poſſev. biblioth. l. 8. c. 17.

Cornel. Curtius de Clavis Domin. c. 12.

Lud. de Paramo de Orig. S. Inquiſ. l. 2. tit. 3. c. 8. c. 9. n. 19.

Rubricæ Miſſal. Rom. Comment. illuſtr. p. 2. tit. 4. de Introit. ſect. 2. dub. 2. & 4.

Greg. Valent. in Hymnod. Eccleſ. tr. 2. Hymn. 13. p. 268.

Paul. Layman. Theol Moral. l. 4. tr. 7. c. 5. n. 10.

Elig. Baſſæ. Flores Theol. Practic. tit. Ador. ſuppl. n. 6, 7.

Ph. Gamachæ. in 3. p. Th. q. 25. con. 2.

Yſambert. ad q. 25. diſp. 4. art. 1. & diſ. 5. art. 1.

Azor. Inſtit. Moral. l. 9.

Reaſon of that Worſhip, that it is not abſolute, but relative Latria; but when Chriſt and the Image together make up the ſame material Object of Adoration, then it is properly Latria; which he endeavours to prove both from the Councils of *Nice* and *Trent*. *Phil. Gamachæus* a late Profeſſor of Divinity of the *Sorbon* determines, *That the Croſs and Image of Chriſt as they repreſent him, and as they are conceived together with Chriſt, ought to be worſhipped with the ſupreme Worſhip of Latria, becauſe Chriſt himſelf is the Reaſon of the Adoration, and becauſe the Church doth ſo worſhip the Croſs*. O Crux ave, ſpes unica. The ſame is aſſerted as to *Relative Latria* by *N. Yſambertus* another late Profeſſor of the *Sorbon*, (whom I the rather mention, that this might not be thought the particular Opinion of any *Orders* among them, as of the *Dominicans* or *Jeſuits*) who aſſerts, *That both the Croſs and Images of Chriſt are to be worſhipped therewith, becauſe the Image and the Exemplar make up one complex Object, whoſe Soul, as it were, is the Exemplar, and whoſe Body is the Image, to which Object the Adoration is directed, ſo, as that the Worſhip to the Perſon of Chriſt is abſolute, and to the Image reſpective; but yet ſo as that the Image is at leaſt the partial terminative Object of ſuch Adoration.* I might produce many more Teſtimonies not only of Schoolmen, but of Caſuiſts, as *Filliucius*, *Jacobus à Graffiis*, *Azorius*, and others; but I need not do it, ſince *Azorius* affirms, that *this is the common Opinion of their Divines.*

Cathar. de cultu Imagin. p. 137.

§. 14. All the Difficulty is how to reconcile this Doctrine with the Definition of the *Council* of *Nice*: And about this they have fallen into Parties, and made a pleaſant Counter-ſcuffle among themſelves. *Catharinus* ſaith, *That none of the Ancients did ever allow Images to be worſhipped with Latria; and if this Propoſition be true, that an Image as an Image is to be worſhipped with Latria, that likewiſe is true, that an Image is to be worſhipped with Latria, for all wiſe Men underſtand an Image as an Image; but this is ſo far from being in any ancient Writer, that the contrary is expreſly there, and eſpecially in the Decree of the Council of* Nice, *and therefore he hath no way to excuſe the Doctrine of* Thomas, *but by ſaying he had never ſeen that Decree.* But it is plain *Thomas Aquinas* had more regard to the Practice of the Church than to the Definition of that *Synod*, which he thought could not otherwiſe be defended. The main Argument of *Catharinus* againſt this Opinion, is, *Latria is due to none but God; but an Image however conſidered as an Image is not God. And whatever the Imagination of the Perſon paſſeth to upon the ſight of an Image, that can never make that to be God which is not God. If a Man takes the Image for God, that is an abominable Error: If he ſaith it is not God, and yet worſhips it with Latria, this is plainly giving Latria to ſomething elſe beſides God. If it be ſaid, that it is the ſame act of the Mind which paſſeth from the Image to the Prototype, and conſequently the ſame Adoration of both; this,* he ſaith, *will not hold, for if the Image be worſhipped, that muſt be the Object of Adoration, and the worſhip of the Image muſt be terminated on the Image, otherwiſe it is not the worſhip of the Image, but of the thing repreſented; neither can it be underſtood how there ſhould be two Objects and but one Adoration. Some anſwer that the Image and Prototype make one total Object of Adoration, and ſo it is but one Act and that of Latria; but this,* ſaith he, *makes ſtrange Confuſion that the act of Worſhip ſhould be equally terminated on both. If they ſay it begins at the Image, and is terminated on the Prototype, that is not,* ſaith he, *proper Worſhip of an*

Image which is not terminated on it; and how can that be a partial Object of Adoration, if the worſhip be no ways terminated on it? Others ſay, there is a twofold Latria, per ſe & per accidens, *the former is only due to God, the latter may be given to an Image: This,* ſaith he, *contradicts the former, for then the ſame Act of Worſhip would be both* per ſe *and* per accidens, *which is ridiculous; and that which is* per accidens *ought not to be looked on as Worſhip, for any thing may be ſaid to be worſhipped with Latria* per accidens. *Others ſay, that the worſhip of the Image is not terminated on the Image, but on the thing repreſented, and yet ſay it is the worſhip of the Image as an Image, which as ſuch is diſtinct from the thing repreſented, which,* ſaith he, *is not intelligible. To ſay the Image is worſhipped improperly, is a Saying not fit for Philoſophers or Divines, but for Poets and Orators. For it is no more properly ſaid the Image is worſhipped with Latria, than that the Image is the thing repreſented, which no Man in is Senſes would ſay properly.* To Cajetan's *Saying, that an Image as performing the Office of an Image is under that Notion, the ſame with the thing repreſented,* he anſwers, *that ſuch a Metamorphoſis is impoſſible by any act of the Image, or of Imagination: but to defend,* ſaith he, *that the Image as an Image, or as repreſenting is the ſame with the thing repreſented, and ſo as that the Latria is any ways terminated on the Image, is to be mad ones ſelf, and to endeavour to make others ſo. Therefore others ſay, that the Images are not truly and properly worſhipped, but the things repreſented at them, before them, or in them; but this,* ſaith he, *deſtroys the worſhip of Images, and is againſt the Practice of the Church, which directs the Poſture, Words, and Signs of Adoration (even Incenſe) to the Images, as when we ſay to the Croſs,* O Crux ave, ſpes unica. This we ſee is the Burden of the Song among them all; the Church practiſes thus and thus; this Practice muſt be defended one way or other, and happy the Man that doth it beſt; but ſtill the Practice muſt be continued, for *Catharinus* inveighs bitterly againſt *Eraſmus*, for ſaying, *he thought it ſafer and eaſier to take Images out of Churches than to fix the juſt bounds of Worſhip, and to prevent Superſtition.* And he grants at laſt, *that by a Fiction of the Mind, ſuppoſing the Image to be the Perſon repreſented, it may be ſaid, that the Image is to be worſhipped with Latria,* yet he concludes, *that no one ancient Writer that he could ever ſee, did allow, that Images might any way be worſhipped with Latria, but all of them did abominate ſuch an Expreſſion.* And he adds, *That the Doctrine of* Thomas *doth rather take off from Images that true and real Worſhip, which,* he ſaith, *from the* Nicene Council *ought to be given to them, and terminated on themſelves though for the ſake of the things repreſented by them.* *Martinus Pereſius Ayala* ſaith, *That the Doctrine of giving Latria to Images is repugnant to Fathers and Councils, eſpecially to the Definition of the* Council *of* Nice; and he adds, *that there is no more Connexion between a Sign and the thing ſignified, than between two Relatives, as between Father and Son, and although the Son repreſent the Father, yet no Man will ſay, that by the ſame Act of Knowledge, whereby I know the Son as a Son, I do know his Father, for then the Relative Oppoſition would be taken away, and the different Definitions of Correlatives; ſo,* ſaith he, *although by the Image a Conception doth ariſe of the thing repreſented, yet it is not the ſame Act of Knowledge whereby I apprehend the Image and the thing repreſented: But ſuppoſe it were ſo, there is not the ſame reaſon for Worſhip as for Knowledge. For it is not repugnant to an Image as an Image to be apprehended by the ſame Act with the thing repreſented: but*

it

p. 136.

Martin. Pereſ. Ayal. de tradit. 3. *de Imagin. p.* 119. 121.

it ſeems repugnant to an Image as an Image to be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip with the thing repreſented; becauſe an Image, however conſidered, is an inſenſible Creature, to which they all grant no worſhip is due; and although it repreſent never ſo much, it doth not change its Nature, but a Block remains a Block ſtill, and a Stone doth not become Rational by it. But, *ſay they,* Is not the King's Robe worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip that his Perſon is? *I confeſs,* ſaith he, *The whole Perſon as cloathed is worſhipped, and his clothes are no more ſeparated than any other Habits or Diſpoſitions he hath about him. But, if the King's Robe be ſeparated from his Perſon, what reaſon is there to worſhip that as the King himſelf is worſhipped? And the Prince's Image is neither ſubſtantially nor accidentally the ſame with the Prince, and therefore is not to be compared with his Robe; and although ſome Honour be due to the King's Image, yet no Man ever ſaw, unleſs by the compulſion of ſome Tyrant, a Prince's Image worſhipped after the ſame manner that his Perſon is. And S.* Auguſtin *gives no other Reaſon for the worſhip of the Humanity of Chriſt (which he compares with the Prince's Robe) but becauſe it is united to the Divinity; which Reaſon cannot hold for ſuch an Imaginary Union between the Image and the thing repreſented, and therefore it ought not to be worſhipped with the ſame Adoration. Beſides,* ſaith he, *if this were allowed, we might ſacrifice to an Image as well as do other Acts of Latria to it, which cannot be ſaid without Blaſphemy;* but he concludes, *that he defines nothing, and ſubmits all to the Judgment of the Church.* Eſt. in ſentent. l. 3 diſt. 9. ſect. 3. *Eſtius* declares, *that although almoſt all the Schoolmen were for* Latria *to be given up to the Croſs, yet that it is point-blank againſt the definition of the Council of* Nice; *and it is an unſatisfactory Anſwer to ſay, they only were againſt* Latria *to be given to Images for themſelves or abſolute Latria; for no Man ever doubted of that, that they were not to have Divine Worſhip for themſelves; and the Council puts a Diſtinction between the worſhip of the Image and the Exemplar; and joins Images with the Goſpels and Veſſels, which no Man ever thought were to be worſhipped with any kind of Latria: And that, when S.* Baſil *ſaith, the honour of the Image paſſes to the Prototype, he means no more than that the Image is honoured for the ſake of the thing repreſented; and that, if an Image may be worſhipped with Latria, then Sacrifice may be offered to it, which was condemned in* Carpocrates *and the* Collyridians: *And then thoſe things which have a nearer conjunction than an Image may be better worſhipped ſo, as the Bleſſed Virgin which bore him in her Womb. Neither is it enough to ſay, they have proper Excellencies of their own; for they might receive a double Honour, the one proper, the other relative; and ſuppoſing no danger of Error, then it might be done, and* Medina, he ſaith, *yields it of the Bleſſed Virgin not abſolutely but by reaſon of the Conjunction between Chriſt and her while he was in her Womb.* Thus far in the Opinion of theſe Men, the caſe ſeems deſperate as to the reconciling the Doctrine of giving *Latria* to Images with Reaſon, or the *Council* of *Nice.*

§. 15. But we muſt not imagine a Doctrine ſo generally allowed, and ſo ſuitable to the Practice of their Church ſhould be thus given up. Vaſquez diſp. 108. c. 3. Therefore *Vaſquez* undertakes the buſineſs, and like a generous Adverſary, not only proves that *this may be the ſenſe of the Councils*, but that *they could have no other; becauſe an Image cannot be lawfully worſhipped any other way, than as in and by that the Exemplar is made the term and next material Object of Adoration.* This he ſhews not only c. 4. from the *common Conſent of their Divines*, but from the Council *of* Trent *it* ſelf, where it ſays, 1. *That no Worſhip is to be given to Images for the ſake of any Vertue inherent in them; but if Images be worſhipped as ſeparated from the Exemplar, they muſt be worſhipped for ſome Vertue inherent in themſelves; and whatever impreſſion of Sanctity is ſuppoſed to be in them, it is only an inanimate ſign of ſuch a Sanctity as doth not make it an object of Adoration: And if the Excellency of the thing repreſented be the Reaſon moving to Adoration, that Excellency cannot be conceived as diſtinct from the Exemplar when it makes the Image capable of Adoration.* If they ſay *the Excellency is derived from the Exemplar to the Image*, then it follows, *that there is an inherent Virtue in the Images for which they are worſhipped, which is contrary to the Council of* Trent. 2. *That Council makes this to be the only reaſon of Worſhipping Images, becauſe the Honour paſſeth to the Exemplar, which ſhews plainly that according to the Senſe of it, they are to be worſhipped only as joyned with the Exemplar, and by no means as ſeparated from it.* And the ſame he proves, by Expreſſions to the like purpoſe, from the *Council* of *Nice*; and from the former *Teſtimony* of *Baſil, which,* he ſaith, *cannot be otherwiſe underſtood than of the ſame Adoration of the Image and Exemplar, or elſe St.* Baſil's *Teſtimony was very impertinently alledged in the Council of* Nice, *and doth not ſerve the purpoſe for which he uſed thoſe Words himſelf*; many other Teſtimonies he produces, and at laſt concludes that the other Opinion is no older than *Catharinus* and *Ayala*, and that all thoſe who were for the Worſhip of Images, before, viz. Fathers and Schoolmen, were of his Opinion. And he proves his Opinion from this Reaſon *becauſe no inanimate thing is of it ſelf capable of Worſhip; but an Image conſidered as an Image, but without the Exemplar, is an inanimate Thing:* The Major he proves, *becauſe Worſhip is a token of Submiſſion to ſomething, on the Account of its Excellency, and Superiority; but to uſe ſuch to an inanimate Thing, is to make our ſelves Slaves to Images, which would be Idolatry: and on the ſame Account a Man uſes ſuch a mark of Submiſſion, he may as well pray to Images, or beg ſomething of them, as a Servant doth of his Maſter.* He ſaith, that *Alexander* and *Thomas, although they never ſaw the Seventh Synod, yet did ſpeak the Senſe of it, as well as if they had ſeen it: and when that Council denies Latria to Images, it is to be underſtood only of the inward Submiſſion of the Soul, and not of the External Acts of Adoration*; and ſo he anſwers all the Arguments from the *Councils and Fathers:* And he ſaith, *that it may be delivered abſolutely, that Images are to worſhipped with Latria, if by that be meant the ſame Worſhip which is given to the Exemplar; and that the Doctrine of inferior Worſhip tends to Folly and Superſtition, and that his own Opinion is the moſt uſeful to be preached to the People. Suarez* is by no means ſatisfied with this way, ſaying, *the Author of it muſt neceſſarily fall into the abuſive and improper way of Worſhip which is condemned in* Durandus *and* Holcot, *for he takes away all proper Worſhip of Images, and makes them only ſeem to be worſhipped; for the external acts of Adoration, without the internal is but an Appearance of Worſhip and no real Worſhip.* Therefore he proceeds after another method, which is this: 1. *The Prototype may be worſhipped in the Image, and the Image for the ſake of the Prototype, with one and the ſame act of Adoration, both Internal and External:* To explain this he diſtinguiſhes between the *eſſe reale*, and the *eſſe repræſentativum* of the *Prototype*; and although the Image doth not contain the *Prototype* in the firſt, it does in the latter Senſe, *i. e.* in plain terms, although the Perſon of Chriſt be not in the Image, yet we may Fanſie him to be there; which being ſuppoſed, the Mind of him that worſhips is carried primarily to the Exemplar, and by way

c. 5.

c. 6.

c. 9.

c. 13.

Diſp. 109.
c. 1.

c. 2.

Suarez
diſp. 54.
ſect. 4.

of *concomitancy* to the *Image*; not believing the *Image* to be *Chriſt*, (for that were a dangerous thing) but that it doth *repreſent* him as if he were there: And conſequently this *Imagination* is a ſufficient ground to perform all acts of *Adoration* to the *Image*, as if the *Perſon* of *Chriſt* were actually preſent. Which is juſt like a Schoolmaſter, whom I knew, who being to come into an unuſual Preſence, he goes into a Pit, where there were many Trees, and although every one of them had the *eſſe reale* of a Tree, yet he ſuppoſed them to have a diſtinct *eſſe repræſentativum* of the ſeveral Perſons he was to make his Congies to; and having thus faſtned the *eſſe repræſentativum* of the Perſon to the proper *Tree*, he makes all his *Approaches*, and with the ſame Complements he intended to uſe to the *Perſons* themſelves. If one ſhould have ſurprized him in this Act of *Civil Worſhip* to the *Trees*, and asked him whether he believed the *Trees* to be the *Perſons* whoſe Names he called them by, he would, no doubt, (if he had been verſed in *School Divinity*) have anſwered to this very ſubtilly with *Suarez*, that he was not ſuch an Aſs not to diſtinguiſh the *eſſe reale* of the *Tree*, from the *eſſe repraſentativum* of the *Perſons*; and although he bowed and made Legs to the *Trees*, he did not conſider them in ſo doing as *Trees*, but as repreſenting thoſe *Perſons* to whom he was bound to ſhew all that Reverence, which he ſhewed to the *Trees* upon the *Imagination* that they were thoſe very *Perſons*; ſo that the Reverence was *primarily* and *per ſe* ſhewn to thoſe Perſons, *and but concomitanter & per accidens*, and after *an inferior manner* to the *Trees*. But ſaith *Suarez*, *The Image is not ſo properly adored, as co-adored, as the King's Robe is with his Perſon; and although the Image be really different from the Perſon of Chriſt, yet he is worſhipped in his true Being as repreſented by the Image, and as it were veſted with it, and ſo they both become one Object, and that Perſon is worſhipped, and the Image together with him with the very ſame act of Adoration.* I am glad to hear that, ſaith the *Schoolmaſter*, for I hope by this means I may do my *Reverences* to the *Perſons* themſelves, by performing them *to them as repreſented in their true Beings in theſe Trees*; and I pray, Sir, do not think me ſuch a Fop that I would do all this to them conſidered *as Trees, in actu ſignato*, for I conſider them *as Images in actu exercito*; and although you may think I do it to the *Trees*, you are miſtaken; my Mind all that while unites the *Perſon repreſented* and the *Tree* together, and although *my Reverence* be *primarily* deſigned to the *Perſon* for his own ſake, and to the *Tree* only for the ſake of the *Perſon repreſented*, yet this is only a *co-reverence*, ſuch as a Man ſhews to the Perſon of another, by *kiſſing the hem of his Garment*, only there the *Perſon* is *really Veſted*, and here it is only by *Imagination*.

Diſ. 54. *ſect.* 5. 2. *Suarez* ſaith, *Since it is agreed among Catholicks, that the Reaſon of the worſhip of the Image is the Excellency of the Exemplar*; *that may be conſidered two ways.* 1. *As the* objectum quod, *or the thing it ſelf worſhipped in and by the Image as before.* 2. *As the* Objectum quo, i. e. *as the Reaſon of giving worſhip to the Image it ſelf*: And this is that Worſhip which *Vaſquez* charges with *Folly* and *Superſtition*; but *Suarez* undertakes to prove this to be a *poſſible* and *lawful Worſhip*, when the *Image* is *truly* and *properly Worſhipped*, non adorato directè ut quod ipſo exemplari: i. e. *The Worſhip not fixing immediately on the Thing repreſented, but on the Image it ſelf, although on the account of the Exemplar*: For which he makes uſe of this notable Argument; *Be-*

cauſe in this Act of Worſhip there is nothing omitted, but a directing the Intention to the Exemplar; but there is no Precept that requires, that as often as we Worſhip the Image, we ought to direct our Intention farther than the Image it ſelf; and therefore that Worſhip is lawful. And although an inanimate thing be not, as *Vaſquez* urges, *adorabile propter ſe*, yet it may, ſaith *Suarez*, with wonderful ſubtilty, *be adorable, in ſe propter aliud*: And this ſecond kind of Worſhip, he endeavours to prove was eſtabliſhed by the Councils of *Nice* and *Trent*, as well as the firſt.

Bellarmine undertakes to clear the whole Matter by theſe Propoſitions, 1. *That the Images of Chriſt and the Saints are to be worſhipped, not only* per accidens *or* impropriè, *but* per ſe & propriè, *ſo as they terminate the Worſhip, as conſidered in themſelves, and not meerly as they repreſent the Examplar*: Which he proves from the Definition of the *Nicene Council*, which decreed *Images to be worſhipped and not with Latria: But if the Image were to be Worſhipped with a reſpect only to the Exemplar, then it could not be denied, that an Image of Chriſt was to be worſhipped with Latria.* 2. *He would not have it ſaid before the People, that Images are to be worſhipped with Latria; but rather the contrary, becauſe the Diſtinctions neceſſary to defend it are too ſubtle for their Noddles, and the Truth is, the Men that make them do hardly underſtand them themſelves.* 3. *But if we ſpeak among our ſelves, and of the plain Truth of the Caſe, Images may be worſhipped with Latria, but then it is improperly and* per accidens : *As it is repreſented in the Image.* 4. *If we ſpeak of Worſhip* per ſe & propriè, *ſo no Image is to be worſhipped with Latria; becauſe this was condemned by the* Nicene Council. 5. *Yet*, he ſaith, *that the Worſhip which ought to be given to Images* per ſe & propriè, *is Analogically and Reductively the ſame that is given to the Exemplar*, i. e. *the Worſhip of an Image of Chriſt is Analogical Latria:* So that it is, and it is not Latria; it is ſo, but we muſt not ſay ſo; yet if we ſpeak of the proper worſhip of Images, that is not ſo, and yet it is ſo, i. e. *Analogically* and *Improperly*; but if we ſpeak of the proper Worſhip of Latria, then it is not ſo. But doth not the proper worſhip of Latria belong to Chriſt's Perſon? therefore if Chriſt's Perſon be worſhipped in the Image, it ought to be worſhipped with Latria. *True*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *when he is worſhipped in his own Perſon, but not as he is worſhipped in an Image by Participation*; but he that is worſhipped in the Image, is ſuppoſed to be the true object of Latria, and therefore Chriſt, as in the Image, muſt be worſhipped with Latria. If Repreſentation be a ſufficient ground of Worſhip, then his preſence being ſuppoſed in the Image, doth require the ſame Worſhip as they ſay is due to him under the Sacramental Species: And the manner of his being repreſented in the Image would take no more off from the Nature of the Worſhip, than the Prince's Robe doth from the Worſhip due to his Perſon. And *Bernardus Pujol* from thence proves, *That it is lawful to Worſhip the Image and Exemplar with the ſame Act of Adoration, as one Complex Object, becauſe the Church doth worſhip the Sacrament of the Euchariſt with Latria, as it is one Complex object made up of the Species, and Chriſt himſelf as there preſent.* The ſame Author proves againſt *Bellarmine*, *That the proper Worſhip given to Images, is not meerly Analogically and Reductively Latria, but properly, although more imperfect, like that which is given to the Humanity of Chriſt, and therefore*, he ſaith, *the meaning of the Council was only to exclude abſolute Latria, and not relative*; with whom *Tſambertus* agrees, who

Bellarm. de cultu Imag. l. 2, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25.

Pujol de cultu ador. diſp. 3. ſect. 7. aſſert. 5.

aſſert. 7.

Tſambert. ad. q. 25. diſp. 4. art. 2.

likewiſe ſaith, *That when the Image and Prototype are worſhipped with Latria, the Image is a terminative Object of that Adoration, at leaſt as a part to make one entire Object of the Exemplar and the Image.* *Cardinal* Lugo ſaith, *that* Vaſquez *hath not ſpoken clearly to this Point, about the aggregate Object, made up of the Image and the Exemplar*; *for,* ſaith he, *if Internal Adoration were allowed to the Image as a partial Object, it would go a great way to the proving, that the Image it ſelf may be ſo worſhipped* in recto, i. e. *without the Worſhip of the Exemplar : And he thinks, that the ſame Act of Adoration may be terminated* in recto, *both on the Image and the Exemplar : and that this aggregate Object hath a ſufficient excellency to terminate inward Worſhip upon the Image as a part of that Object.* *Arriaga* Diſputes at large againſt the Opinion of *Vaſquez*; but after all he concludes, *That we may ſay abſolutely, that Latria is due to the Image of Chriſt*, and he makes it the ſame Caſe as to Images, and the *Humanity of Chriſt*; and to the *Nicene Council*, he ſaith, *that they ſpake not of the Images of God, but of Angels and Saints, to which no doubt Latria is not due*; and he ſtretches the words of *Epiphanius* the Deacon, to this ſence, *That no Images of Creatures are to be Worſhipped with Latria*; *therefore,* ſaith he, *they did Worſhip the Image of God with Latria.* Very ſubtle, I confeſs! and like *Epiphanius his own ſelf*, who argues in that Council, much after that rate, and with equal probability. *Petavius* concludes with the generality of their *Divines*, *that the deſign of the Council of* Nice *was only to exclude abſolute Latria, and not relative:* For which he quotes the *Greek excerpta*, wherein it is ſaid, *That the Image doth not differ in Hypoſtaſis from the Prototype, but only in Nature: From whence he infers, that it is the ſame Act of Adoration to the Image, and the thing repreſented.* But if all the danger lay in ſuppoſing Images to be diſtinct Hypoſtaſes; the Heathens in that Council declared, *That they did not look on them as ſuch, but only as Repreſentations*, and therefore in that reſpect they were no more to blame than the *Nicene Fathers* in the worſhip of them.

Lugo de Myſt. Incarn. diſp. 36. ſect. 3.

Arriag. de Incarn. diſp. 56. ſect. 6 ſubſ. 2. n. 68.

n. 70.

Petav. de Incarn. l. 15. c. 15. n. 6.

From all this Diſcourſe we ſee, (1.) That ſome great Divines in the *Roman Church* do aſſert proper and abſolute Latria to be given to the Images of Chriſt, as thoſe who aſſert, *The Image and Chriſt to make up one entire Object of Adoration.* (2.) That the Doctrine of a Relative Latria to be given to Images, and ſuch as is given to the Humanity of Chriſt, hath almoſt univerſally obtained in the *Roman Church.* (3.) That they all agree in this, that the *External Acts of Adoration* are to be performed to Images, ſuch as *Genuflections*, *Proſtrations*, *Burning of Lights and Incenſe*, &c. (4.) That thoſe who aſſert an Inferior Adoration to be given to Images, do ſuppoſe that Adoration to terminate in the Images themſelves, although it be given on the Account of the thing repreſented. (5.) That thoſe who differ from each other in this Matter, do in effect charge one another with Idolatry: But of that afterwards.

§. 16. Nothing now remains to the full ſtating of this Controverſie, but to conſider the Practice of the *Roman Church* in the Worſhip of Images, which may be gathered very much from the former Diſcourſe, but will receive ſomewhat more light by theſe Obſervations. 1. That the Church of *Rome* hath determined in her Publick Offices, that *Latria is due to the Croſs of Chriſt*, *viz*, in the Pontificale, where the Rubrick determines *the manner of Proceſſion at the*

Pontificale Rom. Ordo ad recip. Imperat. Rubr. 1.

Reception of the Emperor; and there it is ſaid, *That the Croſs of the Legate ought to have the Right Hand*, quia debetur ei Latria, becauſe Latria is due to it; not only that it may lawfully be given to it, but that it is due to it, without any mention of the Exemplar, or any Diſtinctions or Limitations about the Nature of this Latria. 2. That Solemn Prayers are made for the Conſecration of the Images ſet up for Worſhip, and for Vertue to be given to them. In the Office of Benediction of a new Croſs there is this Prayer,

Pontific. in Benedict. Novæ Crucis.

> Rogamus te Domine Sancte, Pater omnipotens, ſempiterne Deus, ut digneris bene + dicere hoc lignum Crucis tue, ut ſit remedium ſalutare generi humano; ſit ſoliditas fidei, profectus bonorum operum; redemptio animarum; ſit ſolamen, & protectio ac tutela contra ſeva jacula inimicorum. Per Dominum Noſtrum, &c.

Is this Prayer made in Faith or no? whereby they pray for ſuch mighty Benefits by a new Croſs; and to take away any Suſpicions of *Metonymies* and *Proſopopœia's*, it is ſaid expreſly *hoc lignum Crucis tuæ*: This Wood of thy Croſs may be a wholſome Remedy to Mankind, a ſtrengthener of Faith, an increaſer of Good Works, the Redemption of Souls, a Comfort, Protection and Defence againſt the Cruelty of our Enemies. And after ſuch Prayers, allowed and uſed by Publick Authority in the *Roman Church*, with what Conſcience could the Council of *Trent* ſay, *That they believed no virtue in Images, nor hoped for any thing from them*? After this, the Biſhop conſecrates the Incenſe, and prays for many good Things to come by that too, then the *Croſs* is *ſprinkled* with Holy Water, and then he *incenſeth* it, ſaying,

> Sanctificetur lignum iſtud, in nomine Pa+tris & Fi+lii, & Spiritus + Sancti; & benedictio illius ligni in quo membra ſancta ſalvatoris ſuſpenſa ſunt, ſit in iſto ligno; ut orantes inclinanteſque ſe propter Deum ante iſtam crucem inveniant corporis & anime ſanitatem. Per eundem, &c.

Then the Biſhop kneels before the *Croſs*, and devoutly adores and kiſſes it; and as many beſides as pleaſe: After this follows a long Prayer for the Sanctification of that new ſign of the *Croſs*; then the Biſhop kneels, adores and kiſſes again, and as many as will. Then follow particular Offices for the Conſecration of an Image of the Bleſſed Virgin, and of other Images. In the *Ceremoniale Romanum*, we find very ſtrange Prayers upon the Conſecration of the *Agnus Dei's*, which, if there were any ground to hope for any of the Advantages there prayed for, by the Worſhip and Honour of them, no one that loved either his Soul or Body would be without them: For the Pope himſelf, good Man, prays thus,

Sacrar. Cerem. l. 1. c. de conſecr. Agnus Dei

Tu eos bene-+-dicere, ſanctifi-+-care, & conſecr-+-are digneris, ut tua larga benedictione ſanctificati eandem virtutem accipiant contra omnes diabolicas verſutias & fraudes maligni ſpiritus; ut illos devote ſuper ſe ſerentibus, nulla tempeſtas eiſdem prevaleat, nulla adverſitas dominatur, nulla aura peſtilens, neque aeris corruptio, nulluſque morbus caducus, nulla maris procella & tempeſtas, nullum incendium, neque ulla iniquitas dominetur eis, neque prevaleat: homo partus cum matre incolumis conſervetur per interceſſionem unigeniti, &c.

What admirable Virtue have theſe *Agnus Dei's* in them! they are *good againſt the Devil, good againſt Storms, Peſtilence, Falling-ſickneſs and Sin*; and what could a Man wiſh for more? but then it is to be obſerved, that theſe Virtues do not depend meerly on the carrying of theſe about one, but the worſhip of them is required too: So in another Prayer there extant,

Bene-+-dicas, & benedicta ſancti-+-fices, quatenus ipſorum veneratione & honore nobis famulis tuis crimina diluantur, &c.

And there we find theſe Verſes of *Urban* V. which he ſent to the Greek Emperor with three *Agnus Dei's*. No Mountebank ever ſet forth the Power of his Medicines with more Advantage than the Pope doth the Virtue of his *Agnus Dei's*.

Balſamus, & munda cera cum Chriſmatis unda,
Conficiunt Agnum; quod munus do tibi magnum:
Fonte velut natum per myſtica ſanctificatum.
Fulgura de ſurſum depellit, omne malignum
Peccatum frangit, ut Chriſti ſanguis: & angit.
Pregnans ſervatur; ſimul & partus liberatur.
Dona defert dignis; virtutem deſtruit ignis,
Portatus munde de fluctibus eripit unde.

Quarant. in Sum. Bullar. p. 7

Stephanus Quaranta having met with a more perfect Copy, adds ſome more Verſes of the virtues of theſe little Images of Wax; and it is great pity any of them ſhould be loſt.

Morte repentina ſervat, Sataneque ruina.
Si quis honoret eum, retinet ſuper hoſte Tropheum,
Parſque minor tantum tota valet integra quantum.
Agnus Dei, miſerere mei,
Qui crimina tollis, miſerere nobis.

Azor. Inſtit. Mor. l. 9. c. 9.

It is not to be queſtioned, ſaith *Azorius*, but, *the Pope himſelf having made theſe Prayers over them* (to whom alone it belongs to conſecrate them the firſt Year of his Popedom, and every Seventh Year after) *they will have the Effects prayed for, if they be uſed with that due Reverence and Devotion which is required.* I find nothing more ingenuouſly confeſſed to have been taken from *Heatheniſm*, than the wearing of *Agnus*

nus Dei's for ſuch Uſes, by *Cardinal Baronius*, and *Raſponi*. *Baronius* ſaith, *the newly baptized uſed to have them hanged about their Necks, inſtead of the little Amulets the Gentiles put upon their Childrens Necks againſt Faſcination.* For, ſaith he, *it being impoſſible to break off all the Gentile Cuſtoms, in thoſe who were become Chriſtians, they were allowed the continuance of them, ſo they were turned to the worſhip of the True God.* And *Cardinal Raſponi* ſaith, *that inſtead of the little Images of falſe Gods, theſe were invented to be worn for the ſame purpoſes*, viz. *the driving away the Miſchiefs both of Body and Soul.* Thoſe were called *Bullæ*, which were worn by Boys, and *Pupæ*, by Girles, being little round Images, that were firſt hung upon Children, and after uſed by the greateſt Perſons, as by thoſe that Triumphed, as *Raſponi* obſerves, to prevent the Power of Enchantment. (Thoſe that conſider this and the *ſaliva luſtralis*, uſed upon the *dies luſtricus* among the *Heathens*.

Baron. ad A. D. 58. n. 76, 77.

Raſpon. de Baſil. Lateran. l. 2. c. 8. p. 144.

Frontemq; atq; uda labella
Infami digito, & luſtralibus ante ſalivis
Expiat——

Perſ. Satyr. 2.

with the great Vertues attributed by them to Salt, and Oyl, and Holy Water, may eaſily underſtand that part of the *Roman Ritual*, which concerns the Ceremonies they have added to Baptiſm.) But beſides the *Bullæ* which the *Heathens* uſed for *Amulets*, they had little Images, which they carried about with them; in which they ſuppoſed there were great Vertues, and to which they gave Divine Worſhip. So *Dio* ſaith, *Cæſar carried a little Image of* Venus; *and Suetonius of Nero*, that he had *Icunculam puellarem, and which he ſecretly worſhipped three times a Day*; and *Aſclepiades* did carry always about with him *a little Image of the* Dea Cœleſtis, ſaith *Ammianus Marcellinus*; as *Apuleius* ſaith, he did himſelf, *a little* Mercury *which he worſhipped, which*, he ſaid, *ought not to be touched but with pure Hands, being a conſecrated Thing*; juſt as *Azorius* determines, *that no Laymen ought to touch an* Agnus Dei, *for the very ſame Reaſon, becauſe they are conſecrated: And the Council of Milan under Carolus Borromæus* (ſince canonized) *declares, that when any Artificer makes a Golden or Chryſtal Caſe to put an* Agnus Dei *in, he muſt not preſume to touch it either with his Gloves, or with any Inſtrument; but he muſt ſend for one in Holy Orders to put it into the Caſe.* And after all this, is it poſſible for any to ſuppoſe, that the *Heathens* did attribute Virtue to their Images, and that they in the Church of *Rome* do not? when they pray for Virtues to be given to them; and believe great Efficacy to be in them, and uſe them with as much Superſtition as the *Heathens* did. What ever then the Council of *Trent* hath determined to avoid calumny, the Solemn Prayers, and Offices, and Practice of their Church, do ſufficiently manifeſt that they believe Virtue to be in Images, and conſequently do truſt in them for thoſe Effects which were pray'd to be given by their means.

Dio l. 43.

Sueton. in Neron. c. 56.

Ammian. Marcell. l. 22.

Apule. Apolog.

Azor. l. 9. c. 9. q. 3.

Acta Eccleſiæ Mediolan. ſub S. Carolo Borrom. l. 2. n. 41, 42.

(3.) We ought to compare the Practice of the Worſhip of Images in the *Heathen* and *Chriſtian Rome* together; and if either exceed the other, the latter hath done it in ſome parts of Folly and Superſtition. The ſolemn Rites which concerned the Worſhip of Images in the *Heathen Rome* lay in theſe things, 1. *Conſecration.* 2. *Supplication.* 3. *Pompous Proceſſion.*

1. *Conſecration of Images for publick Worſhip*; which was to be performed by the *Pontifices or Prieſts. Before Conſecration*, ſaith *Quintilian; they are only the Works of Mens Hands, it is that which brings God into them, and makes them fit to be ſet up for Worſhip; this therefore is not to be permitted to all, but only to thoſe whoſe Hands are pure, and devoted to ſacred things.* This Conſecration was generally performed with a certain form of Words, which is now loſt with the old *Pontifical Books*; *but perhaps*, ſaith *Gutherius*, *they had none at all; no more than they had in the Conſecration of Emperors*; which was done only by the Solemnity of the Action it ſelf. *Minucius Felix* makes the Adorning, Conſecration, and Prayers, to be neceſſary Things, which make *an Image to become a God*; i. e. when it is ſolemnly dedicated to divine Worſhip. But they had two ſorts of conſecrated Images, ſome that were only Ornamental, which they called ἀγάλματα; and others that were the proper Images of the Temple, which were ſet up over the middle Altar, *and to that God, whom that Image repreſented, the Temple was dedicated, and the reſt, as Servius tells us, were only to beautifie the Temple. Viturvius* ſaith, *the Images were to be above the Altars, that they who came to pray and Sacrifice at the Altar, might look on the Divinity*; as it is fully expreſſed in one of the Coyns of *Domitian* mentioned by *Gutherius* and *Gevartius*. This was the *High Altar*, beſides which, there were generally two other at leaſt; the one near the Entrance, where the Beaſts were ſacrificed and burnt; the other held the Veſſels and Utenſils and was called *Anclabris* ſaith *Feſtus:* But the chief Altar was that, over which the Image was placed, and was called *Altare ab altitudine*, i. e. *the high Altar*. And it is very obſervable, although it hath been little taken notice of, that the Sacrifices were burnt at the lower Altar; which the Prieſts having done, they then went up to the High Altar, and there did *adolere*, i. e. *offer Incenſe and Prayers*; *for as Arnobius* ſaith, *they did caſt their Incenſe into the Fire*, ante ipſa Numinum ſigna, *before the Images of the Gods, which*, he there ſaith, *they believed to be the chief part of Worſhip, and to have the greateſt Influence on propitiating the Gods.* From whence I obſerve, how unreaſonably thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, meerly to excuſe themſelves, have made Sacrifice the only external act of *Latria*, and excluded Incenſe and Supplication from being peculiar to God; when among both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, theſe were looked on as the more ſolemn and diviner parts of Worſhip.

Quintil. declam. 323.

Guth. de Vet. jure Pontific. l. 4. *c.* 22.

Minuc. p. 26.

Serv. in Georg. 3.

Vitruv. l. 4. *c.* 8.

Guther. de Vet. jure Pontif. l. 3. *c.* 6.

Gevart. Numiſ. Tab. 32. *n.* 4.

Feſt. v. Anclabris.

Arnob. l. 7. *p.* 232.

2. *Supplication:* which properly relates to the Prayers made in great Diſtreſſes; but I take it as comprehending all their ſolemn Prayers: which were wont to be made among the old *Romans*, with great Expreſſions of Devotion, *before the Images of their Gods*; which in *Arnobius* is expreſſed by *Deorum ante ora proſtrati*; by *Lucretius*, *Pandere Palmas——Ante Deum delubra*; by *Cæſar*, *ante ſimulachra projecti victoriam à Diis expoſcerent*; by *Lucan*, *mæſtaque tenent delubra catervæ*; by *Ovid*.

Arnobl. 1. *p.* 29

Lucret. l. 5

Cæſar de bello civ. l. 2.

Lucan. l. 2

Summiſſoq; genu vultus in imagine Divæ Fixit.

Ovid. Faſt. l. 4.

which, with many other Expreſſions to the ſame purpoſe in Latin Authors, do imply, that they made *their Prayers before the Images of their Gods*; and not that they took the Images themſelves for Gods, any otherwiſe than thoſe do who ſuppoſe ſome extraordinary preſence

ſence after Conſecration; or, by the Power of Imagination repreſented them as preſent to them in their Images; which the *Romans* properly called Adoration; which was *orare ad*, to pray to them as preſent; or *ad os orare*, as *Gutherius* interprets it; thence *Arnobius*, *quotidianis ſupplicationibus adorare.* And this on great Occaſions was performed through all the Temples for two or three Days, as the Senate thought fit, as we find it often in *Livy*, with ſolemn Proceſſions of the People.

Gutb. de Vet. jure Pontif. l. 4. c. 17. Arnob. l. 1.

3. Another part of the *Divine Honour* they gave to Images, was the *carrying them in Pomp* upon *ſolemn Feſtivals* (which is largely deſcribed by *Dionyſius*:) For then *they carried their Gods from the Capitol through the* Forum *into the great* Cirque; *and after the ſeveral Orders of Men in the Proceſſion, at laſt came the Images of the Gods carried upon Mens Backs, and when this Proceſſion was over, the Prayers and Sacrifices began.* This was looked on as ſo peculiar to the Gods, that *Suetonius* reckons it as one of the great Inſtances of *Cæſar*'s affecting *Divine Honours*, that he would have his Image carried in this *ſacred Proceſſion*.

Dionyſ. Halic. l. 7. p. 475.

Suet. in Jul. l. 26.

§. 17. Let us now ſee what the Practice of *Rome Chriſtian* hath been in theſe Particulars. 1. For Conſecration, we have already ſeen the *ſet Forms* appointed for it in the *Roman Pontifical*; although the *Nicene Council* thought no other Conſecration neceſſary, than the ſetting up the Images for *Publick Worſhip*; yet the *Roman Church* would not let People imagine them defective in any thing which the *Heathens* did towards the more ſolemn worſhip of *Images.* 2. For *Supplication* before them, let the *Images* ſet up for Worſhip over the *high Altar* ſpeak for them, whether in this Point of *Adoration* they come behind *Heathen Rome.* By the Rubrick of the *Miſſal*, in every ſolemn Maſs, *the Prieſt is to go up to the middle of the Altar, and there having kiſſed the Altar, he puts the Incenſe into the Thuribulum, which he is to do three times with his right hand, and his left hand on his Breaſt; having done this, he makes a profound Reverence to the Crucifix over the Altar* (as appears by the *Picture* of the *Altar* in *Gavantus*) *and three times incenſeth that; then bowing again to the Crucifix he incenſeth the Altar*; which is to be done with ſo much Niceneſs and Ceremony, that *Gavantus* reckons up twenty nine times, with their exact order, wherein the ſeveral *parts* of the *Altar* and *Crucifix* are to be *incenſed* by the *Prieſt* who celebrates Maſs. *If there be any Reliques or Images of Saints about the Altar, after the incenſing and adoration of the Crucifix, before the Prieſt goes from the middle of the Altar, he firſt incenſeth thoſe on the right-hand, and then making his Reverence to the Croſs, he doth the ſame to thoſe on the left-hand.* *Philander* in his *Notes* on *Vitruvius*, in his *Diſcourſe* to *Paul* 3. about the *right placing* of *Images*, ſaith, *That that due placing of Images is over the Altars*, as the Image of the *Madonna* at *Loreto*, hath a holy Altar before it of ſquare Stone, ſaith *Turſellinus*; and accordingly *Matthæus Riccius* ſaith, *That in* China *they placed the Image of the Bleſſed Virgin on the Altar, where they every day did offer their Devotions.* *Aloyſius Novarinus* glories in the *Invention* of a *new ſort of Worſhip*, viz. of the *Bleſſed Virgin big-bellied, with Chriſt in her Womb*; which was called, LA MADONNA DELL' ALLEGREZZA, and he ſaith, *That he cauſed an Altar to be erected, and an Image to be ſet up for this Worſhip, firſt at* Verona; *and deſires it may be generally received, as the moſt excellent way of her Worſhip, to promote which,* he ſaith, *he had written* (no

Miſſal. de Intr. Part. 2. tit. 4. n. 4.

Gavant. in Miſſ. p. 103.

Philand. in Vitr. l. 4. c. 8.

Turſel. hiſt. Lauren. l. 1.

Trigaud. de Chriſtian. Exped. apud Sinas l. 4. c. 11. p. 403.

Novar. Elect. ſanc. l. 4. c. 54.

1. *Conſecration of Images for publick Worſhip*; which was to be performed by the *Pontifices or Prieſts*. *Before Conſecration*, ſaith *Quintilian*; *they are only the Works of Mens Hands, it is that which brings God into them, and makes them fit to be ſet up for Worſhip*; *this therefore is not to be permitted to all, but only to thoſe whoſe Hands are pure, and devoted to ſacred things.* This Conſecration was generally performed with a certain form of Words, which is now loſt with the old *Pontifical Books*; *but perhaps*, ſaith *Gutherius*, *they had none at all*; *no more than they had in the Conſecration of Emperors*; which was done only by the Solemnity of the Action it ſelf. *Minucius Felix* makes the Adorning, Conſecration, and Prayers, to be neceſſary Things, which make *an Image to become a God*; i. e. when it is ſolemnly dedicated to divine Worſhip. But they had two ſorts of conſecrated Images, ſome that were only Ornamental, which they called ἀγάλματα; and others that were the proper Images of the Temple, which were ſet up over the middle Altar, *and to that God, whom that Image repreſented, the Temple was dedicated, and the reſt, as Servius tells us, were only to beautifie the Temple.* *Viturvius* ſaith, *the Images were to be above the Altars, that they who came to pray and Sacrifice at the Altar, might look on the Divinity*; as it is fully expreſſed in one of the Coyns of *Domitian* mentioned by *Gutherius* and *Gevartius*. This was the *High Altar*, beſides which, there were generally two other at leaſt; the one near the Entrance, where the Beaſts were ſacrificed and burnt; the other held the Veſſels and Utenſils and was called *Anclabris* ſaith *Feſtus*: But the chief Altar was that, over which the Image was placed, and was called *Altare ab altitudine*, i. e. *the high Altar*. And it is very obſervable, although it hath been little taken notice of, that the Sacrifices were burnt at the lower Altar; which the Prieſts having done, they then went up to the High Altar, and there did *adolere*, i. e. *offer Incenſe and Prayers*; *for as Arnobius* ſaith, *they did caſt their Incenſe into the Fire*, ante ipſa Numinum ſigna, *before the Images of the Gods, which*, he there ſaith, *they believed to be the chief part of Worſhip, and to have the greateſt Influence on propitiating the Gods.* From whence I obſerve, how unreaſonably thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, meerly to excuſe themſelves, have made Sacrifice the only external act of *Latria*, and excluded Incenſe and Supplication from being peculiar to God; when among both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, theſe were looked on as the more ſolemn and diviner parts of Worſhip.

Quintil. declam. 323.
Guth. de Vet. jure Pontific. l. 4. c. 22.
Minuc. p. 26.
Serv. in Georg. 3.
Vitruv. l. 4. c. 8.
Guther. de Vet. jure Pontif. l. 3. c. 6.
Gevart. Numiſ. Tab. 32. n. 4.
Feſt. v. Anclabris.
Arnob. l. 7. p. 232.

2. *Supplication*: which properly relates to the Prayers made in great Diſtreſſes; but I take it as comprehending all their ſolemn Prayers: which were wont to be made among the old *Romans*, with great Expreſſions of Devotion, *before the Images of their Gods*; which in *Arnobius* is expreſſed by *Deorum ante ora proſtrati*; by *Lucretius*, *Pandere Palmas——Ante Deum delubra*; by *Cæſar*, *ante ſimulachra projecti victoriam à Diis expoſcerent*; by *Lucan*, *mæſtaque tenent delubra catervæ*; by *Ovid*.

Summiſſoq; genu vultus in imagine Divæ Fixit.

Arnob. l. 1. p. 29
Lucret. l. 5
Cæſar de bello civ. l. 2.
Lucan. l. 2.
Ovid. Faſt l. 4.

which, with many other Expreſſions to the ſame purpoſe in Latin Authors, do imply, that they made *their Prayers before the Images of their Gods*; and not that they took the Images themſelves for Gods, any otherwiſe than thoſe do who ſuppoſe ſome extraordinary preſence after Conſecration; or, by the Power of Imagination repreſented them as preſent to them in their Images; which the *Romans* properly called Adoration; which was *orare ad*, to pray to them as preſent; or *ad os orare*, as *Gutherius* interprets it; thence *Arnobius*, *quotidianis ſupplicationibus adorare*. And this on great Occaſions was performed through all the Temples for two or three Days, as the Senate thought fit, as we find it often in *Livy*, with ſolemn Proceſſions of the People.

Guth. de Vet. jure Pontif. l. 4. c. 17.
Arnob. l. 1.

3. Another part of the *Divine Honour* they gave to Images, was the *carrying them in Pomp* upon *ſolemn Feſtivals* (which is largely deſcribed by *Dionyſius*:) For then *they carried their Gods from the Capitol through the* Forum *into the great* Cirque; *and after the ſeveral Orders of Men in the Proceſſion, at laſt came the Images of the Gods carried upon Mens Backs, and when this Proceſſion was over, the Prayers and Sacrifices began.* This was looked on as ſo peculiar to the Gods, that *Suetonius* reckons it as one of the great Inſtances of *Cæſar*'s affecting *Divine Honours*, that he would have his Image carried in this *ſacred Proceſſion*.

Dionyſ. Halic. l. 7. p. 475.
Suet. in Jul. l. 26.

§. 17. Let us now ſee what the Practice of *Rome Chriſtian* hath been in theſe Particulars. 1. For Conſecration, we have already ſeen the *ſet Forms* appointed for it in the *Roman Pontifical*; although the *Nicene Council* thought no other Conſecration neceſſary, than the ſetting up the Images for *Publick Worſhip*; yet the *Roman Church* would not let People imagine them defective in any thing which the *Heathens* did towards the more ſolemn worſhip of *Images*. 2. For *Supplication* before them, let the *Images* ſet up for Worſhip over the *high Altar* ſpeak for them, whether in this Point of *Adoration* they come behind *Heathen Rome*. By the Rubrick of the *Miſſal*, in every ſolemn Maſs, *the Prieſt is to go up to the middle of the Altar, and there having kiſſed the Altar, he puts the Incenſe into the Thuribulum, which he is to do three times with his right hand, and his left hand on his Breaſt; having done this, he makes a profound Reverence to the Crucifix over the Altar* (as appears by the *Picture* of the *Altar* in *Gavantus*) *and three times incenſeth that; then bowing again to the Crucifix he incenſeth the Altar*; which is to be done with ſo much Niceneſs and Ceremony, that *Gavantus* reckons up twenty nine times, with their exact order, wherein the ſeveral *parts* of the *Altar* and *Crucifix* are to be *incenſed* by the *Prieſt* who celebrates Maſs. *If there be any Reliques or Images of Saints about the Altar, after the incenſing and adoration of the Crucifix, before the Prieſt goes from the middle of the Altar, he firſt incenſeth thoſe on the right-hand, and then making his Reverence to the Croſs, he doth the ſame to thoſe on the left-hand.* *Philander* in his *Notes* on *Vitruvius*, in his *Diſcourſe* to Paul 3. about the *right placing* of *Images*, ſaith, *That that due placing of Images is over the Altars*, as the Image of the *Madonna* at *Loreto*, hath a holy Altar before it of ſquare Stone, ſaith *Turſellinus*; and accordingly *Matthæus Riccius* ſaith, *That in* China *they placed the Image of the Bleſſed Virgin on the Altar, where they every day did offer their Devotions. Aloyſius Novarinus* glories in the *Invention* of a *new ſort of Worſhip*, viz. of the *Bleſſed Virgin big-bellied, with Chriſt in her Womb*; which was called, LA MADONNA DELL' ALLEGREZZA, and he ſaith, *That he cauſed an Altar to be erected, and an Image to be ſet up for this Worſhip, firſt at* Verona; *and deſires it may be generally received, as the moſt excellent way of her Worſhip, to promote which*, he ſaith, *he had written* (no

Miſſal. de Intr. Part. 2. tit. 4. n. 4.
Gavant. in Miſſ. p. 103.
Philand. in Vitr. l. 4. c. 8.
Turſel. hiſt. Lauren. l. 1.
Trigaud. de Chriſtian. Exped. apud Sinas l. 4. c. 11. p. 403.
Novar. Elect. ſanc. l. 4. c. 54.

doubt, an admirable *Book*) *Of the Life of Chriſt in the Womb of the Virgin.*

And for *praying to Images*, it is done with as much Ceremony and Formality as it ever was among the *Heathens*; with *Proſtrations, Genuflections, looking as devoutly upon the Images, approaching* to them, and touching them with as much ſhew of Reverence as ever was uſed among them; inſomuch that if an old *Roman* were revived and ſaw the Modern Practices of Worſhip of Images at *Rome*, he would ſay they had done by Worſhip as the *Stoicks* did by *Philoſophy*, viz. only *changed the Names*, when the things were the ſame. Nay ſcarce any Superſtition can be mentioned ſo *barbarous* among the *Heathen Idolaters* towards Images, but it is practiſed in the *Roman Church*; Witneſs the *binding the Image of St.* Anthony *to get a good Wind, which* Peter *Della Valle* ſaith, *is much uſed, and not without ſucceſs among the* Portugals; and *Boulaye le Gouz* mentions *their putting the Images of St.* Anthony *and the Bleſſed Virgin, with their Heads forward into Wells, drawing them up and down there, to procure Rain, and for other very uſeful Purpoſes.* But ſetting aſide ſuch barbarous Superſtition of the People (which is not condemned by their ſpiritual Governours that we find) we need inſiſt on no more than what is either *required, or commonly allowed and practiſed with Approbation.* We have already ſeen by the Confeſſion of their beſt Writers, *That their Church does allow praying to the Croſs in the moſt expreſs and formal Terms of Prayer, O Crux Ave, Spes unica, Hoc paſſionis Tempore, Piis adauge Gratiam, Reiſque dele Crimina.* Wherein *Bernardus Pujol* confeſſes that not only the common People, but the *Church it ſelf doth ſpeak to the Croſs, as the Image of Chriſt*; and what is this then, but *praying to the Image?* Upon the Third of *May* we find this *Antiphona* to the *Croſs.*

DellaValle Lett.9 p.6 Boulay Voyage l. 2. c. 25.

Hymn. ad Veſper. Dom. Paſſion. Pujol de adorat. diſp. 3. Sect. 6. p. 281.

> *O Crux ſplendidior cunctis aſtris, mundo celebris, hominibus multùm amabilis, ſanctior univerſis, quæ ſola fuiſti digna portare talentum mundi, dulce lignum, dulces clavos, dulcia ferens pondera; Salva præſentem catervam in tuis hodie laudibus congregatam.*

Brev. Rom Feſt. Maii 30. invent. S. Crucis

But the moſt ſolemn Adoration of the Croſs is performed upon *Good-Friday*, which according to the Rubricks of the *Roman Miſſal* is after this manner, *Prayers being ended, the Prieſt goes to the Epiſtle ſide of the Altar, and there takes the Croſs from the Deacon; and then turns to the People, and by degrees uncovers a little of it from the Top, and begins the Antiphona,* Ecce lignum Crucis, in qua ſalus mundi pependit, *Then the Choire Sings,* Venite, Adoremus; *at which they all proſtrate themſelves (not to the Earth, ſaith Gavantus, but with kneeling, and a very lowly Reverence) Then he goes forward to the Corner of the Altar, and opening the Right-hand of the Crucifix, and lifting it up a little, he ſings louder,* Ecce Lignum, *&c. and the reſt ſing and adore again; then he goes to the middle of the Altar, and uncovers the whole Crucifix, and liſts it up and ſings yet louder, and they adore, as before. When this is done, the Prieſt carries it to a place prepared before the Altar, and there kneeling he places it; then he pulls off his Shooes, and goes to worſhip the Croſs, three times kneeling, before he kiſſes it: And after him, the reſt do it in their Order.* And the Pope himſelf on that day *lays aſide his Miter, hath his Shooes pulled off, and goes between two Cardinals* ad adorandum, *to worſhip the Croſs, before which he kneels three times at a convenient Diſtance, and Prays, and then kiſſes it: And ſo all the Cardinals two and two, and the reſt after them.* Several other Ceremonies there are in the Miſſals of *York* and *Saliſbury*;

Rubr. Miſſal. de feria ſextâ in Paraſceue.

Cerem. Sacr. l. 2. de ſexta Feriâ, &c.

bury; but thoſe which are in the *Roman Miſſal* are ſufficient to prove that they in the *Roman* Church are bound to give as ſolemn Adoration to the *Croſs*, as ever any Heathens gave to any Images whatſoever. Beſides this, they make ſolemn Supplication to other *Images* of *Chriſt*; as to that of the *Veronica* at *Rome*, in thoſe known Verſes, *Salve ſancta Facies noſtri Redemptoris*, &c. Wherein they pray to the Image *to purge them from Sin, and bring them to Heaven*; which are pretty reaſonable Requeſts to be made to an Image, eſpecially ſo authentick a one as that is: Of which *Bzovius* ſaith, *That it hath ſupreme Honour among Chriſtians, and hath an Altar on purpoſe for it*, which is called *Altare ſanctiſſimi ſudarii*, (as he ſhews from *Grimaldus*) *in S.* Peter'*s Church at* Rome, *and was in the Oratory of Pope* John 7. and the *Monuments of the Conſecration of that Altar are ſtill preſerved among other Records of that Church, which had Prieſts belonging to it.* This Image is ſhewed at ſolemn times, and then the *People fall down and worſhip it*; the manner whereof is deſcribed by Pope *Pius* 2. relating to the Proceſſion of the *Pope* at the Tranſlation of the Head of S. *Andrew*: *The Pope coming in Pomp with the Cardinals and Clergy to that part of the Church where the* Veronica *was, commanded it to be ſhewn. Forthwith the Cardinal of S.* Mark *goes up the Steps, and ſhews the venerable and ſacred Image, the People three times crying out Mercy. It was,* ſaith he, *a wonderful thing at one time to ſee our Bleſſed Saviour* (in this Image) *and the Reliques of the Apoſtle; and the Pope and Cardinals and Clergy kneeling and praying with their Heads uncover'd*, viz. to this Image of *Veronica*? Gretſer *ſaith, That in ſome Miſſals there was a* Miſſa de Veronica, *with an Indulgence granted by* Innocent 4. *to thoſe who ſaid that Maſs, or but the* Collect *there mentioned*; *after which follows the* Sequence, *viz.* Salve ſancta facies, *&c. full of devout Affections*, ſaith *Gretſer*; which *Bollandus* ſuppoſes to be *the Pſalm made by* Innocent 3. *for the Honour of the* Veronica, *of which* Matth. Paris *ſpeaks*. But we are not to imagine *Veronica* to be only thus worſhipped at *Rome*; for the very ſame is pretended to be in *Spain* too, in the *Cathedral Church of Jaen in Bætica*, where it is likewiſe ſhewed and worſhipped with mighty Reverence and a *kind of ſacred Horror*, ſaith *Bollandus*, *twice a Year*. *Lucius Marinæus* ſaith, *There is ſo much Divinity in it, that no Man can tell what colour it is off*; *and that the Worſhip of it hath mightily enriched the Place*; to which *Clement* 7. and *Julius* 3. granted large *Indulgences*, and *Litanies* are appointed to be uſed by the People at the ſhewing of it. There are others of them ſhewed, and worſhipped in other Places as both *Bollandus* and *Gretſer* confeſs; at which they ſeem a little troubled, but think to ſalve all by ſaying, that the reſt are Copies, or that *Veronica*'s *Handkerchief had three Foldings*, and every one had a diſtinct Image, whereof one was kept at *Rome*, another at *Jeruſalem*, and a third in *Spain*; but whether Originals or Copies, whether true or falſe, they are all worſhipped, where ever they are, with mighty Devotion, and Miracles are ſaid to be done by them. *Lucius Marinæus* mentions another Image of Chriſt which was ſolemnly worſhipped in *Spain*, viz. one made by *Nicodemus*, and *was found by a Merchant in an Ark Floating on the Sea*; Cujus Imaginis invocato Numine, ſaith he, *The Divinity of which Image being pray'd to, abundance of infirm Perſons were healed.* And he ſaith of *Ferdinand* King of *Spain*, *That he did moſt devoutly Worſhip a certain Image of* God, *which he carried about with him.* Ab eâ itaque quicquid & neceſſario & honeſtè petebat, facile ſemper aſſequebatur; *he obtained eaſily and al-*

Bzov. A. 1216. *n.* 16.

Æn. Sylv. Comment. l. 8.

Gretſer de Imag. non manufactis c. 17.

Bolland. in 4. *Febr. Sect.* 3. *n.* 13.

Luc. Marinæ. Sic. de reb. Hiſpan. l. 5.

Luc. Marin. ib.

ways, whatever he duely prayed for to the Image. Another *Divine Image of Chriſt* which hath *ſolemn Supplications* made to it is that *imprinted on the ſacred Sindon, or Shroud at Beſancon, which is ſhewed twice a year upon a Mountain near the City, where vaſt numbers of People meet to adore it; and the Devils roar at the opening of it, and the Skies of a ſudden clear, although it rained before, when it is ſhewed, and doth ſuch mighty Wonders, that* Chiffletius ſaith, *Præſenti Divino Numine ſemper affulget; it hath always a Divine Preſence with it; forty Hours Prayers,* he ſaith, *are often made to it, and in extraordinary Neceſſities it is carried in Proceſſion like the Ark) but more holy than the Ark) and in a time of general Peſtilence,* he ſaith, *they finding no other remedy did fly* in St. Sudarii aſylum & clientelam, *into the Sanctuary and Protection of this Divine Image, and thereupon the City inſtituted a Society and ſolemn Proceſſion to the Honour of it every Year, on the Third of* May, *to which other Cities of* Burgundy, *as* Dole *and* Salines, *joyned themſelves; and* Gregory 13. *granted an Indulgence to the Altar erected for the honour of this Image: which is called* Altare S. Sindonis. The like might be ſhewed concerning other Images, but theſe are ſufficient to my purpoſe, to prove the common and allowed Practice of the Worſhip of Images in the *Roman Church*, as to the Rites of Supplication and Adoration, to be as Extravagant, as ever were among the *Heathens*.

Chifflet. de linteis ſepulchr. Chriſti. c. 11. 15.

c. 14.

3. For Solemn Proceſſions with Images, we have as great Inſtances as ever were among them; Witneſs the Proceſſion with the Image of St. *Roch* by the grave *Fathers* of the *Council of Conſtance, which was done,* ſaith *Baronius, by a Decree of that Council; when upon the Plague raging there, his Image was carried through the City in ſolemn Pomp, upon which the Plague ſtayed: from this Example,* ſaith he, *his Images were every where ſet up, and Altars, Chappels, and Temples erected to him.* Witneſs, *The Proceſſion at* Rome *by* Paul 2. *wherein the Pope and Cardinals went barefoot, the Image of St.* Mario de Populo, *and the Image of our Saviour in the* Lateran *being ſolemnly carried to gain a Victory over the Turks. Cardinal Raſponi* ſaith, *That is thought to be the moſt effectual way to obtain Favour and Mercy of God, to carry the Image of our Saviour from the* Lateran *Church in a ſolemn Proceſſion to St.* Maria Major; *for then they think their Prayers are moſt ſure to be heard, when the Image of Chriſt ſtands by that of the Bleſſed Virgin, whoſe Authority and Favour is ſo great with her Son.* So *Stephen* 3. *found when he carried the Image on his own Shoulders Barefoot, the People following him, when he was much diſtreſſed by* Aiſtulphus. Upon the Feaſt of the *Aſſumption of the Bleſſed Virgin, the Pope and Cardinals keep the Veſpers at St.* Maria Major (as *Raſponi* deſcribes it from *Benedictus* Canon of St. *Peters) thoſe being ended,* the *Pope returns to the* Lateran; *the Cardinals take from the Chappel of St.* Laurence *the Image of our Saviour, but firſt, the Pope and Cardinals, Barefoot, make Seven Bowings, and then open the Image and kiſs the Feet of it, then this Image is carried with great Pomp and Devotion, with Torches burning, and the People ſinging through thoſe Streets of the City that have been moſt troubled with Serpents and Devils; for which cauſe Pope* Sergius *appointed this Proceſſion.* But it ſeems ſo great Wickedneſs was committed in this Nocturnal Proceſſion, (although *Raſponi* ſaith, *That a Miracle happened of not conſuming the Wax of the Torches,)* that *Pius* 5. forbad this Proceſſion. Every Year in *Rogation Week* for Three Days the Image of the *Bleſſed Virgin* is carried in a ſolemn Proceſſion from *Mount Gardia* near *Bononia*, with publick Supplications; be-

Baron. Martyrol. Aug. 16.

Ciaccon. in Paulo 2. *Bzov. A.* 1216. *n.* 16.

Raſponi de Baſil. Later. l. 4. *c.* 19.

Bonon. Chronic. Deip. 346. *A.D.* 1433 cauſe once, in a time of great Rain, when no other means would help them, *Cardinal Albergati* appointed ſuch a *Proceſſion againſt Rain for Four Days* together, after which it ſeems the Rain ceaſed. Upon *Tueſday in Eaſter Week*, *Sedulius* deſcribes a moſt ſolemn Proceſſion carrying the Image of the *Bleſſed Virgin, at Maeſtricht*. Firſt, *The Image is taken out of the Chappel, and placed in the middle of the Church for more ſolemn Adoration; where the People continue at their Prayers all Night, before the Image*; at which times, he ſaith, *the Officers of the Church have given away Seventeen Thouſand little Images of the Bleſſed Virgin with Indulgences: where*, ſaith he, *it is a pleaſant Sight to behold Children, Boys, Virgins, Matrons, Men, only covered with linnen or flannen Shirts, and Barefooted to approach, to worſhip, to kneel, and even to creep about the Image of the Bleſſed Virgin; and watering the very Ground with their Tears: Many from the Head to the Knees having Iron Armour next to their Bodies; going upon their bare Knees the whole Proceſſion; and drawing heavy chains of Iron faſtened to their Feet.* The manner of which Proceſſion is thus ſet down, *After Maſs performed to the Honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, and the chords of St.* Francis *are diſtributed among the great Perſons, (which they carry upon their Garments that Day like Shoulder Belts) the Proceſſion begins; firſt a Crucifix is carried by one of the Friars, whom a great number follows of Men, Women, and Children; all Barefoot, with only Linnen or Flannen Shifts, with Torches in their Hands, in the habit of Penitents with great Silence Praying and Weeping as they go. In the Year* 1608. *there were about a Thouſand in this Dreſs, among whom where not a few Men who covered their Heads with Iron Head-pieces that they might not be known. Many Women drew their Children after them that could hardly go; and others carried them Sucking at their Breaſts; and an old Woman that could not go, was carried in her Bed. After theſe followed the Whippers under the peculiar care of the Jeſuits, with their Faces covered and Barefoot. Then followed another Croſs; after them the Franciſcans ſinging to the Praiſe of the Bleſſed Virgin; then the chief Citizens, then the Officers of her Chappel, then the Torch Bearers immediately before the ſacred Image, which the choiſeſt Virgins carried on their Shoulders: then followed a Company of armed Men, who had vowed this Service to the Virgin for ſeveral Years. In that Year* 1608. *there were* 86 *Perſons ſtark naked (only where Nature would not allow it) that had Iron Armour on their Bodies from Head to Foot; and moſt of them drawing a heavy Chain faſtened to their right Foot, that they might go more uneaſily; their Linen Drawers did ſhew how the Blood dropt from their Fleſh by the pinching of the Armour; and the very way was ſprinkled with Blood; after theſe, the Magiſtrates of the City followed, and the Conſuls and Senators all bearing Torches before the Hoſt, which was carried under a Silken Canopy, with a moſt profound Reverence; then came in the laſt Place, the Governour, the Nobility, and a vaſt Multitude of all ſorts of People; and for Eight Days together many People walked the ſame round out of great Devotion.* I do not think this Proceſſion can be matched, by the Supplications and the *Pompa Circenſis of old Rome*; or by any of the Proceſſions with their Idols, which *Peter Della Valle* deſcribes among the *Heathen Indians*; which, he confeſſes, *to be very like thoſe uſed among Chriſtians, when the Images of Saints are carried in Proceſſion, when any Body or Fraternity go in Pilgrimage to* Loretto *or* Rome, *in the Holy Year.*

Sedul. de Virgine Moſe Traject. c. 2. 1.

Marian. l. 2. c. 14.

Pet. della Valle lett. 5. n. 3. 18. 25.

The Jeſuits boaſt very much of their Zeal in ſetting up the Worſhip of the Images of the *Bleſſed Virgin* in *Flanders*, and eſpecially of theſe Solemn Proceſſions with her Images; particularly at *Courtray*

Imago primi ſæc. Soc. Jeſu l. 6. p. 775. &c.

for Nine Days together, wherein there have been Nine Thouſand Perſons: In the Year 1636. the Plague raging there, a Solemn Supplication was appointed with a Proceſſion of the Image through the City, with wonderful Devotion; and at Bruges, A. D. 1633. *with an incredible number of People; and a Thouſand Torches of Virgin Wax;* and the like Solemnities were ſet up by their means at *Bruſſels*, *Antwerp*, *Mechlin* and other Places. *Otho Zylius a Jeſuite* ſets down the order of the Proceſſion, wherein the Image of the *Bleſſed Virgin* that was before worſhipped at *Boiſleduc* was carried to *Bruſſels*, upon the Shoulders of Four *Capucins*, the *Infanta Iſabella* following it with all the Nobility, and infinite Numbers of People, with the higheſt Expreſſions of Pomp and Devotion, and at laſt it was placed in the *middle* of a *Chappel juſt over the Altar*, where it hath Solemn Worſhip given to it, and wonderful cures are ſaid to be wrought by it. I cannot conclude this Diſcourſe, without giving ſome Account of another notable Proceſſion at *Bruſſels* of an Image of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, the Occaſion whereof was this; *a new Confraternity was inſtituted in Spain of the Slaves of the Bleſſed Virgin, by one* Simon Rojas; *whoſe Cuſtom was to ſalute one another with thoſe Words,* Ave Maria, *inſtead of* Your humble Servant, *and this Sodality was eſtabliſhed with large Indulgencies by* Paul 5. *and afterwards was begun in* Bruges, A. D. 1626. *having Fetters as the badge of this Slavery, and new Indulgences from* Urban 8. *for the eſtabliſhing this Society, it happened luckily, that an Officer of the King of* Spain's *Fleet being ſick at* Dunkirk, *pretended to diſcover a great Secret to* Barth. de los Rios *then Preacher to* Iſabella Clara Eugenia, viz. *that he had a moſt admirable Image of the Bleſſed Virgin, which had been worſhipped for 600 Years in the Cathedral Church of* Aberdene, *and had ſpoken to the laſt Catholick Biſhop, and had miraculouſly eſcaped the Hereticks Hands; and was deſigned for a Preſent to* Iſabella; *but he, (Wretch that he was) upon a promiſe made by the Franciſcans of his own Country in* Spain, *of praying for his Soul and his Families, had intended to have carried it thither, which he found was diſpleaſing to the Bleſſed Virgin by his dangerous Sickneſs; and he hoped upon this Confeſſion ſhe would have Mercy upon him; and therefore he deſired him to preſent this Image to her Highneſs in the Name of the Catholicks of* Aberdene; *which was received by her with wonderful Devotion, and ſhe ſaid her Prayers before it Morning and Evening; but this did not ſatisfie her, for ſhe reſolved to have this Image carried to* Bruſſels *with a Solemn Proceſſion, and for that purpoſe obtained an Indulgence from* Urban 8. *for all thoſe who ſhould attend it; and a rich and magnificent Altar was erected, over which the Image was to be placed: and Banners were made with this Inſcription,* In Nomine Mariæ omne genu flectatur, *&c. after which on* May 3. *the Proceſſion was performed with all imaginable Pomp, and kept for Eight Days together: and yet after all this, one* Maxwel, *a learned Scotchman ſhewed in a Diſcourſe preſented to* Iſabella, *that upon the beſt Enquiry he could make, this Famous Image was meer Impoſture, and a Trick of a crafty Merchant to procure ſome Advantage to himſelf by it; but the poor Man was impriſoned for this Diſcovery, and forced to make a publick Recantation: And the Worſhip of this Image was advanced, and a Solemn Supplication, and Proceſſion with it obſerved every Year;* as the ſame Author informs us, and the Confraternity of the Slaves of the *Bleſſed Virgin* highly promoted by it. Several other *Solemn Proceſſions* are related by him, as of *Bleſſed Maria de Remediis*, *Bleſſed Maria de Victoria*, with the Popes Bulls for Eſtabliſhing the Society of Slaves of

Otho Zyl. hiſtor. B. Mar. Sylvæduc. l. 4. c. 18.

Barth. de los Rios hierarch. Marian. l. 2. c. 7.

c. 19.

c. 10.

c. 11.

c. 13.

c. 14.

c. 16.

c. 19.

of the *Blaſſed Virgin*; but theſe are enough to ſhew, that the *Roman Church* in its Conſtant, and allowed Practices, doth not come behind old *Heathen Rome*, in this part of the Worſhip given to Images.

CHAP. III.

Of the Senſe of the Second Commandment.

§. 1. HAving endeavoured, with ſo much Care, to give a juſt and true Account of the Controverſie between us, as to the *Worſhip* of *Images*, and therein ſhewed from the Doctrine and Practice of the *Roman Church*; 1. That they ſet up Images in Churches over Altars, purpoſely for *Worſhip*. 2. That they Conſecrate thoſe Images with *Solemn Prayers* for that purpoſe. 3. That they uſe all the Rites of *Worſhip* to them which the *Heathen Idolaters* uſed to their Images, ſuch as *Bowings*, *Proſtrations*, *Lights*, *Incenſe*, and *Praying*. 4. That they make *Solemn Proceſſions* in honour of Images carrying them with as much Pomp and Ceremony as ever the *Heathens* did their Idols; The Queſtion now is, whether theſe *Acts* of *Worſhip* towards Images were unlawful only to *Heathens* and *Jews*; but are become lawful to *Chriſtians*? But if theſe *Acts* of *Worſhip* be now equally unlawful to us, as to them, then *Chriſtians* performing them, are liable to the ſame charge that the *Jews* and *Heathens* were; and if the Scripture calls that Idolatry in them, it muſt be ſo in *Chriſtians* too, as much as Murder, or Theſt, or Idultery is the ſame in all, for the Words of the Law of God makes no more Difference as to one, than as to the other. We are therefore to enquire on what account the Senſe of this Law is ſuppoſed to be conſiſtent with the Practice of the ſame things among *Chriſtians*, which were utterly forbidden by it to the *Jews* and *Heathens*: The Words of the Law are theſe,

> Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any Graven Image, nor the Likeneſs of any thing which is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Waters under the Earth; Thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor worſhip them; for I the Lord thy God am a Jealous God, &c.

My Adverſary *T. G.* denies, *that God herein did forbid himſelf to be worſhipped by a Crucifix, or ſuch like ſacred Image*; *and* he aſſerts, *that the deſign of the Law is only to forbid the Worſhip of Idols. The firſt part*, he ſaith, *toucheth not the Worſhip of Images, nor of God himſelf by them, but only the making them; the Second forbids indeed in expreſs Terms to bow our ſelves down to the Images themſelves, but ſpeaks not one Word of the Lawfulneſs of Worſhipping God himſelf by them. To bow our ſelves down to the Images themſelves, without any Relation to God, is by the Confeſſion of all to worſhip them inſtead of God; The Jews we know did Worſhip God by Bowing down before the Ark and the Cherubims, and yet they did not Worſhip them inſtead of God*; *therefore*, he aſſerts, *that by Image an Idol is to be underſtood, and that by Idol ſuch an Image as is made to repreſent for Worſhip a Figment that hath no real Being*; *and by ſimilitude, an Image or Reſemblance of ſome real Thing, but falſely imagined to be a God.*

T. G. p. 38. 39.

p. 49.

God. This is the ſenſe which *T. G.* gives of the ſecond *Commandment*. But if I can make it appear,

1. That there is no reaſon to take the word he tranſlates *Idol* here, for the Repreſentation of *a meer Figment ſet up for Worſhip*, and that if it were ſo taken, it would not excuſe them.

2. That the Worſhip of *God* before the Ark and Cherubims was of a different Nature from the Worſhip of Images here forbidden, and that the ſenſe of the Law doth exclude all *worſhip of Images*; then this Interpretation of *T. G.* will appear to be very falſe and groundleſs.

§. 2. 1. That there is no reaſon to underſtand, what we render *Images*, of ſuch *an Idol as ~~repreſents a~~ meer Figment ſet up for worſhip*. If there were any colour of Reaſon for ſuch an Acception of the word *Idol* here, it muſt either be, 1. From the *natural Importance* of the Word; or, 2. From the *uſe* of it in *Scripture*; or, 3. From the *conſent* of the *Fathers*; or, 4. From ſome *Definition* of the *Church*. But I ſhall ſhew, that there is no ground for affixing the *ſenſe* to the *Commandment* from any one of theſe.

1. Not from the *natural Importance* of the *Word*. He that reads ſuch an expreſs Prohibition in a Divine Law, of ſomething ſo diſpleaſing to God, that he annexes a very ſevere Sanction to it, had need be very well ſatisfied about the ſenſe he gives to the Words of it, leſt he incur the Wrath of God, and be found a perverter of his Law. If a Man ſhould reject all humane Authority, becauſe the Firſt Commandment ſaith, *Thou ſhalt have no other Elohim beſides me*; but in Scripture, Magiſtrates and Judges are called *Elohim*, therefore it is unlawful to own any civil Magiſtrates; he would have much more to ſay than *T. G.* and his Brethren have in reſtraining the ſenſe of the Law about Images to ſuch Idols as are only repreſentations of *Imaginary Beings*. For the Original Word hath no manner of tendency that way; it ſignifying any thing that is carved or cut out of Wood or Stone; and as I told *T. G.* before, “ It is no leſs than forty ſeveral times rendred by “ the LXX. by γλυπτὸν, and but thrice by εἴδωλον, and which is very “ obſervable, although *Exod.* 20. 4. they render it εἴδωλον, yet in “ the Repetition of the Law, *Deut*. 5. 8. the *Alexandrian* MS. hath “ it γλυπτὸν, and *Deut*. 4. 16. in ſome Copies of the LXX. the “ ſame word is tranſlated γλυπτὸν, and *Iſaiah* 40. 18. they tran- “ ſlate it by εἰκὼν, which is properly an Image, and the Vulgar “ Latin it ſelf uſeth, *Idolum*, *Sculptile*, and *Imago* (*Iſa.* 44. 9, 10, “ 13.) all to expreſs the ſame thing. To this *T. G.* replies, *That the LXX. generally tranſlating it* γλυπτὸν, *had ſome particular reaſon to render it Idol here*; *and becauſe this is a Word of ſtricter Signification, it ought to regulate the larger*; *and in the other Places*, he ſaith, *there is ſtill ſome Term or Clauſe reſtraining the Words to ſuch a graven Thing or Image, as is made to be compared with God, or to be the Object of Divine Worſhip, that is, to be an Idol.* Then it ſeems a graven Image when it is made the Object of Divine Worſhip, becomes an Idol in *T. G.*'s ſenſe; and yet an Idol in the *Commandment is the Repreſentation of a meer Figment*; but might not that be the ſenſe of an Idol in this Place, which he grants is meant in another? where the Words are expreſs concerning the Repreſentation of God, as in

T. G. p. 54, 55.

in *Iſaiah* 40. 18. And if he allows this to be the meaning of an Idol in the Commandment, I will grant that the LXX. had a particular reaſon to render *Peſel* by εἴδωλον here. For *Aquinas* well obſerves, *that this Commandment doth not forbid the making of any Sculpture or Similitude*, ſed facere adorandam, *to make it for worſhip; becauſe it follows, thou ſhalt not fall down to them and worſhip them.* And *Montanus* expreſſes the ſenſe of the Commandment after this manner, *Simulachrum divinum nullo pacto conflato. Signa cultûs causâ ne facito*; and *Nicolaus Faber* (both Learned Men of the *Roman Church.*)

Aq. 3. q. 25. art. 3. ad 1.

Montan. de Gen. & Regen. Adam. l. 4. c. 9.

> *Sculptilibus nè flecte genu, pictæve tabellæ.*

Fabri opuſcul. p. 97.

and again,

> *Non pictum ſculptúmve puta venerabile quidquam.*

If this be *T. G.*'s ſenſe of an Idol, I freely yield to him that the LXX. had very good reaſon ſo to render *Peſel* in this Place, where it is ſuppos'd to be an *Object of Divine Worſhip.* But how can this agree with what *T. G.* ſaith, *That the Law ſpeaks not one Word of the Unlawfulneſs of worſhipping God himſelf by an Image?* For, doth not the Law condemn the worſhip of an *Idol?* And doth not *T. G.* ſay, *That an Image, when it is made an Object of Divine Worſhip becomes an Idol?* And doth it not then follow, that the Law in expreſs terms doth condemn the worſhip of God by ſuch an Image: Nay, is it not the ſelf-ſame *T. G.* that ſaith, *That the making ſuch Images as are conceived to be proper Likeneſſes or Repreſentations of the Divinity, is againſt the Nature and Unalterable Law of God?* But what Law of God is there that doth forbid ſuch Images, if it be not this? And if this Law doth forbid ſuch Images, then the Signification of an Idol is not here to be taken for the Repreſentation of a Figment, but of the greateſt and moſt real Being in the World. Have not I now far better reaſon to return his own Words upon him, *Such frequent Self-contradictions are the natural Conſequences of a Diſcourſe not grounded upon Truth; and although the Reader may think I take delight to diſcover them in my Adverſary, yet I can aſſure him it is a much greater Grief to me to ſee ſo ſubtle a Wit ſo often entangled in them?* But it may be *T. G.* thinks to eſcape by ſaying, *that when he ſaith an Image being made the Object of Divine Worſhip is an Idol, he doth not underſtand it of an Image of God, but when the Image it ſelf is taken for God*; which Evaſion can do him no Service; for, 1. He grants that Images which are made for *Likeneſſes of God*, are condemned by the Law of God, and that they are an infinite Diſparagement to the Divine Nature. 2. I have at large ſhewed that in the *Roman Church*, Images of God and Chriſt are made the Objects of Divine Worſhip. And, 3. That the very Heathens did not take the Images themſelves for Gods. 4. The place he anſwers, *Iſa.* 40. 18. doth imply, that the Images of the Divinity are therefore condemned, becauſe nothing can be made like unto God. But of that afterwards.

T.G. p. 96.

T.G. p. 38.

T.G. p. 61.

§. 3. Let us then ſuppoſe that the LXX. had particular Reaſon to render *Peſel* by εἴδωλον in the Commandment, yet what is this, *to the Repreſentation of a meer Figment for Worſhip*? Doth εἴδωλον ſo properly, ſo naturally, ſo neceſſarily ſignifie a Figment, that it cannot be taken in any other ſenſe? I ſee *T. G.* makes only uſe of good *Catholick Lexicons* (ſuch a one as that called *Catholicon*, which *Eraſmus* is ſo pleaſant with) that aſſure him what the ſenſe of a Word muſt be in ſpight of all uſe of it by prophane and heretical Authors: Thus *Simulachrum* muſt ſignifie only Heathen Images, and εἴδωλον, a *Sphinx*, a *Triton*, or *Centaure*; and why ſo? Did it always ſignifie ſo? did all *Greek Authors* uſe it only in that ſenſe? Doth the *Etymology* of it imply it? No, none of all theſe: What then is the reaſon that a Word ſhould be ſo reſtrained againſt the former and common Acception of it? The reaſon is very plain; for if it be taken for the Repreſentation of real Beings, then for all that we know, the Image of the Trinity, or of the Bleſſed Virgin, or of any other worſhipped in the *Roman Church* may prove Idols; and therefore this muſt be the ſenſe, becauſe the Church of *Rome* cannot be guilty of Idolatry. This is the real Truth of the Caſe, but it is too great Truth to be owned. Only *Bellarmine* (who often ſpeaks freelier than the reſt) confeſſes, *their Deſign herein is to ſhew, that the Images worſhipped in the Church of* Rome *cannot be Idols, becauſe they are Repreſentations of real Beings.* A very miſerable ſhift! as will appear by the Examination of it. Let us therefore ſee whether there be any pretence from the uſe and importance of the Word, for reſtraining the ſenſe of an Idol, to an *imaginary Repreſentation.* And I am ſo far from *T. G.*'s Opinion, that by the beſt enquiry I can make, the proper Signification of Εἴδωλον is, *a Repreſentation of ſomething that really is.* So *Heſychius* interprets it by ὁμοίωμα and εἰκὼν; and the old *Greek* and *Latin Gloſſaries* render εἴδωλον and *Simulachrum* by each other (and notwithſtanding *T. G.*'s ſeverity againſt me for tranſlating *Simulachra Images*, I can make it appear from ſome of the moſt authentick Writers of the *Roman Church*, that they do not ſcruple calling ſuch Images as they worſhip *Simulachra.* I leave *T. G.* then to judge whether they be not Idols too) *Iſidore* makes *Idolum* to be properly *Simulachrum quod humana effigie factum & conſecratum eſt: An Image made and conſecrated in the Figure of a Man*: As *Plutarch* calls the Image of *Sylla* Εἴδωλον; and *Porphyry* in the beginning of the Life of *Plotinus*, when *Amelius* deſired a Picture of him; he anſwered, *Is it not enough to carry ſuch an Idolum about me, but I muſt leave* εἰδώλου εἴδωλον *an Image of an Image*? So we find *Idolum* uſed in the *Chaldaick Oracles*,

Bellarm. de Imag. l. 2. c. 5.

Catech. Rom. explic. præc. 1. n. 10 Onuphr. de 7 urb. Eccl. de Baſil. Lateran. Carol. Borrom. in Concil. Mediol. 1. p. 1. Iſid. Orig. l. 8. c. 11. Plut. vit. Syllæ.

Ἔστι ϗ εἰδώλοις μερὶς εἰς τόπον ἀμφιφάοντα,

where *Pſellus* obſerves, *That according to the* Platoniſts, *the Mind is ſaid to be* Εἴδωλον τοῦ Θεοῦ *the Image of God; and the rational Soul, the Image of the Mind, and the irrational, the Image of the rational; and Nature of the irrational Soul; and the Body of the Image of Nature; and Matter of the Body.* But *Iſidore* applying *Idolum* to an *Eccleſiaſtical Senſe*, ſuppoſeth not only *Repreſentation*, but *Conſecration* to be *neceſſary*

Pſell. in Orac. Chaldaic. p. 53:

ſary to it; wherein he follows *Tertullian*, who ſpeaking of the created Beings that were worſhipped, ſaith, *Eorum Imagines Idola; imaginum conſecratio Idololatria: Their Images were Idols, and the Conſecration of them is Idolatry*: and a little before, he ſaith, *That all Service of an Idol is Idolatry, and every Repreſentation is an Idol*; Omnis forma vel formula Idolum ſe dici expoſcit; *For*, ſaith he, εἴδωλον *is from* εἶδος *which ſignifies a Form or Repreſentation of a Thing*. Or as the *Greek Etymologiſt* thinks it comes immediately from εἴδεσθαι to *reſemble*. Among the *Philoſophers* it was taken for the *Image of things conveyed to our Sight*, ſo *Diogenes Laertius* ſaith, *That* Democritus *held Viſion to be performed* κατ’ εἰδώλων ἐμπτώσεις *by the Incurſion of Images*; κατ’ εἰδώλων εἰσκρίσεις ſaith *Plutarch*; *Empedocles* ſaith he, *joyned raies to the Images*, (εἰδώλοις:) and *Democritus* and *Epicurus* ſaid that *Reflection in a Glaſs was performed* κατ’ εἰδώλων ὑποστάσεις *by the Subſiſtence of the Images*. *Cicero, Lucretius*, and St. *Auguſtine* render theſe εἴδωλα *by Imagines*; *Catius* the *Epicurean* called them *Spectra*; *Macrobius Simulachra*; but all of them underſtood the moſt *proper Repreſentations of things to our Sight*; which *Epicurus* was ſo far from thinking that they *repreſented things that were not*, that he made them infallible *Criteria* of the *Truth* of Things. The *Poets* and *ſome other Authors* made uſe of εἴδωλα to ſignifie *Spectres* and *Apparitions*, but ſtill they ſuppoſed theſe to be the *Repreſentations* of ſome *real Beings*; So *Homer* calls the Soul of *Elpenor* that appeared to *Ulyſſes* εἴδωλον; but *Euſtathius* there obſerves, *That theſe* εἴδωλα *were exactly like the Perſons they repreſented as to Age, Stature, Habit, and every thing*: and ſo *Homer* himſelf expreſſes it, ſaying that *Apollo* made an εἴδωλον a *Repreſentation of* Æneas.

Tertul. de Idol. c. 4.
c. 3.
Diog. Vit. Democr.
Cicer. ad Attic. l. 2. *p.* 3.
Plut. de placit. Philoſ. l. 4. *c.* 13, 14.
Lucret. l. 4
Cic. ep. l. 15. *ep.* 16.
Auguſt. ep. 56.
Macrob. Sat. l. 1. *c.* 14.
Odyſſ. λ΄. *v.* 83.

Αὐτῷ τ’ Αἰνείᾳ ἴκελον, καὶ τεύχεσι τοῖον.

Iliad. ε΄. *v.* 450.

So in another Place ſpeaking of *Minerva*'s making a *Repreſentation* of *Iphthima*,

Εἴδωλον ποίησε, δέμας δ’ ἤϊκτο γυναικί,

Odyſſ. δ΄. *v.* 796.

By which we ſee that the very *Poetical uſe* of the *Word*, for a *Spectre*, doth imply an exact *Reſemblance to ſome real Being which it repreſents*: from whence then hath this Signification of an Idol come into the *Roman Church*, that it muſt ſignifie a *Repreſentation of ſomething that is not?* But from whenceſoever it comes, we are ſure it is neither from the *Natural Importance*, nor the uſe of the Word among *Greek Authors*.

2. Not from the uſe of it in *Scripture*. The *Author* of the Book of Wiſdom gives this Account of the beginning of the *Worſhip* of *Idols*, viz. *That Fathers having loſt their Children, made Images of them, and appointed Solemnities to be kept before them, as if they were Gods; then by degrees, Princes paſſed theſe things into Laws, and made Men to Worſhip graven Images: And thus either out of Affection or Flattery the Worſhip of Idols began*: where it is obſervable, that he makes the *Repreſentation of Perſons*, that were *really in Being*, to have been the firſt Idols: And he diſtinguiſhes the bringing in of Idols from the Worſhip of the Elements, or Heavenly Bodies; and he thinks theſe much more excuſable than thoſe who Worſhip the *Work of Mens Hands*; the Folly of which he there elegantly deſcribes; but he ſtill ſuppoſes

§. 4.
Wiſd. c. 14. *v.* 15.
Ch. 13. *v.* 6. *&c.*

theſe Idols to have the Reſemblance either of Man or ſome Living Creature. To the ſame purpoſe *Diophantus* the *Lacedæmonian* in *Fulgentius*, ſaith, *That* Syrophanes, *the* Egyptian, *being greatly afflicted for the loſs of his Son made an Image of him, and all his Servants to pleaſe him did what they could to adorn this Image, and ſome when they had offended ran to it as a Sanctuary*; *from hence*, ſaith he, *came the Worſhip of Idols.* And *Eutychius* gives the like Account of the *Original* of *Idols*, *That when a great Man was dead, they ſet up his Image on his Sepulchre*; *from whence the World was filled with Idols*, i. e. *with Images of Men, Women, and Children*: This he thinks began among the *Chaldeans* and *Egyptians*; but *Herodotus* ſays the *Egyptians* were the firſt who made Images of their Gods: *Lucian*, that they borrowed this Cuſtom from the *Aſſyrians*. *Epiphanius* makes the beginning of Idolatry to be in the time of *Seruch*; but he ſaith, that *it went no farther than to Pictures in his Time*; and came to Images and Statues in the time of *Nahor*. *Cedrenus* ſaith, *That* Seruch *and his Companions made Statues for the Honour of thoſe who had done any famous Action*; *which their Poſterity miſunderſtanding, worſhipped them as Gods.* Thus far we find that the firſt Idols that are ſuppoſed to have been in the World, were the *Repreſentations of things that had real Beings.* The only People that could be ſuſpected to be meant in Scripture as thoſe who had ſuch Idols as were *Repreſentations of what had no real Beings*, muſt be the *Phœnicians* and *Egyptians*: who beſides the Worſhip of Beaſts, and the Images of them, had many Extravagant Images. *Sanchoniathon* ſaith, *Taautus made the Images in* Phœnicia *with Wings*, Saturn *with Four, and the reſt of the Gods with two.* And *Dagon*, and *Atergatis* or *Derceto*, is ſuppoſed to be an Image, whereof the *upper part is of Humane Shape, and the lower of a Fiſh*; among the *Egyptians*, one of their Images had the *Face of a Ram, and another of a Dog*, &c. If theſe be the Idols T. G. thinks are prohibited in the *Second Commandment*, I deſire him to conſider, 1. Whether the Images of *Humane Shape* were not prohibited by the Law equally with theſe? Or whether it were lawful to worſhip ſuch Images as did repreſent *real Beings* in that manner, that it was unlawful to worſhip thoſe Images that were only *Chimæra*'s and Fancies of Mens Brains? If not, this Diſtinction ſerves to no Purpoſe at all To make this more plain, I ask *T. G.* whether it were unlawful to worſhip God among the *Egyptians* under the repreſentation of an Image with the Body of a Man, and the Head of a Hawk, which was a *Repreſentation of ſomething that had no real Being juſt like it*; but it was lawful to worſhip him with *the Image of a Man*, as *Euſebius* ſaith, *that* Cneph *or the Creator of the World was worſhipped under ſuch a Repreſentation among them?* It is certain, that both theſe ſorts of Images were among the *Egyptians*, and according to *T. G*'s Notion, one of theſe was an Idol, and the other not. But is it poſſible for Men of common Underſtandings to ſuppoſe that God by the words of the Law hath forbidden the one, and not the other; when both were intended to repreſent the ſame *Being?* But according to this Senſe, the *Inhabitants* of *Thebais*, of whom *Plutarch* ſaith, *That they only worſhipped* Cneph *the Immortal God*, *or the Creator under the Image of a Man*, were altogether as Innocent as thoſe in the *Roman* Church, who worſhip God under a like Repreſentation. And can it enter into *T. G*'s Head that God ſhould, notwithſtanding all the words

v. 13, 14.

Fulgent. Mythol. l. 1.

Eutych. Annal. Tom. 1. *p.* 56.

Herod. l. 2.

Lucian. de Deâ Syr.

Epiph. l. 1. *Sect.* 8.

Cedren. hiſt. Comp. p. 45.

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 1. *p.* 39.

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 3. *c.* 11.

Plut. de Iſid. & Oſiri. p. 357.

of this *Commandment* allow ſuch kind a of *worſhip* of *Images* as was received among the *Egyptians* ? But if this were condemned in them, then if the Second Commandment be in force, the like Worſhip muſt be condemned in the Church of *Rome*. 2. That there is a Diſtinction to be made between ſuch Images as have *no real Reſemblance in Nature, and ſuch Images which repreſent that which hath no real Being*; for although the *Phœnician* and *Egyptian Images* had nothing in Nature which anſwered to their Figure, yet there might be ſomething which anſwered their *Repreſentation*, i. e. they were only *Symbolical Images*, and the Nature of thoſe Symbols being underſtood, there was no difference as to matter of Worſhip between theſe and other Images. As for Inſtance, a *Sphinx* is one of thoſe Images which *T. G.* would have to be underſtood, for an Idol in the *Second Commandment*; ſuppoſing then that I allow him (as a *Sphinx* was painted among the *Egyptians* with Wings, and the *face of a Man*, and the *Body of a Lion*) that it was the *Repreſentation of ſomething that had no real Being* agreeable to it; yet *Clemens Alexandrinus* ſaith, *That their deſign was to repreſent hereby that God was both to be loved and feared*; now this Image did *Symbolically* repreſent a *real Object of Worſhip*; and therefore could be no Idol even in *T. G*'s Senſe. So *Kircher* ſaith, *one of the chief and moſt common Images of the* Egyptians *was a winged Globe with a Serpent paſſing through the middle of it*; *by the Globe*, ſaith he, *they repreſented the Divine Nature, by the Serpent, the ſpreading of Life, and by the Wings the Spirit of the World.* Here is an Image that hath no *real Being* Correſpondent to it, and yet it repreſents the *Infinite Nature*, and *Power*, and *Goodneſs of God: Sometimes*, ſaith he, *they repreſented Providence by a Scepter with a Dog's Head within a Semicircle; by which, and innumerable other Ways they repreſented the hidden Myſteries of the Divine Being: and they thought this Symbolical way moſt pleaſing to God*; and was certainly fartheſt from that danger which *T. G.* thinks to be moſt conſiderable in Images, *viz. making Men Anthropomorphites.* To avoid which, the *Egyptians* generally mixed the Figures of Men and Beaſts together, not ſo much *to ſhew the Communion of Nature*, as *Porphyry* imagines, as that theſe were meer *Symbolical Images*, and not intended for any *proper Likeneſſes*, and therefore according to *T. G*'s Principles, thoſe which he calls Idols, were more Innocent, than thoſe which he calls *Images*; for the one might bring Men *to erroneous Conceits of the Deity*; but the other being *Symbolical* were not apt to do it. *Plutarch* ſaith, *That when they repreſented* Mercury *by the Image of a Man, with the Head of a Dog, they only intended thereby to repreſent Care, Watchfulneſs, and Wiſdom: and that they repreſented* Oſiris *by a Scepter with an Eye in it, by a Hawk*, and by the Figure of a Man; now by *Oſiris*, he tells us, *They meant the moſt powerful God*, and ſo doth *Apuleius*; and *Tacitus* ſaith, *The ſame God which was called* Jove *among others, was called* Oſiris *by them.* Theſe Images, and many others of very ſtrange Shapes, with a mixture of very different Forms, are ſuppoſed, in the *Menſa Iſiaca*, and the *Egyptian Obeliſks*, to repreſent the moſt *true and perfect Being in regard of his Nature and Production of things*; as *Athanaſ. Kircher* hath endeavoured at large to ſhew. If therefore the *Egyptians* did make ſuch *Symbolical Figures* with reſpect to the moſt real Being; and yet theſe Images where Idols properly ſo called: then it follows, that ſome Repreſentations of the true God are Idols, and condemned in the Second Commandment.

Clem. Alex. Str. 5.

Pignor. expoſit. Menſæ. Iſiacæ. p. 34.

Kircher. Sphinx. Myſtagogâ par. 2. c. 3.

Porophyr. de abſtin. l. 4.

Plut. de Iſid. & Oſir. p. 355

p. 371.

Apul. Metamor. l. 11. *Tacit. hiſt. l.* 4.

Oedip. Ægypt. Tom. 3.

3. The Scripture uſes the Word Idol for the Repreſentation of all ſorts of things which are made the Objects of Worſhip. Thus in the firſt Place the LXX. makes uſe of the Word Εἴδωλα, it is taken for the *Teraphim of Laban*, Gen. 31. 19, 34, 35. which are ſuppoſed to be of *Humane Shape*; not only from the general Opinion of Jewiſh Writers; but becauſe of the miſtake of the *Teraphim* for *David*, 1 Sam. 19. 13. The *Images* of *Baal* are called Idols, 2 Chron. 17. 3. Jer. 9. 13. and what the LXX. render, 2 *Kings* 11. 18. τὰς εἰκόνας the *Images of Baal*; in the parallel Place, 2 Chron. 23. 17. they expreſs by τὰ εἴδωλα αὐτοῦ *the Idols of Baal*. Whether by *Baal* be underſtood the *Aſſyrian Belus*, or the *Phœnician Beel Samen*, i. e. whether a Repreſentation of a Man, or of the Sun, we are ſure this was an *Image* of a *real Being*, and yet the LXX. call it an *Idol*. *Idols* are joyned with *Molten Gods* by the LXX. *Levit.* 19. 4. i. e. what ever *Images* are ſet up for *Divine Worſhip*: And all the *Gods* of the *Heathen* are ſaid to be *Idols*, 1 Chron. 16. 26. but they were not all meer *Figments of Mens Brains*, being either *Dead Men* that were Worſhipped (as St. *Hierome* ſaith, by the *Idols* of the *Heathens* we underſtand *Imagines Mortuorum* the Repreſentations of Dead Men) or the Works of the Creation, eſpecially the Heavenly Bodies, which was the moſt early and the moſt common Idolatry of the *Eaſtern* Parts, and moſt frequently condemned in Scripture.

Hieron. in Iſai. c. 37. l. 11.

If it be ſaid, *That although they had real Beings, yet their Deities were Fictitious*, I anſwer, 1. That is not to the purpoſe; for the queſtion is, whether the proper Signification of an *Idol* be the *Repreſentation of meer Imaginary Beings, Sphinxes, Tritons, Centaures?* But what a ridiculous Anſwer is this to that Queſtion, to ſay that although their *Being be Real*, yet their *Deity* is *Fictitious?* For this is to grant, that *Idols* are not Repreſentations of *Imaginary Beings* but of *Imaginary Deities:* which I readily grant. 2. This will equally hold againſt all *Repreſentations* of created *Beings* that have *Divine Worſhip* given to them; for by giving them any part of *Divine Worſhip* they are ſo far made *Gods*; but ſince they are not truly ſo, they are ſtill but the Repreſentations of Imaginary Deities, although they be of real *Saints*, or *Angels*. In which ſenſe the Scripture calls them אלילים and אונים *Nothings* and *Vanities*, and St. *Paul* ſaith, *That an Idol is nothing in the World*; not becauſe it repreſented that which was not; but becauſe neither the *Image* nor the thing repreſented were any real *Deity*.

4. The far greateſt part of the *Idols* expreſsly mentioned in *Scripture* were the *Repreſentations of real Beings:* not only that the things had *Subſiſtence* which were repreſented by them, but that the very *Images* were of ſome Creatures exiſting in the World. *Lyra* ſaith, *That* Moloch *was in the Faſhion of a Man*; and ſo *Benjamin Tudelenſis* ſuppoſes, when he ſaith, *That two Female Images ſtood of either ſide of him.* *Kircher* ſhews, *from* Baal Aruch, *that* Aſima *was worſhipped in the Form of a Goat:* and from other Jewiſh Authors, *That* Nibcas *had the Figure of a Dog*, Thartak, *of an Aſs*, Adramelech *of a Mule, and* Anamelech *of a Horſe*; Bel *and* Nebo *of Serpents and Beaſts*; Succoth Benoth *of a Hen and Chickens*; Aſtaroth *of Sheep*. Will *T. G.* ſay that theſe were not *Idols*, becauſe they were *Images* of *real Beings?* If he doth, he muſt excuſe the groſſeſt *Idolatry* condemned in *Scripture*; if he doth not, he muſt then confeſs, that this is not the notion of an *Idol* in the ſenſe of Scripture, viz. a Repreſentation of what hath

Lyra in Lev. 18. Benjam. Itiner. p. 33. ed L' Emper. Kirch. Pantheon Hebræorum.

no Exiſtence, but in the Imagination, as *Sphinxes*, *Tritons*, *Centaures*, and the like.

§. 4.

3. But *T. G.* would have us believe, That this is the ſenſe of the Fathers; for he quotes *Origen* and *Theodoret* for this Interpretation of the Second Commandment. It is well known, that *Origen* had a great many of *T. G.*'s Idols in his Head, viz. *Imaginations of things that were not*; and therefore it is ill fixing upon an Interpretation of Scripture, of which he was the firſt Author. But I have proved at large from the unanimous conſent of the Fathers in charging the *Arians* with Idolatry, and the *Gnoſticks* in worſhipping the Images of Chriſt with Divine Honours, that this could not be their ſenſe. For if this were the Notion of an Idol, *to repreſent what hath no Exiſtence*, neither the *Arians* nor the *Gnoſticks* could be accuſed of worſhipping an Idol; but the Fathers do in expreſs terms call Chriſt an Idol, *if he had Divine Worſhip given him, and yet were not God*. And it is farther obſervable, (1.) That the ſecond Council of *Nice* confeſſes, *That* Arians *were juſtly condemned for Idolatry*, not only by one or two Fathers, but *by the Catholick Church*; from whence it is evident, that the *Catholick Church* did declare that *T. G.*'s ſenſe of an Idol is falſe. (2.) That when the Fathers repeat the ſecond Commandment, inſtead of εἴδωλον, they uſe other Words, which they ~~would never~~ have done, if they had thought there had been any peculiar Importance of the word Idol in that place different from Image. *Juſtin Martyr*, ~~in his~~ Dialogue with *Trypho* the *Jew*, repeats the words of the Law thus, μήτε εἰκόνα, μήτε ὁμοίωμα, *Thou ſhalt not make any Image or Similitude*. *Clem. Alexandrinus* makes the thing forbidden to be τὰ γλυπτὰ προσκυνεῖν, *to worſhip graven Images*: And the thing required to be, *not to make* γλυπτὸν ὐδὲ χωνευτὸν, *either a graven or a molten Image*. And even *Origen* himſelf, lays ſo little weight on his Obſervation about εἴδωλον, that when he gives an Account of this Law in his Books againſt *Celſus*, he never mentions it, but uſeth γλυπτὸν, εἰκὼν, ὁμοίωμα; and ſaith, *the meaning of the Law was to forbid any kind of Images*. *Tertullian* ſaith, *that God hereby did forbid all kind of Similitude*, quanto magis Imaginis ſuæ, *how much more any Image of himſelf*: and elſewhere he makes an *Idol* and an *Image* the ſame thing; and in another place, *That God did prohibit all Similitudes to prevent any occaſion of Idolatry*; for, he adds, *thou ſhalt not bow down to them nor worſhip them*. *Therefore*, ſaith he, *the brazen Serpent was not againſt the Law, being not for Worſhip, but for a Remedy; nor the Cherubim, being meerly Ornaments, and therefore not falling under the Reaſon of the Law*, and afterwards he reckons up the ſeveral terms of the Law, by Images, Statues and *Similitudes*. St. *Cyprian* interprets the meaning of the word *Idols* in the Commandment, when he ſaith, *they are ſuch as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks of, that have Mouths and ſpeak not*, &c. which is certainly meant of Images of Humane Shape; and in another place, he ſaith, *the Heathen Idols were made*, ad defunctornm vultus per imaginem detinendos: *To preſerve the Countenances of the dead by Images*: Which are almoſt the ſame Words with thoſe of *Minucius Felix* ſpeaking of the ſame Subject, *While they deſired*, ſaith he, *defunctos Reges in imaginibus videre, to ſee their Princes Images, and to retain their Memories in their Statues, that which at firſt was intended for their Comfort, became an Object of Worſhip*. So *Lactantius* ſaith, *that their Simulachra*,

Concil. Nicæn. 2. Act. 6. p. 411.

Juſt. Martyr, dial. cum Tryph. p. 321.

Clem. Alex. Str. l. 3. p. 441.

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 4. p. 182.

Tertull. de ſpect. c. 23.

De Idol. c. 3, 4.

C. Marcion. l. 2. c. 22.

C. Marcion. l. 4. c. 22.

Cyprian. de exh. Martyr. c. 1.

De Idol. vanit. c. 1.

Minuc. Fel. p. 21.

Lact. l. 2. c. 2, 3.

their Idols, in T. G.'s ſenſe, *were either the Monuments of the dead, or of the abſent*; and he makes the ſenſe of the Law to be *nihil colendum eſſe quod oculis mortalibus cernitur, nothing to be worſhipped that can be ſeen.* St. *Auguſtine* giving the *ſenſe* of this Commandment, ſaith, *That therein any Similitude of God is forbidden to be worſhipped*: And therefore ſurely not the meer Figments of Mens Brains, or Repreſentations of *Sphinxes, and Tritons, and Centaurs.*

S. Aug. ep. 119. c. 11.

Orig. in Exod. hom. 8.
Theod. in Exod. q 38
Orig. Exhort. ad Martyr. ed. Wetſten p. 167

(3.) That thoſe very Perſons who put that *ſenſe* upon the word *Idol*, do yet make the *ſenſe* of the Commandment to be againſt the Practice of the *Roman* Church. For, both *Origen* and *Theodoret* make it unlawful by the force of this Commandment, *to perform any external Act of Worſhip towards any Repreſentation whatſoever*: And the difference they both put between Worſhip and Service, is, *That the latter is that of the Mind, and the former of the Body; but both*, they ſay, *are here forbidden*; and therefore I cannot imagine what comfort *T. G.* can have in ſuppoſing their *Images* are not forbidden under the name of *Idols*, if they be forbidden under the name of *Similitudes*, and it be as unlawful to worſhip them under one name as under the other? Our Quarrel is not with them, meerly on the account of the word *Idolatry*; but it is on the account of their Worſhips being contrary to the expreſs Law of God; and whether it be forbidden under the name of *Idol* or *Similitude*, it is all one to us, as long as the Worſhip they practice, is as plainly againſt the Senſe of this Commandment, as Perjury, Adultery, or Theft is againſt the other Commandments: And that even in the Opinion of *Origen* and *Theodoret* themſelves. Beſides, if we look into the Senſe of theſe two Authors, we ſhall find their meaning was not, as *T. G.* imagines, to make thoſe only *Idols* that were made to repreſent Fictions of the Brain; but to ſhew that God had forbidden all ſorts of Images, Symbolical as well as others. *For*, ſaith *Origen*, Moſes *being skilled in all the Wiſdom of the* Egyptians, *did forbid thoſe things which are uſed in their ſecret and hidden Myſteries*; *i. e.* their *Symbolical* and *Hieroglyphical* Repreſentations: And *Theodoret* particularly mentions the *Ægyptian Images, with the Faec of a Dog, and the Head of an Ox*: Whereby it is plain, that they thought *Moſes* by this Law intended to forbid all manner of Repreſentations of things in order to worſhip, whether it were by Hieroglyphicks, or by proper Similitudes. So that neither *Origen*, nor *Theoderet*, by this Interpretation, do give the leaſt Countenance to the practice of the *Roman Church*.

§. 5.

Bell. de Imag. l. 2. c. 24.

4. I ſhall in the laſt place ſhew, that this Interpretation of the term *Idol* is overthrown by the moſt Learned Perſons of the *Roman Church*, who do confeſs that the *Images* of real Beings may become *Idols*. And that in theſe following Caſes, 1. When *proper Latria is given to an Image: That is truly Idolatry*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *when proper Latria is given to any thing beſides God: And it is not only Idolatry when an Idol is worſhipped without God, but when an Idol is worſhipped together with God.* And from hence he concludes, *That no Image ought to be worſhipped with proper Latria.* Which Concluſion cannot be of any force, unleſs ſuch an *Image* becomes an *Idol*: But he goes farther, and ſaith, *That thoſe who worſhipped an Image of Chriſt with Divine Honours, although it be for the ſake of Chriſt, and not of the Image, did commit Idolatry*:

For, ſaith he, *although a Man pretends to give theſe Honours for the ſake of God, or Chriſt; yet in as much as he gives Divine Honours to them, he doth really give it for themſelves, altho' he denies it in Words*, (which is a very fair Confeſſion) *and from hence thoſe were condemned as Hereticks, who gave Divine Worſhip to the Image of Chriſt; as appears by* Irenæus, Epiphanius, *St.* Auguſtine *and* Damaſcen. According to which Conceſſion, the Diſpute cannot any longer be, *Whether the Images of Chriſt, or the Saints, be Idols or no*, if we can prove that Divine Honours are given to them by the Doctrine and Practice of the *Roman Church.* And even *T. G.* himſelf ſaith, *Is not the giving Divine Worſhip to a Creature the ſame as to make it a falſe God? And is it not Heathen Idolatry to worſhip a falſe God?* From whence it follows, that it is the Worſhip makes any thing an Idol, and not the Repreſentation of an imaginary Being. 2. When *Images are worſhipped as true Repreſentations of the Divine Nature.* So *Sanders* expreſly, *He that goes about to repreſent the inviſible Nature of God by an Image, ſins grievouſly and makes an Idol; and he that propoſes ſuch an Image for worſhip commits Idolatry*: But ſuch an Image is no Repreſentation of a meer Figment of Mens Brains; but a vain endeavour to ſet forth the moſt perfect Being. If he had only ſaid it had been a fooliſh and vain Attempt, he had only expreſſed the impoſſibility of the thing: But when he makes ſuch an Image an Idol when it is propos'd for Worſhip, he doth imply, that an imperfect Repreſentation of an infinite Nature when it is worſhipped becomes an Idol. This is not to be avoided by ſaying, *That ſuch an Image is a falſe Repreſentation*: For it is no otherwiſe falſe than every Image of a Man is ſo; for no Image can repreſent the inviſible Nature of a Man. And it adds much force to this, that the Author of the *Greek Excerpta* about the uſe of Images, from the *Nicene Council*, and the Writers of that Time, ſaith, *That the Deſign of the ſecond Commandment is againſt making any Images of God*, which he looks on not only as an abſurd, but a very wicked Practice; and which, he ſaith, *was then common among the Ægyptians.* 3. *When an Image is worſhipped for the ſake of any Sanctity, Vertue, or Divinity abiding in it. Whoſoever doth ſo*, ſaith *Jacobus Almain, is an Idolater.* And ſo much is implied in the *Council* of *Trent* it ſelf, when it declares, *That no worſhip is to be given to an Image on any ſuch account*: If ſo, then the doing it is a thing forbidden and unlawful; and not only ſo, but they looked on this as the certain way of putting a difference between Idolatry and their Worſhip: But Men may ſuppoſe Sanctity, Vertue and Divinity to be in an Image of a real Being, and therefore ſuch an Image may be properly an Idol. And ſo *Vaſquez* confeſſes, *That this is Idolatry to give Worſhip, although it be inferior, to any inanimate Being (as an Image is) for the ſake of any thing belonging to it, or inherent in it.* Thus I have ſhew'd, that there is no pretence to excuſe the Worſhip of Images from being Idolatry, and a breach of the ſecond Commandment, becauſe an Idol is only a Repreſentation of only imaginary Beings, as *T. G.* ſaith, ſuch as *Sphinxes, Tritons, Centaurs*, or the like.

T. G. p. 162.

Sander. de honor. Imag. adorat. c. 4. *init.*

Biblioth. Patr. To. 4 *p.* 731.

Jacob. Almain. in ſentent. l. 3. *diſt.* 9. *prope fin.*

Vaſq. q. 103. *c.* 9. *art.* 3.

2. I now come to ſhew more particularly what the *ſenſe* of the Law is, by conſidering what *T. G.* ſaith in anſwer to what I had formerly ſaid about it: The original Queſtion between us, was, Whether

§. 6.

ther God by this Law hath forbidden the giving any worſhip to himſelf by an Image? *No*, ſaith T. G. *he hath not; but what he forbids there is only his giving his worſhip to Idols.* To reſolve this Queſtion, being about the *ſenſe* of a Law, I propos'd three ways, 1. From the Terms in which the Law is expreſſed. 2. From the *Reaſon* annexed to it. 3. From the Judgment of the Law-giver himſelf. But before *T. G.* comes to the handling of theſe, he lays down ſome Arguments of his own to ſhew, *That God did not intend by this Law, to forbid the* T.G.p.39, 40. *worſhipping of himſelf by an Image, but only the worſhip of Idols.* 1. *Becauſe the* Jews *did worſhip God by bowing down before the Ark, and the Cherubim.* 2. *Becauſe St.* Auſtin *makes this Commandment to be only an Explication of the firſt.* To theſe I ſhall give a diſtinct anſwer.

TG.p.40, 49, 50, 52, 53, 56, 77, 79, 81, 103, 206, 207. 1. *T. G.* on all occaſions, lays great weight *on the worſhipping of God before the Ark and the Cherubims: Which he makes to be the parallel of their worſhipping God by bowing or kneeling before a Crucifix*: To which Inſtance I had given this Anſwer, "1. That the *Jews* only directed their worſhip towards the Place where God had promiſed to be ſignally preſent among them; which ſignifies no more to the worſhip of Images, than our lifting our Eyes to Heaven doth when we pray, becauſe God is more eſpecially preſent there. 2. That tho' the Cherubims were there, yet they were always hid from the ſight of the People, the High Prieſt himſelf going into the Holy of Holies but once a year: And that the Cherubims were no Repreſentations of God, but his Throne was between them on the Mercy Seat; but they were Hieroglyphical Figures of God's own appointing, which the *Jews* know no more than we do: Which are plain Arguments they were never intended for Objects of Worſhip, for then they muſt not have been meer Appendices to another thing, but would have been publickly expos'd as the Images are in the *Roman* Churches, and their form as T.G.p.206 well known as any of the Bleſſed Virgin." But *T. G.* ſtill inſiſts upon it, *That the Reverence which the* Jews *ſhewed to the Ark and Cherubims, was of the ſame Nature with the Worſhip they give to Images.* And he thinks I have not anſwered the Argument he brought for it. Therefore, to give him all reaſonable Satisfaction, I ſhall, 1. Compare their worſhip of Images and theſe together. 2. Examine all the colour of Argument he produces for the worſhip of theſe among the *Jews*.

1. For comparing their worſhip of Images with the *Jews* worſhipping God before the Ark and the Cherubims. As to their worſhip of Images, I need only repeat, 1. That they are publickly ſet up and expoſed for worſhip in their Churches, and over their Altars. 2. That they are conſecrated for this End. 3. That the People in their Devotions bow to them, kneel and pray before them with all expreſſions of Reverence. 4. That the Councils of *Nice* and *Trent* have decreed that *worſhip is to be given to them on the account of their Repreſentation; becauſe the Honour given to them paſſes to the Exemplar.* 5. That the Images themſelves on the Account of their Repreſentation are a proper object of inferior Worſhip, and that conſidered together with the Exemplar, they make up one entire object of Supreme Worſhip; in theſe their Divines generally agree, and condemn the Opinion of thoſe who ſay, *That they are only to worſhip the Exemplar before the Image*; *as contrary to the* Decrees *of Coun-*

cils. But if the *Ark* and *Cherubims* were neither ſet up nor expoſed, nor conſecrated as *Objects* of *Worſhip*; if the People of the *Jews* never thought them to be ſo, nor worſhipped them as ſuch; if the utmoſt were only that, which the Divines of the *Roman Church* condemn, *viz.* making them only a Circumſtance and not an *Object* of *Worſhip*, then I hope the Difference will appear ſo great that *T. G.* himſelf may be aſhamed of Inſiſting ſo much on ſo weak a parallel.

§. 7. In External *Acts* of *Worſhip* theſe two Things are to be diſtinguiſhed, (1.) The *Object* of *Worſhip*, or the thing to which that *Worſhip* is given. (2.) The *local Circumſtance* of expreſſing that worſhip towards that Object. That there is a real Difference between the *Object* and *local Circumſtance* of Worſhip, by our lifting up our Hands and Eyes towards Heaven when we worſhip *God*: but no Man that underſtands our Religion can ſay, that we worſhip the *Heavens*, but only *God* as preſent in them; wherefore *God* is the *Object*, and looking up to Heaven, barely the *Circumſtance*. When we praiſe any Perſon for ſome Excellency in him, if he be preſent, we naturally turn our Face towards him, to let others by that Circumſtance underſtand, of whom we ſpeak; but which way ſoever we looked, the ſame Perſon would be the *Object* of our *Praiſe*; when we do this at anothers mentioning his Name, no Man of common Underſtanding will ſay, that the praiſe is directed to the very name of the Perſon; and if a Man makes a Panegyrick upon another, and reads it out of a book, no one ſuſpects that his Praiſe is therefore directed to his Book. Thus it is in the *Acts* of *Worſhip*, the *Object* is that *Being* to which the *Worſhip* is directed; but becauſe external Acts muſt have ſome local Circumſtances, by the Poſition of our *Countenances*, and the Tendency of our Poſture either towards *Heaven*, or towards ſome Place as the more immediate *Symbol* of a *Divine Preſence*, the Difference is apparent between ſuch a Direction of the Act towards a Place, and the Direction of it towards an *Object*, in caſe it can be made appear that may be a *Place* of *Worſhip*, which is not an *Object* of it. For which we muſt conſider, (1.) That the *Object* of *Worſhip* is that to which the Worſhip is given either for its own ſake, or for the ſake of that which it repreſents; but a *local Circumſtance* doth only circumſcribe the *material Act of Worſhip* within certain Bounds. And the proper *Object* of *Worſhip* is a *Perſon*, either *really Preſent*, or *repreſented* as *Preſent*. The *Idolaters* who worſhipped their *Images as Gods* (if at leaſt any conſiderable number of them ever did ſo) it was upon this Account, that they ſuppoſed ſome *Spirit* to be *incorporated* in the *Image*, and ſo to make together with it a *Perſon* fit to receive Worſhip. Thoſe who worſhipped the *Elements*, or *Heavenly Bodies*, did it not on the account of the Matter whereof they were made; but of thoſe *Spirits* which they believed to rule over thoſe things they Worſhipped, as I have already ſhewed in the general Diſcourſe. But it is not neceſſary in order to an *Object* of *Worſhip*, that the *Perſon be really Preſent*; for if Men by Imagination ſuppoſe him *Preſent* as repreſented by an *Image*, that makes thoſe who Worſhip that *Image* perform the very ſame *Acts*, as if he were *actually Preſent*; and in the *Church* of *Rome* they do make this *Repreſentation* by an *Image*, a ſufficient ground for making that an *Object* of *Worſhip*; which we ſay is the very thing forbidden in the Second *Commandment*, viz. that any *Image* ſhould be worſhipped on the account of what it *repreſents*; and therefore it forbids all kind of *Repreſentations* to be *worſhipped* by Men: Becauſe an *Image* ſeems to have ſuch a Relation to the thing it repreſents, that they may pretend they give *Worſhip* to it on another Account than meerly its Matter and Form, *viz. the Thing repreſented by it.* Thus when the Reaſon of the *Worſhip* of *Images* is drawn from the *Exemplar*, as it is both in the *Councils* of *Nice* and *Trent*, they thereby ſhew, that they do make the *Image a true Object* of *Worſhip*, although the Reaſon of it be drawn from the *Perſon* repreſented. But ſuppoſe Men worſhip *God* towards the *Weſt*, as the *Jews* did, or towards the *Eaſt*, as the *Chriſtians* did; what is there in this that doth repreſent *God* to us? What is there that we fix our Worſhip upon, but only himſelf; *God* hath no where forbidden Men to worſhip Him towards the Place of His Preſence; for even our Saviour hath bid us pray, *Our Father which art in Heaven*; and ſuppoſing God had promiſed a peculiar Preſence in His *Holy Temple*, it was as lawful to worſhip *God* towards that, as towards *Heaven*; but that which *God* hath ſtrictly forbidden, is the *Worſhipping* of any thing on the account of the *Repreſentation* either of *himſelf*, or of His *Creatures*; for this doth ſuppoſe that *Image* to be made the *Object* of *Worſhip*, although it be on the Account of what it repreſents. 2. Suppoſing the ſame External Acts to be performed towards an *Image*, and towards a Place of *God*'s particular *Preſence*; yet the Caſe is not alike in both theſe if thoſe who do them, declare they do them not with a deſign to worſhip that Place. For to the making any thing an *Object* of *Worſhip*, there muſt be ſome ground to believe that they intend to *worſhip* it, either from the Nature of their Actions, or the Doctrine and Practice of the Church they live in; but in caſe it be expreſly declared, that what they do, is only intended as a *local Circumſtance*, there is no ground to charge them with making it an *Object* of *Worſhip*. Thus thoſe in the *Church* of *Rome*, who declare that they do not *worſhip* the *Image*, but only *worſhip God* before an *Image*, although they perform the ſame External Acts of *Worſhip*, yet are condemned of Hereſie, becauſe hereby they declare they do not give *Worſhip to Images*, which is contrary to the decrees of their Councils: Much more certainly will thoſe be condemned by them who declare it *unlawful to worſhip any thing on the account of Repreſentation*; and that they do only determine the Acts of outward *Worſhip* towards a particular Place, without any intention to worſhip that Place, but only to *worſhip God* that Way. And this was the Caſe of the *Jews* as to the *Worſhipping* of *Images*, and of *God* towards the *Holy of Holies*; they declared it utterly unlawful to do one becauſe *God* had ſtrictly forbidden it; and they thought it as lawful to do the other, becauſe he allowed the Practice of it: and it was ſufficiently known among the People of the *Jews*, that they had no intention to *worſhip* either the *Ark* or the *Cherubims*. 3. Where there is only a *local Circumſtance of Worſhip*, the ſame Thing would be worſhipped, ſuppoſing that Circumſtance changed; but where any thing is an *Object* of *Worſhip*, that being changed, the ſame thing is not *worſhipped*. This makes the Difference between theſe two eaſie, and intelligible by all. If

a

a *Jew* ſhould worſhip towards the *Eaſt*, or *Chriſtians* towards the *Weſt*, the ſame *Object* of their *Worſhip* continues ſtill; for they *worſhip* the ſame *God* both Ways; but if the *Image* of *Chriſt* or the *Bleſſed Virgin* be taken away from the *Altar*, a *Papiſt* cannot be ſaid to worſhip the ſame Thing there, that he did before. Which plainly ſhews, that there is a real Difference between theſe two; which is of great Moment to clear the *Jewiſh Worſhip of God* towards his *Holy Place*, and to ſhew how different it was from the *Worſhip* of *Images*.

§. 8.

2. But *T. G.* pretends *to bring clear Scripture for the Jews Worſhipping the Ark*; Adore ye the Foot-ſtool of God, for it is Holy, *Pſal.* 98. 5. *ſo all the Ancient Fathers*, he ſaith, *read it without Scruple*; and St. *Hierome*, he ſaith, *confirms it. And why was it placed in the Holy of Holies, and why were the People commanded to adore, or bow down before it, but to teſtifie their Reverence to it?* To this I anſwer, 1. One might venture odds againſt *T. G.* that when he quotes *all the Fathers* for him, he hath very few of his Side: Nothing leſs will content him here than *all the Fathers* reading it without Scruple, *for it is Holy*, when *Lorinus* ſaith, *That all the Greek Fathers, not one diſſenting that he had ſeen, read it, For He is Holy:* and among the *Latins* he confeſſes, *That St.* Hierome *and St.* Auguſtine *both read it ſo*; for, ſaith St. *Auguſtine*, *Quis ſanctus eſt in cujus honore adoras ſcabellum pedum ejus?* *Genebrard* acknowledges likewiſe, that St. *Hierome* tranſlates it ſo, and *Suarez* yields that not only the *Greek*, but St. *Auguſtine* and St. *Hierome* read it, *For He is Holy.* 2. Thoſe words do not imply, that the *Jews* did make the Ark the Object of their *Worſhip*; for the *Chaldee Paraphraſt* renders them, *Worſhip Him in His Sanctuary*; and the laſt verſe of the *Pſalm*, where the ſame ſenſe is repeated, interprets this, *Worſhip at his Holy Hill, for the Lord our God is Holy:* where, *the Holy Mountain* is the ſame with the Foot-ſtool before mentioned: And ſo *Muis* confeſſes, who ſaith withal, *That by the Phraſe of Worſhipping His Foot-ſtool, no more is meant than worſhipping God at his Foot-ſtool: and the Sanctuary*, he ſaith, *is called* God's *Foot-ſtool, not only by the Chaldee Paraphraſt and Kimchi, but* Lament. 2. 1. And ſo *Lyra* interprets it, *Ante ſcabellum pedum ejus: Worſhip before His Foot-ſtool:* or *Worſhip at His Foot-ſtool*, as it is *Pſalm* 182. 7. And it would be very ſtrange, if the *Pſalmiſt* ſhould here propoſe the Foot-ſtool for an Object of *Worſhip* to them, when the deſign of the whole *Pſalm* is to call Nations to the *Worſhip* of *God*, *as ſitting between the Cherubims*, Pſal. 99. 1. *i. e* in His Throne which is ſurely different from His Foot-ſtool. I will not contend with *Suarez* about the ſenſe of the *Foot-ſtool of God* here mentioned, (although he confeſſes that *Baſil* and *Vatablus* underſtand the *Temple* by it:) but I will yield him that the *Ark* is moſt probably underſtood by it, becauſe of his *ſitting between the Cherubims* being mentioned before; in which reſpect the *Ark* may properly be called his *Foot-ſtool*. For the *Cherubims* were the *Mercabah*, or the *Divine Chariot*, and ſo called 1 *Chron* 28. 18. where the Vulgar Latin renders it *Quadriga Cherubim:* in ſuch a *Chariot Phyrrhus Ligorius*, the famous *Italian* Antiquary, ſaith, *The Deities were wont to be drawn:* and *Livy*, and *Plutarch* take notice of it in *Camillus* as an extraordinary thing that he made uſe of ſuch a *Triumphal Chariot* which had been before looked on as proper to *Jove* the Father of Gods and Men. Such a *Triumphal*

T. G p. 206

Lorin. in Pſal. 99. 5.

Genebr. in loc.

Suarez in 3. ep. q. 54. *art.* 3.

Sim. de Muis in loc.

Jacob. Leon. de Cherubinis. Pyrrh. Ligor. de Vehic. Antiq. c. 19. *Liv. l.* 5. *c.* 23. *Plut. in Camill. p.* 132.

phal Chariot, I ſuppoſe that to have been in the *Holy of Holies*, but without any *Repreſentation* of the *Divine Majeſty*, and this *Chariot* is that we call the *Cherubim*, and the *Ark* was a kind of *Foot-ſtool* to the *inviſible Majeſty* that ſate between the *Cherubims*, and there delivered his Oracles. Now I appeal to the underſtanding of any reaſonable Man, whether *God* being repreſented as ſitting upon His *Triumphal Chariot*, without any *viſible Image* of Him, the *Worſhip* was there to be performed to the *inviſible Deity*, or to the *viſible Chariot* and *Foot-ſtool?* which is all one as to ask whether Perſons approaching to a Prince on his *Throne*, are to worſhip the Prince or his *Foot-ſtool*, or *Chair* of *State?* But *Lorinus* and *Suarez* ſay, *The Hebrew particle* ל *being added to a Word implying Worſhip, doth not denote the Place but the Object of Worſhip*; which is ſufficiently refuted by thoſe two Places before mentioned, *viz.* the laſt *verſe* of this *Pſalm*, and *Pſalm* 132. 7. 3. Thoſe of the *Fathers*, who underſtood this Expreſſion of the *Object* of *Worſhip*, do declare by their Interpretation that it was not lawful to worſhip the *Ark* after that manner. Therefore *Lorinus* ſaith, moſt of the *Fathers* underſtood it of the Humanity of *Chriſt*, as St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Hierome*, St. *Auguſtine* and others generally after him; and among the *Greeks*, he reckons St. *Athanaſius*, and St. *Chryſoſtome*. But what need all this running ſo far from the literal Senſe, in caſe they had thought the *Ark a lawful Object of Worſhip?* Let St. *Auguſtine* ſpeak for the reſt, *The Scripture*, ſaith he, *elſewhere calls the Earth Gods Foot-ſtool; and doth he bid us worſhip the Earth? This puts me in a great Perplexity; I dare not worſhip the Earth, leſt He damn me who made the Heaven and the Earth; and I dare not but worſhip His Foot-ſtool, becauſe He bids me do it. In this doubt I turn my ſelf to Chriſt, and from Him find the Reſolution of it; for His Fleſh was Earth*; and ſo he runs into a diſcourſe about the Adoration due to the *Fleſh of Chriſt*, and the Senſe in which it is to be underſtood. And elſewhere ſaith, *That the Humane Nature of Chriſt is no otherwiſe to be adored than as it is united to the Divinity.* Which plainly ſhews that he did not think the *Ark* literally underſtood to be a proper *Object* of *Worſhip*.

Aug. in Pſal. 98. 5.

Aug. de Verbis Dom. ſecunda Job Ser. 58.

But *T. G.* adds, that St. *Hierome* ſaith, *That the Jews did Worſhip or Reverence the Holy of Holies, becauſe there were the Cherubims, the Ark*, &c. It is well he puts in *Reverence* as well as *Worſhip*, for *Venerabantur* ſignifies no more than that *they had it in great Veneration*; and that not only for the ſake of the *Ark* and *Cherubims*, but for the Pot of *Manna*, and *Aaron*'s Rod; and doth *T. G.* think in his Conſcience, that the *Jews* worſhipped theſe too? But St. *Hierome* explains himſelf, when he ſaith immediately after, *That the Sepulchre of Chriſt is more venerable than that*; which he interprets by ſaying, *It was a Place to be honoured by all.* And are theſe the doughty proofs which *T. G.* blames me for not vouchſafing an Anſwer to them; I think he ought to have taken it as a kindneſs from me. Let him now judge whether I have neither Scripture, nor Father, nor Reaſon to abet me, in ſaying, *That the Jews only directed their Worſhip towards the Place where God had promiſed to be ſignally preſent among them.*

As to the *Worſhip* of the *Cherubims*, all his Attempts come only to this, *They might be worſhipped although they were not ſeen; and if it were lawful for the High Prieſt to worſhip them once a Year, it was always lawful*; but I deny that the *High Prieſt* ever worſhipped them; for he only worſhipped the *God*

T. G. p. 207

God that ſate upon His *Triumphal Chariot*; and their *being hid from the Sight of the People*, was an Argument they were not expoſed as *Objects of Worſhip*, as *Images* are in the *Roman Church*. *Their being Appendices to the Throne of God*, he ſaith, *was rather a means to increaſe than diminiſh the Peoples Reverence to them.* If by *Reverence* he means *Worſhip*, we may here ſee an Inſtance of the variety of Mens Underſtandings. For no leſs a Man than *Vaſquez*, from hence argues, *That the Cherubims were never intended as an Object of Worſhip, becauſe they were only the Appendices to another thing; but a thing is then propoſed as an Object of Worſhip, when it is ſet up by it ſelf, and not by way of Addition or Ornament to another Thing:* with whom *Lorinus*, *Azorius*, and *Viſorius* agree. And even *Aquinas* himſelf grants, *That the Seraphim* (he means the Cherubim) *were not ſet up for Worſhip, but only for the ſign of ſome Myſtery*; *nay*, he ſaith, *the Jews were expreſly forbidden to worſhip them.* Thus I hope I have made it appear, how very little the Worſhipping of *God* before the *Ark* and the *Cherubims* doth prove towards the Lawfulneſs of the *Worſhip* of *Images* in the *Roman Church*.

Vaſquez diſp. 104 *c.* 6.

Lorin. in Act. 17. 25 & *in Pſal.* 98. 5. *Azor. Inſtit. Mor. l.* 9. *c.* 6. *Viſor. reſp. ad Monci. p.* 16. *Aq.* 1. 2. *qu.* 102. *art.* 4. *ad* 6

The Second Argument of T. G. is, *From the Judgment of St.* Auguſtine, *who makes that which we call the Second Commandment to be only an Explication of the Firſt.* Which I thought ſo weak and trifling an Argument, that I gave a ſhort Anſwer to it in theſe two Particulars. 1. That St. *Auguſtine* did not ſeem conſtant to that Opinion. 2. That ſuppoſing he were, yet it doth not follow that according to his Judgment, theſe Words are only againſt *Heathen Idols*, and not againſt the *Worſhip* of *God* by *Images*. Here T. G. thinks he hath the Bit faſt between his Teeth, and away he runs, raiſing a duſt to blind the Eyes of Beholders; but he muſt be ſtopt in his Carier, and brought to better Reaſon. I asked *T. G.* how he was ſure this was St. *Auſtin*'s conſtant Judgment, ſince in his later Writings he reckons up the Commandments, as others of the *Fathers* had done before him? Upon this he inſults, and calls it *a new way of anſwering Fathers, and the readieſt he ever met with, except it be that of denying them: And if this be allowed, when an expreſs Teſtimony of a Father is alledged, there is no more to do, than to ask how he is ſure, that the Father did not afterwards change his Mind? But*, he ſaith, *he is ſure he hath his Judgment profeſſedly for him in his former Writings; and that I ought to bring better Evidence of his being of another Mind than I have done.* But if I do evidently prove, that St. *Auguſtine* was of our Mind in the main Point as to the Unlawfulneſs of the *Worſhip* of *God* by *Images*; then what matter is it, whether it be the *Firſt*, or *Second*, or *Third*, or *Fourth Commandment*, ſo we are ſure it is one of the *Ten?* And I have already produced ſufficient Teſtimonies from him to this Purpoſe; For doth not St. *Auguſtine* declare, *That it is unlawful to worſhip God by an Image*, when, he ſaith, *it were Impiety for a Chriſtian to ſet up a Corporeal Image of God in a Temple; and that they who do it are guilty of the Sacriledge condemned by St.* Paul, *of turning the Glory of the incorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man?* Doth not St. *Auguſtine* commend *Varro* for *ſpeaking ſo reproachfully concerning the very manner of Worſhipping the Deity by an Image?* and he ſaith, *That if he durſt have oppoſed ſo old a Corruption, he would have both owned the Unity of the Godhead*, Et ſine ſimulachro colendum eſſe cenſeret, *and have thought he ought to be worſhipped without an Image.* Doth not St. *Auguſtine*, when he purpoſely explains that

*T.G. p.*46.

*Aug. de Fide & Symb. c.*7.

De Civit. Dei. l. 4. *c.* 13.

Epiſt. 119. ad Jan. c. 11.

that which he accounts the Firſt Commandment, ſay, *That any Similitude of God is thereby forbidden to be worſhipped*; *becauſe no Image of God is to be worſhipped but what is God himſelf*, i. e. *his Son?* And can any one ſpeak more expreſly our ſenſe than St. *Auguſtine* here doth? Let not *T. G.* then boaſt of his poſſeſſion of St. *Auguſtine*, unleſs it be, as he did lately of all the Fathers; and in truth, the reaſon is much alike for both. *But as to the diviſion of the Commandments he is of* T. G.'*s ſide*: and what is that to our Buſineſs? If St. *Auguſtine* be of our ſide as to the *ſenſe* of the *Commandment*, I can allow him to find out ſomething of the Myſtery of the Trinity in having three Commandments of the firſt Table; and I can be contented with this, that the generality of the Fathers were for the other Diviſion, and upon more conſiderable *Reaſons*. T. G. p. 43. But *T. G.* ſaith, *That St.* Auguſtine *tranſlates this Precept, Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any Idol, and the ſenſe of the Law to be the forbidding the giving the worſhip of God to Idols.* One would think by this, St. *Auguſtine* had no other word but *Idolum* here, whereas he uſes both *Figmentum* and *Simulachrum*, both which words he elſewhere uſes about the *Images* of the true God. But this is their common Method, if they meet with a Word in the Fathers that ſounds their way, they never ſtay to conſider the Senſe of it, but preſently cry out *Idolum*, *Idolum*; and then with the Man at *Athens*, take all that comes for their own: So doth *T. G.* boaſt of the poſſeſſion of the Fathers upon as ſlight grounds as he did; and makes up by the ſtrength of Imagination what is wanting in the goodneſs of his Title; if at leaſt Imagination can ſway him ſo much againſt the plain evidence of *Reaſon*.

§. 10. Having thus cleared the way by removing theſe mighty Difficulties which *T. G.* had laid in it to obſtruct our Paſſage, I now come to conſider the ſeveral Methods I propoſed for finding out the *ſenſe* of this Law. The firſt whereof was from the general Terms wherein it is expreſſed, which are of ſo large and comprehenſive a *ſenſe* as to take in all manner of Repreſentations, in order to worſhip; and I challenged him to ſhew where the word *Temunah*, which they render *Similitude* as well as we, is ever uſed in Scripture to ſignifie ſuch an *Idol* as he ſuppoſes this Law intends. And to what purpoſe are words of the largeſt Signification put into a Law, if the ſenſe be limited according to the moſt narrow Acceptation of one word mentioned therein? For there is no kind of Image, whether graven or painted, whether of a real or imaginary Being, but is comprehended under the Signification of the Words ſet down in the Law. T. G. p. 47, 48, 49, &c. To this *T. G.* anſwers, *That how large ſoever the ſignification of this word* Temunah, *or Similitude be when taken by it ſelf, yet in our preſent Caſe it is limited by the following Words, Thou ſhalt not bow down to them nor ſerve them, to ſignifie ſomething which is made to be worſhipped as God,* that is, *to be an Idol. And ſo, by the word Idol in the Commandment he underſtands ſuch an Image as is made to repreſent for worſhip a Figment that hath no real Being; and by Similitude an Image or Reſemblance of ſome real thing, but falſely imagined to be God;* But, he ſaith, *it was nothing to the Purpoſe to put the word Similitude in its largeſt meaning, that is, as ſignifying any Image whatſoever, though made with reſpect to the worſhip of the true God, when God himſelf commanded the Ark and the Cherubims to be made with that reſpect:* (doth he mean to repreſent the true God? or to be Objects of worſhip? which I have already ſhewed to be falſe.) *That which I am to prove*, he ſaith, is, *that the word Similitude is to be taken ſo here; whereas*, he affirms, *that the word Similitude is to be reſtrained to the Similitude of falſe Gods*. And to make all ſure, he interprets Similitude only of the Repreſentation of falſe Gods, and bowing down to and worſhipping that Similitude, is the worſhipping that Similitude only as God: *i. e.* taking the Likeneſs to be the Thing it ſelf. I cannot blame *T. G.* for making the thing forbidden in the Commandment, if it be poſſible, more abſurd than their Practice in the worſhip of *Images* is; but whether he hath made the *ſenſe* of the Law, or himſelf more ridiculous, let the Reader judge. *By Similitude*, he ſaith, *is here to be underſtood, only the Similitude of falſe Gods, as the Sun, Moon and Stars, and other little things which they worſhipped as Gods*; this, I confeſs, is intelligible and true, altho' not the full meaning of the Commandment; but what then is *bowing down to and worſhipping this Similitude? that is*, ſaith he, *to worſhip this Similitude as God*: How is that? Is it by believing the Similitude to be the Thing? as the *Image* of the Sun to be really the Sun? This is abſurd enough of all Conſcience, and they were ſottiſh Idolaters indeed that did ſo. Or is it that they thought there was no other God beſides that Similitude? That were ſtrange indeed they ſhould think the Similitude to be God, and not the thing repreſented by it. But ſo the wiſe Pope *Gregory II.* interpreted this Commandment in his incomparable Epiſtle to *Leo Iſaurus*: The Emperor tells the Pope he durſt not allow the Worſhip of *Images, becauſe of this ſevere Prohibition of any kind of Similitude, and he deſires him to ſhew who it was that ſince had made it lawful to worſhip the Work of Mens Hands. The Pope for this calls him, an Ignoramus, a dull, and inſolent Fool*: And bids him lay aſide his Pride and Haughtineſs, *and come and learn of him the meaning of the Commandment*. And now we expect ſomething becoming an infallible Head of the Church: *This Commandment*, ſaith the Pope, *was made for the ſake of the Idolaters who lived in the Land of Promiſe, that worſhipped living Creatures of Gold and Silver, and Wood, and all ſorts of Creatures and Fowls of the Air; and ſaid, Theſe are our Gods, and there is no God beſides them; and for the ſake of this Workmanſhip of the Devil, God ſaid that we ſhould not worſhip them; but there is other Workmanſhip for the Honour of God, and this Men may worſhip*. Exceedingly well ſpoken! The Miſchief is, *Maimonides* ſaith, *there never were ſuch Fools in the World to believe there was no other God but their Idols*; but what is *Maimonides* his ſaying to the Head of the Church? I am not yet ſatisfied about *T. G's worſhipping a Similitude as God*, and ſo making it an *Idol*. If it be a God, how is it the Similitude of a God? If it be not, how comes it to be worſhipped as God? What is it the Similitude of? of God? yes. But it is God it ſelf to him that worſhips it as God: And ſo it is the Similitude of it ſelf. So that the Similitude here forbidden to be worſhipped, is a Thing that is like its own ſelf. *T. G.* in another place ſaith, *the thing forbidden in the Commandment, is bowing our ſelves down to the Images themſelves, and this by the Conceſſion of all is worſhipping them inſtead of God*. What is *this bowing down to the Images themſelves*? Is it ſuppoſing them to be really Gods? Then they are not worſhipped as Similitudes; and this ſeems to be his meaning, when he ſaith, *To bow down our ſelves to the Images themſelves, without any Relation to God, is to worſhip them inſtead*

Greg. 2. Ep. 1. ad Leon. p. 10

Ὥσπερ εἶ ἀπαίδευτος καὶ παχύς· τὴν ὑψηλοφροσύνην καὶ ὑπερηφανίαν τὴν προκειμένην σοι.

More Nevoch. l. 1. c. 36.

T.G. p. 39.

inſtead of God. But I am ſtill to ſeek for his meaning; is it *bowing down to Images themſelves*, without relation to any other God? That muſt *ſuppoſe* that *thoſe who do ſo* worſhip them, believe there is no God beſides the *Images*, and that were to make God to forbid a thing, that we never read to be practis'd in the World. Or, is it to *ſuppoſe thoſe Images themſelves to be* Objects of Worſhip? if it be, then all thoſe ſtand condemned for *Idolaters* who aſſert that *Images themſelves* are to be worſhipped. Which I have ſhewed to be the common Opinion of their Divines, and by them thought to be the Decree of the Councils for the worſhip of *Images*. Or laſtly, is the worſhipping *Images themſelves, without relation to the True God, the worſhipping them inſtead of God?* but this is both *falſe* and *impertinent*. It is *falſe*, becauſe they who worſhip Images without relation to the true God, may yet worſhip them barely as they *repreſent a falſe God* (as the wiſeſt of the Heathens did) and therefore not as God: and *Euſebius* ſaith in general of the *Heathens, that they did not look on their Images as Gods:* *Euſeb. l. 4. c.* *It is impertinent, becauſe* by the Confeſſion of their own Writers (as I have ſhewed) an *Image* that hath Relation to the true God, may be worſhipped as God, when Divine Worſhip is given to an *Image* of God or Chriſt. And therefore all this adoe is to no purpoſe: For this Commandment muſt then be ſo underſtood, as to exclude the worſhip of the true God by an *Image*. Otherwiſe it cannot be unlawful to give any kind of worſhip to an *Image* of the true God; and ſo the *Gnoſticks* were not to blame in the worſhip they gave to the *Image* of Chriſt, although they ſtand condemned in all Ages of the Church for it. If this were unlawful, (as they all ſay it is unlawful to Sacrifice to an *Image*) then ſome kind of worſhipping the true God by an *Image* is forbidden by the *Second Commandment*. And now let the Reader judge how well *T. G.* hath acquitted himſelf in his admirable Undertakings, when he ſaith, with ſo much Confidence, *That the Second Commandment ſpeaks not one Word againſt the worſhipping God himſelf by an Image*, *T.G p. 38, 39.* which is to charge the whole Chriſtian Church with Folly and Ignorance in condemning the *Carpocratians*, for worſhipping the *Image* of Chriſt with Divine Worſhip; *who*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, ſine dubio Imaginem ejus propter ipſum colebant, *without all doubt worſhipped the Image of Chriſt with relation to him.* *Bell. de Imag. l. 2. c. 24.*

§. 11. But ſtill when *T. G.* is miſerably miſtaken, the Fathers muſt bear the blame of it. Alas poor Fathers! Muſt you bear the load of all his Miſcarriages? It is but doing you juſtice, to vindicate your Innocency in this righteous Cauſe. He tells me, *That I muſt prove againſt theſe Fathers, (viz. Origen* and *Theodoret) and the general ſenſe of the Church of Chriſt for ſo many hundred years, that the word Similitude is to be taken in the ſecond Commandment for any Image made with reſpect to the worſhip of God.* *T.G p. 50.* A very eaſie undertaking in it ſelf; but by no means either againſt *thoſe Fathers, or the ſenſe of the Chriſtian Church for many hundred years*, which is as plainly on my ſide in this caſe, as it is in the Articles of the Creed, as may be ſeen in the foregoing Chapters. But *T. G.* is again unlucky when he pretends to the Fathers: For thoſe two Fathers he mentions are point-blank againſt him in this Matter: Witneſs the many Citations I there produced out of *Origen*, wherein, he ſaith, *the Chriſtians durſt have no Images of the Deity, becauſe of this Commandment*; *and that they would rather die than de-*

file themſelves with ſuch an impiety. And even *Theodoret* himſelf ſaith, Theodor. in Deut. quæſt. 1. p. 168. *they were forbidden to make any Image of God, becauſe they ſaw no Similitude of him:* And which is more to *T. G.* even the *Nicene Council* and the great Patrons of *Images* for a long time after, did yield that the ſecond Commandment did forbid the making or worſhipping any Repreſentation of God, as I have already at large proved. If I might adviſe *T. G.* I would never have him venture at the Fathers again, but be contented to bear his own Burdens; and out of meer pity to them, not to load them with the imputation of his own Infirmities, if not willful Miſtakes. To make it appear that the Intention of the Law was not meerly againſt the *Idols* of the Heathens, I added theſe Words, "If this had been the meaning of the Law, why was it not more "plainly expreſſed? Why were none of the Words elſewhere uſed "by way of Contempt of the Heathen Idols here mentioned, as be"ing leſs liable to ambiguity? Why in ſo ſhort a Comprehenſion of "Law? is this Law ſo much enlarged above what it might have "been, if nothing but what he ſaith were to be meant by it? For "then the meaning of the two firſt Precepts might have been ſum"med up in very few Words, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but me,* "*and thou ſhalt worſhip the Images of no other Gods but me.* To all this, which is ſurely ſomething more than ſaying, *That it is ridiculous to imagine the Law means any thing elſe*; *T. G.* anſwers not one Word, but inſtead of that he ſpends ſome Pages about two Similitudes, one of T. G. p. 51, 52, 53. mine, and another *quainter* of his own, which muſt ſtand or fall, according to the Reaſon given for the *ſenſe* of the Law, and therefore I ſhall paſs them over. Only for his deſiring me *to make my Similitude run on all four, as the Beaſts mentioned in it,* it is ſuch a piece of Wit, that I deſire he may enjoy the comfort of it.

But he hath not yet done with the word *Peſel, which,* he ſaith, *the* T. G. p. 54 *LXX. would never have rendred it here contrary to their Cuſtom, Idol, without ſome particular Reaſon for it.* What particular Reaſon was there here more than in the Repreſentation of the Commandment, *Deut.* 5. 8. where they tranſlate it by γλυπτὸν, in the *Alexandrian* MS. and in other Copies of the LXX. *Deut.* 4. 16? Was there not as much reaſon to have uſed the ſame Word in thoſe Places as in this, ſince the Commandment is the very ſame? And for the other Places he mentions, as *Iſaiah* 40. 18.----44. 9, 10, 13. I dare leave it to the Examination of any Man, whether they do not far better prove that an *Idol* in Scripture is an *Image* ſet up for Worſhip, than that by graven *Image* is meant an Heathen *Idol.* This I am certain of, that *Peter Picherellus,* an excellent Critick and learned Divine in the *Roman* Church, was convinced by comparing of theſe Places, Picherell. Opuſc. p. 220, 221. *That the Signification of an Idol in the ſecond Commandment is the ſame with that of a graven Image; and that the uſing of any outward ſign of worſhip before any Image is the thing forbidden in this Commandment, and that the doing* p. 230, 231. *ſo is that Idolatry which God hath threatned ſo ſeverely to puniſh*: Which I beſeech *T. G.* and thoſe of his Church to conſider, and repent.

The ſecond way I propoſed to find out the Senſe of the Command- §. 14. ment, was from the Reaſon of it, which, I ſaid, "The Scripture "tells us was derived from God's infinite and incomprehenſible Na"ture which could not be repreſented to Men, but in a way that

Xxx muſt

“ muſt be an infinite diſparagement to it. For which I produced *Iſaiah* 40. 19, 20, 21, 22. *To whom will ye liken God? or what likeneſs will ye compare to him? The Workman melteth a graven Image, and the Goldſmith ſpreadeth it over with Gold,* &c. *Have ye not known, have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the beginning? Have ye not underſtood from the foundation of the Earth? It is he that ſitteth upon the Circle of the Earth,* &c. Whence I deſired to know, whether this Reaſon be given againſt Heathen *Idols*, or thoſe *Images* which were worſhipped for Gods or no? Or whether by this reaſon, God doth not declare, that all Worſhip given to him by any viſible Repreſentation of him is extremely diſhonourable to him? And to this purpoſe, when this Precept is enforc'd on the *People of Iſrael* by a very particular Cau- Deut. 4. 15, 16. tion, *Take ye therefore good heed to your ſelves, leſt ye corrupt your ſelves, and make you a graven Image, the Similitude of any Figure,* &c. the ground of that Caution is expreſſed in theſe Words, *For ye ſaw no manner of Similitude on the Day that the Lord ſpake unto you.* If the whole Intention of the Law had been only to keep them from worſhipping the Heathen *Idols*, or *Images* for Gods, to what purpoſe is it here mentioned that they ſaw no Similitude of God when he ſpake to them? For although God appeared with a Similitude then, yet there might have been great Reaſon againſt worſhipping the Heathen *Idols*, or fixing the Intention of their worſhip on the bare Image. But this was a very great Reaſon why they ought not to think of honouring God by an Image: For, if he had judged that a ſuitable way of Worſhip to his Nature and Excellency, he would not have left the choice of the Similitude to themſelves, but would have appeared himſelf in ſuch a Similitude as had beſt pleaſed T.G. p. 58. him. *This Diſcourſe* T. G. ſaith, *is apt enough to delude a vulgar Auditory out of the Pulpit* (I wiſh their Pulpits had never any worſe before not vulgar Auditories) *but altogether empty and inſignificant when brought to the Teſt of Reaſon.* That is to be tried, whether my Reaſon or his Anſwer will be found ſo: *However*, he ſaith, *this doth not prove it Idolatry.* No! that is very ſtrange, for if the Image of God, when worſhipped, be an Idol and forbidden as ſuch in the Commandment, then I ſuppoſe the worſhip of it is Idolatry. But none ſo blind as they that will not ſee.

Now for the terrible Teſt of Reaſon. He ſaith, 1. *That all Repreſentations of God are not diſhonourable to him*; and for that he produces T.G. p. 59. a *Hieroglyphical Picture of a three corner'd light within a Cloud, and the Name* Jehovah *in the midſt of it, in the Frontiſpiece of a Book of Common Prayer, by* Robert Barker, 1642. from whence he infers, *That the Church of* England *doth not look on all viſible Repreſentations as an infinite Diſparagement to God.* As though the Church of *England* were concerned in all the Fancies of Engravers in the Frontiſpieces of Books publickly allowed: He might better have proved that we worſhip *Jupiter Ammon* in our Churches, becauſe in ſome he may ſee *Moſes* painted with Horns on his Forehead: I do not think our Church ever determined that *Moſes* ſhould have Horns, any more than it appointed ſuch an Hieroglyphical Repreſentation of God. Is our Church the only place in the World, where the Painters have loſt their old Pri- T.G. p. 60. vilege, *quidlibet audendi? There needs no great Atonement to be made between the Church of* England *and me in this Matter:* For the Church Homil. p. 3. p. 40. of *England* declares in the Book of Homilies, *That the Images of God* *the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt are expreſly forbidden and condemned by theſe very Scriptures I mentioned. For how can God a moſt pure Spirit, whom Man never ſaw, be expreſſed by a groſs Body, or viſible Similitude? or how can the infinite Majeſty and Greatneſs of God incomprehenſible to Mans Mind, much more not able to be compaſſed with the ſenſe, be expreſſed in an Image?* ? With more to the ſame purpoſe, by which our Church declares, as plainly as poſſible, that all Images of God are a Diſparagement to the Divine Nature; therefore let *T. G.* make amends to our Church of *England* for this and other Affronts he hath put upon her. Here is nothing of the Teſt of Reaſon or Honeſty in all this: Let us ſee whether it lies in what follows. 2. He ſaith, *That Images of God* T.G.p.61. *may be conſider'd two ways, either as made to repreſent the Divinity it ſelf, or Analogically.* This Diſtinction I have already fully examined, and ſhew'd it to be neither fit for Pulpit nor Schools, and that all Images of God are condemned by the *Nicene* Fathers themſelves, as diſhonourable to him. 3. He ſaith, *That the Reaſon of the Law was to keep them* p. 63. *in their Duty of giving Sovereign Worſhip to God alone, by reſtraining them from Idolatry.* This is now the ſevere Teſt that my Reaſon cannot ſtand before. And was it indeed only *Sovereign Worſhip to God,* that was required by the Law to reſtrain them from *Idolatry*? *Doth this appear* (to return his own Words) *in the Law it ſelf, or in the Pre-* p. 57. *face, or in the Commination againſt the Tranſgreſſors of it?* If in none of theſe Places, nor any where elſe in Scripture, methinks it is ſomewhat hard venturing upon this Diſtinction of *ſovereign and inferiour Worſhip,* when the words are ſo general, *Thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor Worſhip them.* And if God be ſo jealous a God in this matter of Worſhip, he will not be put off with idle Diſtinctions of vain Men that have no colour or pretence from the Law: For, whether the *Worſhip be ſupreme or inferiour, it is Worſhip*: And whether it be one or the other, do they not *bow down to Images*? And what can be forbidden in more expreſs words than theſe are? But *T. G.* proves his Aſſertion, 1. *From the Preface of the Law, becauſe the Reaſon there* T.G.p.64. *aſſigned is, I am the Lord thy God,* therefore Sovereign Honour is only to be given to me, and to none beſides me. Or, as I think, it is better expreſſed in the following Words, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but me*: And who denies or doubts of this? But what is this to the *Second Commandment*? *Yes,* ſaith T. G. *the ſame reaſon is enforced from God's jealouſie of his Honour*: Very well, *of his Sovereign Honour? But provided, that ſupreme worſhip be reſerved to him, he doth not regard an inferior worſhip being given to Images.* Might not *T. G.* as well have explain'd the Firſt Commandment after the ſame manner, *Thou ſhalt have no other Sovereign Gods beſides me; but inferior and ſubordinate Deities* you may have as many as you pleaſe, notwithſtanding the Reaſon of the Law, which *T. G.* thus paraphraſes, *I am the only ſupreme and ſuper-excellent Being, above all, and over all, to whom therefore Sovereign Honour is only to be given, and to none beſides me.* Very true, ſay the Heathen Idolaters, we yield you every word of this, and why then do you charge us with *Idolatry*? Thus by the admirable Teſt of *T. G.'s Reaſon, the Heathen Idolaters* are excuſed from the breach of the Firſt Commandment, as well as the *Papiſts* from the breach of the Second. 2. He proves it *from the neceſſary Connexion between the Prohibition of the Law on the one ſide, and the ſupreme excellency of the Divine* p. 65, 66, *Nature on the other: For from the ſupreme excellency of God, it neceſſarily* 67.

follows that Sovereign Worſhip is due only to it, and not to be given to any other Image or Thing: But if we conſider him as inviſible only and irrepreſentable, it doth not follow on that account preciſely, that Sovereign Worſhip, or indeed any Worſhip at all, is due unto it. Which is juſt like this manner of Reaſoning. The Supreme Authority of a Husband is the reaſon why the Wife is to obey him; but if ſhe conſider her Husband, as his Name is *John* or *Thomas*, or as he hath ſuch Features in his Face; it doth not follow on that account preciſely, that ſhe is bound to obey him and none elſe for her Husband. And what of all this, for the love of School-Divinity? May not the reaſon of Obedience be taken from one particular thing in a Perſon; and yet there be a general Obligation of Obedience to that Perſon, *and to none elſe beſides him?* Although the Features of his Countenance be no reaſon of Obedience, yet they may ſerve to diſcriminate him from any other Perſon whom ſhe is not to love and obey. And in caſe he forbids her familiarity with one of his Servants, becauſe this would be a great Diſparagement to him; doth it follow that becauſe his Superiority is the general Reaſon of Obedience, he may not give a particular Reaſon for a ſpecial Command? this is the caſe here. *God's Supreme Excellency* is granted to be the *general reaſon of Obedience to all Gods Commands*; but in caſe he gives ſome particular Precept, as not to *worſhip any Image*, may not he aſſign a Reaſon proper to it? And what can be a more proper Reaſon againſt *making or worſhipping any Repreſentation of God*, than to ſay, *He cannot be repreſented? Meer inviſibility* I grant is no general reaſon of Obedience; but inviſibility may be a very proper reaſon for not painting what is inviſible. *There is no worſhip due to a ſound becauſe it cannot be painted*; but it is the moſt proper reaſon why a ſound cannot be painted, becauſe it is not viſible. And if God himſelf gives this reaſon why they ſhould make no graven Image, *becauſe they ſaw no Similitude on that day*, &c. is it not madneſs and folly in Men to ſay, this is no Reaſon? But *T. G.* ſtill takes it for granted, *That all that is meant by this Commandment, is that* T.G. p. 67. *Sovereign Worſhip is not to be given to Graven Images or Similitudes; and of the Sovereign Worſhip,* he ſaith, *God's excellency preciſely is the formal and immediate Reaſon why it is to be given to none but him.* But we are not ſuch Sots (ſay the Heathen Idolaters again) to give *Sovereign Worſhip to our Images of* Mercury *or* Apollo, *&c.* therefore the Reaſon of your Command doth not reach us; but we may Worſhip our Images as well as you do yours. 3. He proves it, *ad hominem*, thus, *I grant that no perfect Image of God can be made, and that God need not by a Law forbid an impoſſible thing; but from the Divine Natures being inviſible it only follows that Men ought not to preſume to make any Image, or Likeneſs to repreſent it as it is,* i. e. a perfect Image; *and the Law, in virtue of it muſt be to forbid making any ſuch Image: Therefore, acccording to my ſelf, the irrepreſentableneſs of the Divine Nature, as preciſely conſidered, cannot be aſſigned for the proper Cauſe or Reaſon of this Law.* Very ſubtilly argued? What I ſaid *could not be the Senſe of the Law*, he takes to be *the Senſe of it*, and from thence argues againſt the *Reaſon I had given*: Which is as if I ſhould ſay to him, *T. G.* denies *that this Commandment doth contain any prohibition of the worſhip of God by an Image.* But the Law muſt be underſtood to forbid *worſhipping God by an Image*, therefore, according to *T.G.* the Law doth forbid *worſhipping God by an Image*. Call you this arguing *ad hominem*! One would think it were to a Creature

ture of a lower rank. He ſaith, *I deny that the Law forbids making an impoſſible thing*, i. e. *a perfect Image of God:* He aſſerts, *That the Law muſt be underſtood to forbid the making of any ſuch Image*; and from hence he infers, that *according to my ſelf that cannot be the Reaſon of the Law which I aſſigned*, becauſe from that reaſon that only follows to be forbidden by the Law, which I ſaid could not be the thing *forbidden by the Law*; and he ſaith, *muſt be only forbidden by it.* Before *T. G.* had gone about to prove any thing from hence againſt my ſelf, he ought to have ſhewed, 1. That God's irrepreſentable Nature doth only hold againſt making Impoſſibilities, that is, *perfect Images of God.* 2. That this muſt be the meaning of the Second Commandment, which he ſaith, *I denied.* 3. That when I denied, and he barely affirmed it, he can argue *ad hominem* from my Denial and his Affirmation of the ſame thing, againſt the Reaſon alledged by me, *viz.* I aſſigned from Scripture, that no Image is to be made of God becauſe he is infinite and inviſible: Now ſaith *T. G. I will prove from your own Words, this cannot be the Reaſon of this Law.* How ſo? *You ſay, that the Law doth not forbid making a perfect Image of God, for that is impoſſible.* And what then? doth it hence follow, that the Law doth not forbid making a poſſible Image of God? *Hold*, ſaith *T. G. God's infinite Nature doth only hold againſt a perfect Image, and this muſt be the meaning of the Commandment*, which I utterly denied. And ſo if *T. G.* will argue *ex conceſſis*, it muſt proceed thus, I deny that the Law doth forbid an impoſſible Image of God, or that God's infinite Nature doth only hold againſt ſuch Images; and therefore, *according to my ſelf*, this infinite Nature of God cannot be the reaſon why Images are forbidden in the Second Commandment. Can any Man in the Earth diſcern the Conſequence of this? When I ſay the Law is made againſt poſſible Images, and that the Nature of God is repreſented ſo perfect to deter Men from making the moſt imperfect *Images of God, becauſe they are a Diſparagement to him*: Doth it follow from my Words, that this Reaſon cannot hold againſt the making of *Images*?

T. G. having given us ſuch a Teſt of his Reaſon; I now follow him to the Interpretation he gives of the places of Scripture produc'd by me. To the firſt, *Iſa.* 40. 18. *To whom will ye liken God? Or what likeneſs will ye compare unto him?* He anſwers, *That there is a likeneſs of Repreſentation, and a likeneſs of Compariſon; if the Words be underſtood of the former*, then he ſaith, *is only follows that ſuch a likeneſs is not to be made.* Which is all that I deſire. But again he is at it, *That I deny the Prohibition hereof to be any part of the Law:* Is it poſſible for *T. G.* to ſay this, when my deſign is to prove the contrary? But *by Likeneſs* T. G. *underſtands a perfect Repreſentation*; why doth he not ſay then, by *likeneſs* is underſtood *ſameneſs*? which is not Repreſentation, but the Thing it ſelf. All Repreſentation by the Art of Man muſt fall very much ſhort of the Perfection of the meaneſt Animal; and no Image can repreſent a thing as it is, but as it appears; not in regard of its inviſible Nature, but of its outward Lineaments; either therefore *T. G.* muſt deny any Likeneſs of Repreſentation, or he muſt yield that to be a Likeneſs of Repreſentation in an Image of God which doth not perfectly repreſent him. For if it had the Perfection of God, it would be God. *If the Words be underſtood of a likeneſs of Compariſon, then the meaning*, he ſaith, *is, that none of the Idols of the Heathens are to be compared to him in Wiſdom, Greatneſs, or Power.* But methinks if not the *Hebrew Words*, nor the

T. G. p. 69.

p. 70.

the *Chaldee Paraphraſt*, nor the LXX. nor other Verſions, could prevail with *T. G.* yet the *Vulgar Latine* ſhould have had Authority enough to let him know, that theſe Words are not ſpoken of *Heathen Idols*, but of an *Image of God*, *Cui ergo ſimilem feciſtis Deum? aut quam Imaginem ponetis ei?* Which ſurely ought to ſignifie more with him, than meerly the Contents of the Chapters do with us.

To *Deut.* 4. 15. he anſwers, *That* de facto *no manner of ſimilitude was ſeen at the giving of the Law, by the People; that afterwards they might* p. 71. *not take Occaſion to conceive it to have been a proper repreſentation of the Divinity, and ſo entertain an erroneous Conceit of God.* And doth *T. G.* think, there was not as much danger of *Diſhonouring God* by *Worſhipping* any ſuch *Repreſentation* of God, as by *Entertaining an erroneous Conceit of God in their Minds?* But why muſt this be underſtood only of a *proper Repreſentation*, when the Words are, *no manner of Similitude*, but a *proper Repreſentation?* And yet after all this, the *Images of God* allowed and worſhipped in the *Roman Church* are as much in danger of making Men *entertain erroneous Conceits of God*, as any Similitude of that time; and therefore as much againſt the Reaſon of this *Commandment*. But *T. G.* very modeſtly denies, *theſe Words to contain a Reaſon of this Commandment* (although they be, *For ye ſaw no manner of Similitude*, &c. *Therefore take heed leſt ye corrupt* p. 72. *your ſelves and make a graven Image*, &c.) *but the matter of Fact was made uſe of by him as a Motive to induce the People to the Obſervance of the Law in a Sermon he makes*, Deut. 4. *to preſs them to that Duty.* I ſee *T. G.* is reſolved to make juſt ſuch another Teſt of Scripture as he did of Reaſon; Could it ever enter into a Man's Head Waking, that theſe Words are a *General Reaſon* of the *Whole Law*, and not a particular Reaſon of that Command which immediately follows it, and by the very Words relates to it? *Ye ſaw no Similitude*, therefore *make no Similitude*; this is proper, and natural, and eaſie to all Capacities: But *ye ſaw no Similitude, therefore obey my Law*; Hold there, ſaith *T. G.* himſelf (if he be not in a Dream and hath forgotten himſelf) *to be ſupremely Excellent is the proper Reaſon of Obedience, and not the ſeeing no Similitude; therefore this is no proper Motive to Obedience*, whatever the *Contents* of *Chapters* or *Tops* of the *Pages* of our *Bibles* ſay, which are the pitiful Refuges *T. G.* betakes himſelf to, to eſcape down-right Sinking. But ſome Men would rather give all for loſt, than think to ſave themſelves by ſuch a mean Defence.

Well; but *T. G.* hath ſomething yet to ſay; which is, *That ſup-* p. 73. *poſing all this to be true which I have ſaid, as to the Reaſon of the Law, yet this doth not reach home to them; for it doth not follow from hence, that Chriſt according to his Humanity cannot be repreſented but with great Diſparagement to him: or that to put off our Hats when we behold the Figure of his ſacred Body with intent to worſhip him, muſt be extremely diſhonourable to him. This Argument therefore doth not concern Catholicks* p. 74. *in making the Image of Chriſt and his Saints with reſpect to their Honour.* This is the laſt Effort of *T. G.* on this Argument, and as weak as any of the reſt: For, 1. It is a falſe and moſt diſingenuous Repreſentation of their Practices, as may appear to any one that will but look back, on what I have ſaid upon that Subject. One would think, by *T. G's* Words, they had never uſed or allowed, or worſhipped any *Images* of *God* or the *Trinity* in the *Church* of *Rome*;

which he knows to be otherwiſe; and I have abundantly proved it already. 2. The Force of the Second Command, extending to *Chriſtians*, doth equally hold againſt the *Worſhip* of *Chriſt* by an *Image*, as it did under the Law againſt *Worſhipping God by an Image*. For if the Law be perpetual, as the *Chriſtian Church* always believed, and Chriſt be only the Object of Worſhip as He is God, we are as much forbidden to Worſhip Chriſt by an *Image*, as the *Jews* were to worſhip God by one. I do not ſay, there is as great an incongruity in Repreſenting the *Humane Nature of Chriſt*, as there was in Repreſenting the *Infinite Nature of God*; but I ſay, there is as great an Incongruity ſtill in ſuppoſing an *Image*, of whatſoever it be, can be the *proper Object of Divine Worſhip*. For the Humanity of Chriſt is only capable of receiving Adoration from us, as it is Hypoſtatically united to the *Divine Nature*; and St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *Being conſidered as ſeparated from it, is no more to be worſhipped than the Robe or Diadem of a Prince when it lies on the Ground*; and if the *Humane Nature of Chriſt* be not, what then is the *Image* of it? What Union is there between the *Divine Nature* and a *Crucifix?* All that can be ſaid is, that Imagination ſupplies the Union, and *Chriſt is ſuppoſed to be preſent by Repreſentation*; but this overthrows all Meaſures and Bounds of Worſhip, and makes it lawful to worſhip any Creature, with reſpect to God; it contradicts the Argument of St. *Paul*, *For then God may be worſhipped with the Work of Mens Hands*; it is contrary to the Senſe and Practice of the *Primitive Church* which interpreted this Commandment, to hold againſt all *Images* ſet up for Worſhip, as well thoſe proper to *Chriſtians*, as others among *Jews* or *Gentiles*. *In Evang. ſecund. Job. Serm. 58.*

3. The laſt way I propoſed to find out the ſenſe of the Law, was from the Judgment of the Law-giver: which was fully manifeſted in the Caſe of the *Golden Calf*, and the *two Calves of Jeroboam*. This he calls a *ſolid Principle indeed to work upon*; I am glad to ſee that we *Proteſtants* can fall into the way of Principles; and more glad that God's Judgment recorded in Scripture is acknowledged for ſuch a Principle: But after all, he calls this meer Imagination, and it muſt undergo the Teſt of his Reaſon. The force of my Argument, as he lays it down, is this, "That the *Iſraelites* were condemned by God "of *Idolatry*, for Worſhipping the *Golden Calf*, and yet they did "not fall into the *Heathen Idolatry* by ſo doing, but only worſhip-"ped the true God under that Symbol of His Preſence. To this *T. G.* oppoſes his Opinion, *That the Iſraelites herein fell back to the Egyptian Idolatry*. Here then is the ſtate of the Queſtion between us; to reſolve which, and to bring it home to our Buſineſs, I ſhall propoſe theſe two Things. Whether the Iſraelites did in Worſhipping the *Golden Calf*, fall back to the *Egyptian Idolatry?* 2. Whether it be ſufficient to *T. G*'s purpoſe to prove that they did ſo? For in caſe the *Egyptians* themſelves did worſhip the true God under Symbols, *T. G.* falls ſhort of his Deſign, if he could prove that the *Iſraelites* did relapſe to the *Egyptian Idolatry*: For it would then appear however to be *Idolatry* to worſhip the true God by an Image. 1. I ſhall examine the Evidence on both ſides, *whether the Iſraelites did fall back to the Egyptian Idolatry?* I offered ſeveral Reaſons to prove that the *Iſraelites* had no Intention to quit the Worſhip of that God, who had ſo lately given them the Law on Mount *Sinai*. §. 13. T. G p. 153. p. 156. p. 154.

1. From the Occaſion of this *Idolatry,* which was not any pretence of Infidelity as to the true God; or that they had now better Reaſons given them for the Worſhip of other Gods beſides him; but all that they ſay is, that *Moſes* had been ſo long abſent; that they deſired *Aaron* to make them Gods to go before them. To this T. G. anſwers, *that the very Text I mention ſhews their Infidelity,* viz. *in their deſpair of* Moſes's *Returning.* But if their Infidelity had been with a reſpect to God, it had been far more pertinent to have ſaid *Up, make us Gods to go before us; for as for this God who gave us the Law, we know not what is become of him;* but they only ſpeak of *Moſes* and not of *God,* and the Reaſon was, becauſe immediately before *Moſes* his going up into the *Mount,* the laſt promiſe *God* made Exod. 23. 20, 23. to the People was of an *Angel going before them;* and they underſtood that there was to be an Extraordinary Symbol of his Preſence among them; but what it was they could not tell; and *Moſes being ſo long* Exod. 32. 1. *abſent,* as the Text ſaith, they grew impatient of having this Symbol, T.G.p.160 and ſo put *Aaron* upon making the *Golden Calf. T. G.* ſaith, *they had forgotten this Promiſe, or thought that God was not able to perform it:* For which he hath not the leaſt colour from Scripture or Reaſon; as will appear by the following Particulars. 2. From the intolerable Folly of deſiring *Aaron* to make that *God,* which before he was made delivered them out of the *Land of Ægypt.* For ſo the Nehem. 9. 18. People ſay, *This is thy God, or theſe are thy Gods, which brought thee* 32. 4. *out of the Land of Ægypt.* Is it poſſible to ſuppoſe People ſo extreamly ſtupid to imagine a God juſt then made, ſhould before it was made, *deliver them out of Ægypt?* But *T. G.* is a notable Man, and hath made a rare Diſcovery, viz. *that* Calvin *ſaid ſome ſuch thing before me;* I thank him for the Diſcovery, for I do aſſure him it was more than I had ever read in *Calvin;* but *T. G.* hath a great mind to make *Calvin my Maſter in every thing.* I ſhould not be aſhamed to learn from a Man of ſo great Abilities; but it falls out unhappily, that I do not find one thing he charges me with following *Calvin* in, but it is from him that I learn what *Calvin* ſaid. And if he had pleaſed he might have quoted an Author of their own for Fer. in Act 7. p. 94. theſe Words; *neque enim tam ſtupidi erant,* ſaith Ferus, *quod crederent Aaron poſſe facere Deum; they were not ſo ſtupid to believe that Aaron could make a God;* and *therefore* he ſaith, very honeſtly, *that the Iſraelites worſhipped the True God, by the Calf.* But ſuppoſe *Calvin* did ſay T.G.p.155 this, is there ever the leſs Reaſon in the ſaying? *But we can imagine as ſottiſh things of them,* viz. *that they terminate their Worſhip on the Images, although they deny any Divinity to be in them?* Is it indeed ſo ſottiſh a thing to *terminate their Worſhip on the Images?* what becomes then of all their Divines who plead for it, and ſay that by the Decrees of their Councils, Worſhip ought to be terminated on the *Images themſelves?* as *T. G.* may ſee in the precedent Chapter. *But* p. 165, *the Scripture,* T. G. ſaith, *repreſents the Iſraelites as a People void of Underſtanding; and they were without Learning, and oppreſſed for four Hundred Years together, by the moſt Idolatrous Nation in the World; and ſerved their Gods,* Ezek. 20. 8. I grant the Scripture gives that ſevere Character of them, but it was *becauſe they did not conſider the Conſequence of their Diſobedience;* as appears by the next verſe *Deut.* 32. 29. Muſt we becauſe of this imagine them to be ſuch Fools and Sots, that no *Idolaters* in the World can be parallel'd with them;

viz. to make a God which did mighty things for them, before it was made? Therefore the meaning of making a God can be nothing elſe, but making a Symbol or Repreſentation of God; and the Queſtion then is, whether it were the Repreſentation of an *Egyptian Idol*, or the *God of Iſrael*? That it was not the former I proved—— 3. From the way of Worſhip uſed by the *Iſraelites, which was an Abomination to the Egyptians*, Exod. 8. 26. To this *T. G.* returns not the leaſt word of Anſwer; but he ſhall not eſcape ſo, for from hence I ſhall make it appear beyond Contradiction, that it was not *Egyptian Idolatry*, which the Iſraelites fell into; for which we muſt conſider the Sacrifices that were offered to the *Golden Calf. And they roſe up early on the Morrow, and offer'd Burnt-offerings, and brought Peace-offerings, and the People ſate down to Eat and to Drink, and roſe up to play.* St. *Stephen* ſaith, *And they made a Calf in thoſe Days, and offered Sacrifice unto the Idol, and rejoyced in the Works of their own Hands.* Now the *Burnt-offerings, and Peace-offerings* are expreſſed, *Exod.* 20. 24. to be their Oxen and their Sheep: and immediately before *Moſes* his going up into the Mount it is ſaid, *that they offered Burnt-offerings and ſacrificed Peace-offerings of Oxen unto the Lord:* where the very ſame Words עלת and שלמים are uſed, and the LXX. there render the Word we tranſlate Oxen μοσχάρια, and the Vulg. Lat. *Vitulos*, the ſame Word which is uſed for the *Golden Calf.* Now I ſhall ſhew that nothing could be more repugnant to the *Egyptian Idolatry*, than ſuch Sacrifices as theſe. For which we have this conſiderable Teſtimony of *Horus* in *Macrobius*, *Nunquam fas fuit Ægyptiis pecudibus aut ſanguine, ſed precibus & ture ſolo placare Deos. It was never lawful for the Egyptians to ſacrifice with Cattle and Blood, but only with Prayers and Incenſe:* And from thence he proves *that the Worſhip of* Saturn *and* Serapis *were but lately received among the Egyptians, in the time of the* Ptolemies; *and after they were received, their Temples were without the Cities, that they might not be polluted with Blood within the Cities.* And every one knows, that the Feaſts were upon their Sacrifices; but the Satyriſt ſays of the *Egyptians*;

Exod. 32. 6.

Act. 7. 41.

Exod. 24. 5.

Macrob. Saturn. l. 1. *c.* 7.

Cuperi Harpocrat p. 105.

> *Lanatis animalibus abſtinet omnis*
> *Menſa; nefas illic fœtum jugulare capellæ.*

Juv. Satyr. 15. *v.* 11.

Anaxandrides in *Athenæus*, ſaith, *that a Greek could have no Converſation with an Egyptian; becauſe the one worſhipped an Ox which the other ſacrificed:* And *Herodotus* ſaith, *that the Egyptians would not touch ſo much as the Knife, or Spit, or Pot which the Greeks had uſed.* So great an Averſion had they from thoſe who either eat or ſacrificed the Creatures they worſhipped. *Herodotus* indeed ſaith, *that the Thebans abſtained from Sheep, and offered Goats; The Mendeſians on the contrary abſtained from Goats and offered Sheep.* But this was on the account of the particular Religion of thoſe two *Provinces*; (for they differed very much among themſelves as to particular Animals:) but all the *Egyptians* agreed, as *Herodotus* there ſaith, *in the Worſhip of* Oſiris *and* Iſis: Now *Diodorus Siculus* affirms that *Apis* and *Mneuis* the Bulls of *Heliopolis*, and *Memphis were ſacred to* Oſiris; *Plutarch* ſaith, *that the Ox was the Image of* Oſiris, and *Strabo that* Apis *was the ſame with* Oſiris; and *Mela that* Apis *was the Deity of all the Egyptians. Strabo* gives the moſt particular account of the *Egyptian Worſhip*, and what Creatures were worſhipped in the ſeveral *Provinces*; *but*, he ſaith, *there were three univerſally worſhipped, whereof the*

Athen. l. 7.

Herod. l. 2. *c.* 41.

Herod. l. 2. *c.* 42.

Diod. Sic. l. 1. *c.* 13.

Plut. de Iſide p. 366.

Mela l. 1. *c.* 9.

Strabo l. 17.

firſt is, the Ox, and it was an univerſal Practice not to touch or hurt thoſe Creatures that were ſacred among them; as the Oxen were quite through *Egypt*; from whence *Moſes deſired to go into the Wilderneſs to ſacrifice, for we ſhall ſacrifice the Abomination of the Egyptians to* Exod. 8. 26. *the Lord our God. Lo, ſhall we ſacrifice the Abomination of the Egyptians before their Eyes, and will they not ſtone us? i. e.* ſaith the *Targum* of *Onkelos, becauſe the Egyptians Worſhip Oxen. Becauſe Lambs are the Idols of the Egyptians,* ſaith *Jonathan. If we kill,* ſaith St. *Hierome, the things which they Worſhip.* I leave it now to the Conſideration of any Man, whether the *Iſraelites* uſing their *accuſtomed Burnt-Offerings and Sacrifices*, and *Feaſtings* upon them, as they did in the Worſhip of the *Golden Calf*, can be ſuppoſed to have returned to the *Egyptian Idolatry.*

4. I urged this, as an Argument that the *Iſraelites* intended to worſhip the *true God, becauſe* Aaron *proclaimed a Feaſt,* ליהוה *to Jeho-* Exod. 32. 5. *vah.* And however the *People void of Underſtanding*, I ſuppoſe *Aaron* being High Prieſt, and Head of the Church at that time, was not ſo bereft of common Senſe, as to give the incommunicable Name of *Jehovah* to a *Calf* of his own making. All that *T. G.* ſaith to this, T.G.p.159 is, *that* Aaron *perhaps and ſome of the wiſer Men among them might not be ſo ſottiſh, as to ſuppoſe the Calf he made to be the God that delivered them out of* Egypt, *yet it is certain they were ſo weak, as to concurr with the People in the external Practices of their Idolatry.* But this is not the force of my Argument, which lies in this, that *Aaron* ſaid, *it was a Feaſt to Jehovah,* when they were to ſacrifice to the *Golden Calf*; either therefore he muſt ſuppoſe that Worſhip was intended for the Honour of the *True God*, or he muſt give the name of *Jehovah* to the *Calf*; which would ſhew him to have been more ſottiſh than the People, for they only called the *Calf* by the Name of *Elohim*, but he gives the Name of *Jehovah* to it, which was that peculiar Name God was known by to the People of *Iſrael* upon the Accompliſhment of his Promiſe in bringing them out of *Egypt. I appeared unto* Exod. 6. 3. 6. Abraham, *and to* Iſaac, *and to* Jacob *by the Name of God Almighty, but by my Name Jehovah was I not known unto them: Wherefore ſay unto the Children of* Iſrael, *I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the Burdens of the Egyptians,* &c. Therefore when the People ſay, *This is the God that brought us out of the Land of* Egypt, *Aaron* preſently proclaims a Feaſt to *Jehovah*, i. e. *to the God that brought them out of the Land of* Egypt. And when afterwards the *Ark* (which was the *Symbol God* himſelf appointed of his Preſence among them) was removed, upon their travelling from the Mount of the Lord, *Moſes* ſaid, *Riſe up Jehovah*; and when it reſted, *Return O Jehovah* Numb. 10. 35. 56. *unto the many Thouſands of* Iſrael. Thus the Name of *Jehovah* was uſed by *Moſes* himſelf upon occaſion of the appointed *Symbol* of God's Preſence; but when *Aaron* proclaimed a Feaſt to *Jehovah* upon making the *Golden Calf*, *Moſes* calls it a *Golden God*, becauſe *God* Exod. 32. 31. v. 6. ſaith, *they had made a Molten Calf, and worſhipped it, and ſacrificed thereunto, and ſaid, This is thy God which brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt. Which therefore by St. *Stephen* is called an *Idol*. 5. The ex- Act. 7 41. preſſing it to be *the God that brought them out of the Land of* Egypt, doth imply, that they did not intend one of the *Egyptian Gods*. For what reaſon could they have to think that one of the Gods of *Egypt* ſhould deliver them out of the *Egyptian Bondage*; and while their own Wor-

ſhippers were forſaken by them, to preſerve thoſe who were ſo great Enemies to them? And how could they think the Gods of *Egypt* had wrought all the Miracles for them which were ſeen in that Deliverance? And how unlikely was it they ſhould forſake the *God* of *Iſrael* and return to the *Egyptian Gods*; when they make uſe here of the very Preface of the Law which *God* had ſo lately given them on *Mount Sinai*: viz. *I am the God that brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt. To this *T. G.* returns no manner of Anſwer. 6. When the *Iſraelites* revolted to the *Idolatry* of their Neighbours, the Scripture punctually ſets down the Names of the *Idols* they worſhipped, as *Baal Peor*, *Moloch*, *Remphan*; but here is nothing of that Nature mentioned. To this *T. G.* Anſwers, *What then? Is it the Idols having a Name, that makes the Worſhippers Heathen Idolaters? If they conceived or believed the Calf to be a God, were they not as much Heathen Idolaters for Worſhipping it without a Name, as the Egyptians for Worſhipping it under the Name of* Apis? But *T. G.* cunningly diſſembles the force of the Argument, which was not from their *Worſhipping it without a Name*, but from the Scriptures not expreſſing it, which it doth upon other Occaſions: And *Bellarmin* himſelf tells us, from *Abulenſis*, *Cajetan* and others, *that the Iſraelites had two ſorts of Idols, one without a certain Name*, as the *Idol of Micha*, Judges 17. *and it may be, the Golden Calf which* Aaron *made, and* Jeroboam *renewed, for the Scripture doth not call it* Moloch *or* Baal, *&c. The other had a certain Name, as* Baal, Moloch, Aſhtaroth, Chamos, *Therefore ſay they not improbably* (mark that) *that it may be allowed of the firſt ſort, that the Jews did worſhip the True God in the Idol.* Then an Image of the true God may be an *Idol*, and thoſe *Idolaters*, who worſhip ſuch an Image. *But they erred moſt grievouſly*, ſaith *Bellarmin*, *in three Things*: 1. *That they ſacrificed to the Idol*, i. e. gave Divine Worſhip to it. 2. *That they believed the Divinity to be in it*: How doth that appear? no more ſurely, than thoſe who believe Images to ſpeak and to work Miracles. 3. *That they thought God to be corporeal and like the Idol*, *i. e.* the *Iſraelites* thought the great *Jehovah* to be juſt of the Faſhion of the Calf. What prodigious Fools muſt ſome Men make the *Iſraelites*, that they may not appear as great *Idolaters* themſelves? 4. I argued from St. *Stephen*'s Words, *And they made a Calf in thoſe Days and offered Sacrifice to the Idol: Then God turned and gave them up to worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven*; whereby, I ſaid it was obſervable, that the *Idolatry* of the *Calf* was diſtinct from the other *Heathen Idolatry*, this being a Puniſhment of the other. To this *T. G.* ſaith nothing, and yet it is a thing which deſerves Conſideration, that that which the Fathers accounted the moſt juſtifiable *Idolatry* of the *Heathens*, *viz.* the Worſhipping the Hoſt of Heaven, is looked upon as the Judgment following the Worſhip of the *Golden Calf*. So *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Origen* plead for this ſo much in Compariſon with other *Heathen Idolatries*, as hardly to think it a fault in them; and it is farther obſervable that in no kind of *Idolatry*, which the *Iſraelites* ever fell into, ſave only that of *Jeroboam*, which was of the ſame Nature with this, that Expreſſion was ever uſed, *Theſe are thy Gods which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt*: which ſhews that this Worſhip had a peculiar Reſpect to that God who brought them in ſo remarkable a manner out of the Bondage they were under there. Theſe are the Reaſons which I have to prove,

T.G p.161

Bell. de Imag. l. 2. *c.* 13.

Act. 7. 41, 42.

Clem. Alex. Str. 6. *p.* 482. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 238.

that the *Iſraelites* did intend to worſhip the *True God* by the *Golden Calf:* And we have ſeen what weak Anſwers *T. G.* gives to ſome of them, and none at all to others.

§. 14. I muſt now attend to the Reaſons he gives to the contrary, and thoſe are either from Scripture or Fathers. 1. From *Scripture, where they are charged with forſaking God*, Deut. 32. 15, 16, 17, 18. As tho' the *Iſraelites* committed no *Idolatry* in the Wilderneſs but that of the *Golden Calf.:* Whereas it is well known that they worſhipped *Baal-Peor*, *Moloch*, and *Remphan*; of which a blacker Character is given than of the other. *But the Pſalmiſt ſaith, that in Worſhipping the Calf, they did forget God*, Pſal. 106. 19, 20, 21. And was not that forgetting the God that appeared with ſuch a terrible Majeſty on *Mount Sinai, to turn his Glory into the Similitude of an Ox that eateth Graſs?* But in the Expreſſions of *Scripture to forget God is to diſobey Him*; *beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God, in not keeping his Commandments, and his Judgments, and his Statutes which I command thee this Day.* And was not this forgetting God in this ſenſe, ſo openly to break one of the Laws he had ſo lately given them? That which ſeems to come neareſt the matter is, the Expreſſion of St. *Stephen*, *That our Fathers would not obey, but thruſt Him from them (that is, the true God*, ſaith *T. G.* whereas the Words are plainly meant of *Moſes) and in their Hearts turned back again into Egypt, ſaying, Make us Gods to go before us*; which relates not to the Object but to the manner of Worſhip by ſuch a Symbol of Worſhip as was in greateſt Veneration among all the *Egyptians*. This is the force of all that he brings out of the Scripture.

T.G.p.155

Deut. 8. 11, 14. 6. 12.

Act. 7.39, 40.

2. From them he betakes himſelf to the Fathers: And he quotes two Paſſages of St. *Athanaſius*, and St. *Hierome*; and a doubtful Place of St. *Chryſoſtom* to his Purpoſe. This is the firſt time I have found *T. G.* citing the Fathers truly and pertinently; and it were too hard dealing with him, not to allow him theſe Teſtimonies; eſpecially about the Expoſition of a Place of Scripture; wherein their beſt Commentators take ſo much Liberty of receding from them, when they apprehend the Scope and Circumſtances of the Place do enforce another Senſe; as I have already ſhewed at large concerning this. And to theſe Fathers, I ſhall oppoſe the Teſtimony of others, who make the *Egyptian Ox* to be only a Symbolical Repreſentation of the *Patriarch Joſeph*, and ſay that on this Account the *Iſraelites* made choice of the *Golden Calf*; ſo the Author of the Book *De Mirabilibus S. Script.* in St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, (as good an Author as the *Homiliſt de Pœnit.* whom he quotes under St. *Chryſ.* Name) ſaith, *That the* Egyptians *ſet up the Image of an Ox by the Sepulchre of* Joſeph; *and for this Cauſe the* Iſraelites *made choice of that Similitude, when they made an Idol in the Wilderneſs. Julius Firmicus Maternus* ſaith, *That the* Neocori *did preſerve in* Egypt *the Image of* Joſeph, by which he underſtands *Apis, or the ſacred Bulls*; the ſame is affirmed by *Rufinus* and *Suidas*. From whence it follows, that this being looked on as the Symbol taken up in *Egypt* in Remembrance of the Service of *Joſeph*, it was very unlikely, that the *Iſraelites* ſhould look on the *Image* it ſelf as ſo powerful a thing, as the Teſtimonies of *Athanaſius* and St. *Chryſoſtom* imply; to be able even before it was made, *to deliver them out of* Egypt: Which is ſuch a horrible Contradiction,

T. G. p.

De mirab. S. Script. l. 1. c. 15.

De errore profan. Relig. p. 18 Rufin. hiſt. Eccl. l. 2. c. 23. Suid. v. Σάραπις.

tradiction, that we had need to have better Teſtimonies than thoſe, to make us think the *Iſrealites* ſuch Sots to believe it. But if it were only looked on as a Symbol of God's preſence, this gives a probable account why the *Iſraelites* ſhould make choice of this, before any other of the *Egyptian* Images, becauſe by it the kindneſs of *Joſeph* (who by *Moſes* is compared to a young Ox) was ſuppoſed to be remembred by them. But, Deut. 33. 17.

§. 15. 2. We are to enquire whether ſuppoſing that the *Iſraelites* did revolt to the *Egyptian Idolatry* in the worſhip of the Golden Calf, that be ſufficient to prove that they did not worſhip the true God under this Symbol? For if the *Egyptians* themſelves did worſhip the Supreme God under Symbolical Repreſentations of him, then although the *Iſraelites* might return with their Hearts into *Eygpt*, yet this doth not prove, that they did not worſhip the true God by the Golden Calf. *Plutarch*, who diſcourſeth largely concerning the *Egyptian Worſhip*, ſaith, *That the Golden Bull was the Image of* Oſiris, *which was ſhewed for four days together, from the ſeventeenth of the Month Athir*: And it was a common practice in *Egypt* to have Golden Images (*effigies ſacri nitet aurea Cercopitheci*) wherein *Lucian* ſaith, *The barbarous Nations did exceed the* Greeks, *who made their Images of Wood, or Ivory, or Stone.* For there were two ſorts of Images of their Gods among the *Egyptians*. Thoſe Images and Repreſentations which were in their Temples, or places of Worſhip, and thoſe which they accounted the living Images of their Gods, *viz.* Beaſts, ſuch as the two famous Bulls, *Apis* and *Mneuis*; the one at *Memphis*, the other at *Heliopolis*, both in Honour of *Oſiris*; which places were as the *Dan* and *Bethel* of *Egypt*; *Memphis* being the *Metropolis* of the upper, *Heliopolis* of the lower *Egypt*; wherein the *Iſraelites* lived, and ſaw the worſhip of the ſacred Bull of *Heliopolis*. *Plutarch* ſaith, *The* Egyptians *looked on* Apis *as the Image of the Soul of* Oſiris. *Diodorus* ſaith, *That they looked on the Soul of* Oſiris *as paſſing by Tranſmigration into* Apis (from which Doctrine the worſhip of Beaſts was not only entertained in *Egypt*, but is ſo in the *Eaſt Indies* to this Day, in which caſe the Beaſt is only the *material Object* of *Worſhip*, but the formal Reaſon is the preſence of ſome Divine Soul which they ſuppoſe to be there, which on their Suppoſition ought to have Divine worſhip given to it by the Principles of the *Roman* Church, as the Elements of Bread and Wine on a Suppoſition more extravagant, *viz.* of Tranſubſtantiation.) But whether the worſhip of Animals came into *Egypt*, from the Doctrine of Tranſmigration, or from their Uſefulneſs, or from ſome politick Reaſons, which are mentioned both by *Plutarch* and *Diodorus*; this is certain, that *Plutarch* thinks, *their wiſer Men did not worſhip the Animals themſelves, but looked on them only as Repreſentations of ſome Divine Perfection which they diſcerned in them, and on that account gave worſhip to them.* Ἀγαπητέον οὖν οὐ ταῦτα τιμῶντας, ἀλλὰ διὰ ταῦτα τὸ θεῖον, *Thoſe Perſons ought to be moſt eſteemed, who did not worſhip the Animals themſelves, but through them did worſhip the Deity; and they ought to be looked on as clearer and more natural Repreſentations of God than inanimate things; and we ought to eſteem them, as the Workmanſhip and Inſtrument,* τοῦ πάντα κοσμοῦντος θεοῦ, *of the God that orders all things. And there is all the reaſon to imagine, that what hath a Soul and Senſe, is better*

Plut. de Iſid. p. 366.
Juven. Satyr. 15.
Lucian in Jove. Tragœd.
Marſham. Chronic. Can. p. 60.
Plut. de Iſid. p. 362.
Diod. l. 1. p. 76.
Plut. de Iſid. p. 382.

ter than that which hath none, viz. *an Image*: *And the Divine Nature is not ſeen in Colours and Figures, and ſmooth Superficies; which are worſe than dead Creatures, for theſe never had life in them*: *But that which hath Life, and Senſe, and Motion, hath a greater Influence from that Divine Wiſdom which governs all things*; *therefore*, ſaith he, *theſe ought not to be looked on as inferior Repreſentations of the* τὸ θεῖον *the Divine Being, than thoſe Images which are made of Braſs or Stone by the Workmanſhip of Men, and are ſubject to Corruption, and deſtitute of all Senſe and Underſtanding.* Whereby we ſee that *Plutarch* did put a difference between the common Practices of the People, and the Intention of the wiſer Men in the *Egyptian* Idolatry. He before takes notice of the follies of the People *that worſhipped the living Creatures themſelves as Gods, and thereby not only*
p. 379. *expoſed their Religion to the Scorn and Contempt of others*; *but led ſome Men into horrible Superſtition, and tempted others to turn Atheiſts*; and then he gives this as the moſt reaſonable account of the Worſhip of theſe Animals, according to their wiſer Men, whoſe Opinions ought moſt to be followed in Religion. From whence it appears that the diſtinction of the Practice of the People, and the Doctrine of Divines hath obtained among the groſſeſt Idolaters; and if the Peoples Practice be excuſed becauſe the Divines teach otherwiſe, the moſt ſottiſh *Egyptian* Idolaters are excuſable, as well as thoſe in the *Roman* Church. For what is there in this Principle of Worſhip laid down by *Plutarch*, which may not be defended by the avowed Doctrine of the *Roman* Church? Here is, (1.) a right ultimate Object of Worſhip, *viz.* the τὸ θεῖον *the Divine Being, which orders and governs all things.* (2.) Here is a Repreſentation of that Object by the Perfections derived from that Being to a Creature. (3.) Here is a right directing the Intention through that Repreſentation to the ultimate Object. And, (4.) the formal Reaſon of Worſhip is the Derivation or Participation of that Perfection which repreſents God from the Divine Being: And therefore this is no Sovereign Worſhip which is given to it.

§. 16. The only difficulty here is to ſhew that the *Egyptians* did intend to worſhip the Supreme God by either ſort of their *Images*: Which is not only affirm'd by *Plutarch*, who ſaith, *They underſtood by* Oſiris *the wiſe Providence of God, and by* Porphyry, who ſaith, *The* Egyptians, *by the*
Porphyr. de Abſtin. l. 4. ſect. 9. *ſeveral Animals they worſhipped, did expreſs their Devotion towards the Almighty Power of God*; and by *Apuleius*, who was initiated in the *Egyptian* Myſteries, and in the Concluſion of his *Metamorphoſis*, *Oſiris* is
Apul. Metam. l. 11. called *Deus Deûm magnorum potior, & majorum ſummus, & ſummorum maximus, & maximorum regnator Oſiris*, which are Deſcriptions of no leſs than the Supremeſt God; but *Maximus Tyrius* yields at laſt that
Max. Tyr. diſſ. 38. in fin. the *Egyptians* did worſhip the τὸ θεῖον, *the Deity by the worſhip of Animals*, as the *Greeks* did by the Statue of *Phidias*. And there is a conſiderable Teſtimony to this purpoſe in *Vopiſcus*, taken out of an Epiſtle of the Emperor *Adrian*, which he wrote to *Servianus* from
Fl. Vopiſc. in Saturnino. *Egypt*, giving an account of the manners of the *Egyptians*; wherein are theſe words, *Unus illis Deus eſt, hunc Chriſtiani, hunc Judæi, hunc omnes venerantur & gentes. They had one God, whom Chriſtians and Jews, and all Nations worſhipped. Iſ. Caſaubon* ſuſpects this Paſſage, but without any reaſon, as *Salmaſius* proves, and is apparent, becauſe the ſame thing is ſaid in the beginning of the ſame Epiſtle: Where he ſaith, *That however they differed in other Points, yet they all agreed in*

the worſhip of Serapis, by whom *Phylarchus* in *Plutarch* underſtands, *That God which governs the World*: And *Seguinus* ſhews from ancient Coins and Authors, that *Serapis*, and *Jupiter Ammon*, and *Jupiter Pharius*, and *Jupiter rerum omnium potens* were all one. Thence the Inſcriptions,

Plut. de Iſid. p. 362.

Seguin. Numiſm. p. 2, 3, 4.

D.E.O. I.N.V.I.C.T.O.
S.E.R.A.P.I. S.E.R.V.A.T.O.R.I.

Grut. Inſcript. p. 85

D.E.O. M.A.G.N.O.
S.E.R.A.P.I.

and that mentioned by *Triſtan*,

I.O.M. S.A.R.A.P.I.D.I.
P.R.O. S.A.L.V.T.E. I.M.P.

Triſtan. Comment. Hiſtor. To. 2. p. 190.

From which it appears that ſuppoſing the *Iſraelites* did relapſe to the *Egyptian* Idolatry, it doth not from thence follow that they did not worſhip the true God by an Image.

§. 17.

I proceed now to the two Calves of *Jeroboam* at *Dan* and *Bethel*; which being made in imitation of the Golden Calf, muſt ſtand or fall by what hath been ſaid already concerning that. But I ſhall here make good the peculiar Arguments to *Jeroboam*'s Caſe, which were brought to prove that he did intend to worſhip the God of *Iſrael* by the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel*. 1. Becauſe *Jeroboam* manifeſts no deſign of taking the People off from the worſhip of the true God, but only from the worſhipping him at *Hieruſalem*. For all that he ſaith to the People is, *It is too much for you to go up to* Jeruſalem, *behold thy Gods, O* Iſrael, *which brought thee up out of the Land of* Egypt. If *Jeroboam*'s Intention had been to have altered their Religion, he would have ſpoken againſt that, and not only againſt the place of it; and to ſhew to them that he had no ſuch Intention, he continued the ſame Feaſts and way of Worſhip which were at *Jeruſalem*. To this *T. G.* anſwers, *That* Jeroboam'*s End was to ſecure the ten Tribes to himſelf; and the likelieſt way to effect it was the making them ſuch Idols as their Fathers had worſhipped in* Egypt *and the Wilderneſs*: And yet ſoon after *T. G.* repreſents him as *a great Polititian, that would not make any ſudden Changes*. But could there be any change greater or more ſudden than to change the true God for Molten Gods and Devils, as *T. G.* ſaith he did; which words (if they be underſtood in *T. G.*'s ſenſe for the *Egyptian Idols and Devils in them)* was as great a change as could be made in Religion, and too ſudden to be made by ſuch a Politician. He ſhould have begun the Alteration in the ſmaller Matters, if he intended no ſudden change; and firſt have gained ſome of the great Men to him to be ready to join with him, when opportunity ſerved, with hopes of Preferment and Places at Court; when theſe were ſecured, then put in ſome of the vileſt of the People into the Prieſthood (as he did) to render that ſacred Office mean and contemptible, the better to prepare the People for a change; then to ſend Agents abroad to tamper with the moſt active

1 Kings 12. 28.

T. G. p. 164

p. 165.

active among them, to allure ſome and to terrifie others, according to their ſeveral Diſpoſitions; then to give Liberty to thoſe tender Conſciences that longed for the Onions and Fleſh-pots and Bulls of *Egypt*; and when he had by degrees prepared a conſiderable party, that would be ſure to adhere to him, then by little and little to open the great Deſign to them, which he aimed at all this while. But it was too great a Change for ſuch a Politician, to ſay at the very firſt to them; *Come, renounce the God of* Iſrael *without more ado; I have ſet up other Gods for you to worſhip, and I command you all immediately to obey me*: Methinks, this would ſeem too harſh and unpolitick, and too dangerous for ſo new a Government as his was; a little Indulgence for tender Conſciences for a time, with the ſweeteſt Words, had better become ſuch an *Achitophel*, as *T. G.* calls *Jeroboam*. This, this had been the way to have wheedled and drawn in the ſilly and injudicious Multitude, “ By telling them what an Oppreſſion it was for “ them to be under the Juriſdiction of the High Prieſt and his Brethren “ at *Jeruſalem*; and that there was no reaſon ſuch a vaſt number of “ lazy Prieſts and ignorant *Levites* ſhould be maintain'd out of their “ Labours by Tythes and Offerings; that all the pretence of the true “ worſhip of God being confined to the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, was on- “ ly out of a deſign to enrich the Prieſts and the City; that it was “ only zeal for their own Intereſts and Revenues, which made them ſo “ earneſt for that particular way of Worſhip which was ſo different “ from the reſt of the World. What! could they imagine that God “ had no other People in the World, but ſuch as went up to *Jeruſa-* “ *lem* to worſhip? What would become of the Catholick way of wor- “ ſhip which was in all the Nations round about them? Was it credi- “ ble, that God ſhould ſuffer ſo great a part of Mankind to run on “ in ſuch Idolatry, as a few *Jews* accounted it? If it were ſo diſplea- “ ſing to God, could it ever be thought that the wiſeſt King “ they ever had, *viz. Solomon*, ſhould in the wiſeſt time of “ his Life, *viz.* in his old Age, fall to the practice of it? Beſides “ all this they ought to conſider how much the Honour and “ Safety of the Nation was concerned in embracing the ſame Ca- “ tholick way of worſhip which prevailed round about them. “ Their pretending to greater purity of worſhip than their Neigh- “ bours, made them hated and ſcorned, and reproached by their “ Neighbours of all ſides, *viz.* by *Moab* and *Ammon*, and *Ama-* “ *lek*, the *Philiſtins*, and thoſe of *Tyre*: But if they returned to the “ worſhip of the neighbour Nations, they might be ſure of the “ aſſiſtance of the King of *Egypt*, with whom *Jeroboam* had lived “ many years, who would be ready to help them on all occa- “ ſions; and their leſſer Enemies would then be afraid to di- “ ſturb them. Thus we ſee what plauſible Pretences there were to have drawn the People off from the Law of *Moſes*, to the Idolatries of *Egypt*; but we read not the leaſt intimation of this Nature in the whole Hiſtory of this Revolt: But *Jeroboam* only ſaith, *Theſe are thy Gods which brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt, which was the moſt unpolitick way of perſwading them to return to the Gods of *Egypt*. Beſides, he not only appointed a Feaſt like unto that in *Judah*, but it is ſaid, *That he offered upon the Altar, and ſacrificed unto the Calves which he had made*, i. e. according to the cuſtom of the *Jewiſh Sacrifices*, than which nothing could be more repugnant

1 Kings 12. 32.

to the *Egyptian* Idolatry, as I have already proved. But *T. G.* T.G.p.165
ſaith, *The Text ſpeaks but of one Feaſt*; it is very true, it mentions
but one; but it is ſaid afterwards in ſeveral Places, *That* 2 Kings
they departed not from the way of Jeroboam; and that very Feaſt 17.22, 23.
being accompanied with ſo many Sacrifices, was a plain evidence
it was not the *Egyptian Idolatry* which he then ſet up. And it is
remarkable to this Purpoſe, that every one who was to be conſecrated
a *Prieſt to the Golden Calves*, was to be conſecrated with
a Sacrifice of a young Bullock, and of ſeven Rams; which according 1 Chron.
to the Rites of the *Egyptian Idolatry*, were enough to have prophaned 13. 9.
the moſt ſacred Perſon. And *Joſephus* (who may be allowed
to have underſtood the Mind of *Jeroboam* as well as *T. G.*) ſaith *Joſeph.*
expreſly, *That in the Speech he made to the People, he only pleaded, that* *Antiq.*
God being every where preſent, he might be worſhipped at Dan *and* Bethel, *Jud. l.* 8.
as well as Jeruſalem: *And that, for their greater conveniency, he had* *c.* 3.
ſet up the Calves at Dan *and* Bethel, *that there they might worſhip*
God. Thus we ſee that in this worſhip at *Dan* and *Bethel*, *Jeroboam*
intended no more than to worſhip the God of *Iſrael* there.
I will not deny that *Jeroboam* was for Liberty of Conſcience, and
allowed the practice of *Egyptian* Idolatry, and appointed Prieſts to
ſerve at the ſeveral Altars, as the People had a mind; but the eſtabliſhed
worſhip, at which himſelf was preſent, was at the *Calves*
of *Dan* and *Bethel*. For it is ſaid, *That he offered on the Altar there.* 1 Kings
But we read, that he appointed Prieſts, not only for the *Calves*, 12. 33.
but, 1. *for the High Places*; which were of two ſorts, 1. Some for 2 Chron.
the *worſhip of falſe Gods*, as thoſe which *Solomon* allowed to be built for 11. 15.
Chemoſh and *Moloch* on the *Mount of Olives*. 2. Others were for
the worſhip of the true God in the ten Tribes. For there being 1 Kings
ſome *diſſenting Brethren among the* Iſraelites, who would neither join 11. 7.
with the Houſe of *Judah* in the worſhip at *Hieruſalem*, nor with *Jeroboam* 2 Kings
in the worſhip of the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel*; to keep 23. 13.
theſe ſecure to his intereſt, he permits them to worſhip God on
the *High Places*, i. e. *Altars* erected to that purpoſe upon an aſcent
of Ground. And this I prove from that paſſage of *Elias*,
They have thrown down thy Altars; ſpeaking of the Children of *Iſrael*'s 1 Kings
demoliſhing them in the time of *Ahab*, who was the eighth 19. 10, 14.
in Succeſſion from *Jeroboam*. And in the Reformation of *Joſiah*,
he puts a difference between the Prieſts of the *High Places*; for
ſome of them were permitted to *eat unleavened bread among their* 2 Kings
Brethren; *and others he ſlew upon the Altars.* Which ſhews that both 23. 9, 20.
in *Judah* and *Iſrael* there were ſome who did ſtill worſhip the
true God on the *High Places*. 2. *Jeroboam* appointed Prieſts לשעירים
Piloſis, to the *hairy ones*; which I wonder how it come to be tranſlated
Devils both here and *Leviticus* 17. ſince in above fifty
places of Scripture it ſignifies *Goats*; and but in one, the LXX.
render it by δαιμόνια, and there *Aquila* hath τριχιῶντες, and the
Vulgar Latine *Piloſi*, and our Tranſlation *Satyrs*: And ſince the Iſa. 13.21.
worſhip of *Goats*, and other hairy Animals was ſo frequent among
the *Egyptians*, as of Dogs, Wolves, Cats, Ichneumons, *Herod. l.* 2.
Apes, &c. but eſpecially the Goats, as *Herodotus*, *Strabo*, *Diodo-* *c.* 46.
rus, *Plutarch*, and others relate (and the *Pan*, and *Faunus*, and *Strab. l.* 17. *Plut. de*
Silenus, and *Silvanus*, and *Satyri* were but a ſort of Goats: For *Iſid: Dio-*
dor. l. 1.

Boch. de Anim. Sacr. l. 2. *c.* 53.

the *Arabick* word *Satar* is a *Goat*, and the *Egyptian* Name for *Pan* is *Mendes*, which, ſaith *Bochartus*, ſignifies a *Goat* too.) And ſince this worſhip was ſo common in *Egypt*, was there not reaſon to forbid it by a Law, *Levit.* 17. 7. And is there not cauſe where we meet with this word relating to an Object of Worſhip, to underſtand it according to the common practice of *Idolaters*, and the common ſenſe of the word? Therefore I grant that *Jeroboam* did permit the *Egyptian Idolatry*, but he eſtabliſhed the *Golden Calves* as the Religion of the State.

§. 18. 2. I ſhewed, that the true God was worſhipped by the Golden Calves, becauſe the Sin of *Ahab*, who worſhipped *Baal*, is ſaid to be ſo much *greater than the Sin of* Jeroboam. 1 Kings 16. 31, 32. *And it came to paſs as if it had been a light thing for him to walk in the Sins of* Jeroboam, *that he took to Wife* Jezabel, *Daughter of* Baal, *King of the* Zidonians, *and went and ſerved* Baal, *and worſhipped him; and he reared up an Altar for* Baal, *in the Houſe of* Baal, *which he had built in* Samaria. T. G. *p* 166 Yes, ſaith *T. G.* Ahab's *Sin was greater, becauſe he added this Idolatry to the other.* Who denies that his Sin might have been greater in that reſpect? But that it was not ſo to be underſtood, appears by the Oppoſition between God and *Baal* in the words of *Elijah*? 1 Kings 18. 21. *How long halt ye*, ſaith he to all the People, *between two Opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him: But if* Baal, *then follow him.* Now there being three ſeveral ways of Worſhip among the People, if two of the three had not agreed in the ſame Object of Worſhip, *viz.* the God of *Iſrael*, *Elijah* could not have ſaid that they halted only between two Opinions of God and *Baal*; if ſome were for the God of *Iſrael*, others for the Gods of the *Egyptians*, and others for *Beel Samen*, or the God of the *Zidonians*. T. G. *p.* 167 *But*, ſaith *T. G.* Elijah *ſuppoſes a general Apoſtaſie of the ten Tribes to* Baal *in the next Chapter.* And what then? It was but very lately ſo, and they were not yet ſo fixed but they might be put in mind that they were lately of another Opinion: And ſome render it, *How long will ye paſs from one extream to another? How long will ye be ſo uncertain in Religion, now for God, and then for* Baal? So *Vatablus* renders it, *Quouſque tandem alternis, &c. Now of one ſide, then of the other*? or as ſome imagine, they themſelves *worſhipped the Calves, and ſometimes* Baal. So that notwithſtanding what *T. G.* ſaith, the Oppoſition is here plain between the God worſhipped by the Calves, which was the *publick and eſtabliſhed worſhip of the ten Tribes*, and the worſhip of *Baal*, which was newly introduced: And ſo the true God is ſuppoſed to be worſhipped by thoſe who did not worſhip *Baal*. To confirm this, I added, that *Jehu* magnifies his zeal for *Jehovah* againſt *Baal*, when it is ſaid of him but a little after, 2 Kings 10. 16. *That he departed not from the Calves of* Dan *and* Bethel; which evidently ſhews the Oppoſition between the God of *Iſrael* worſhipped by the Calves, and the worſhip of *Baal*. *No*, ſaith *T. G.* *Jehu's zeal for the Lord doth not acquit him from Idolatry in following* Jeroboam, *any more than the lawful Act of Matrimony acquits a Husband from the Crime of Adultery who defiles his Neighbour's Bed.* T. G. *p.* 166 I perceive *T. G.* grew very ſleepy when he wrote this, and forgot what we were about: For I never

ver intended to clear *Jehu* from Idolatry by his zeal for *Jehovah*, but from ſuch an *Idolatry* as excludes the worſhip of the true God. For that was my buſineſs to ſhew that he might be guilty of Idolatry, and yet worſhip the true God, by the Calves of *Jeroboam*; as he not only ſhews by that Expreſſion to *Jonadab*, but by diſtinguiſhing between the Prieſts of the Lord, and the Prieſts v. 23. of *Baal*; and yet ſoon after that Character is twice given of v. 29, 31. *Jehu*, *That he departed not from that worſhip which* Jeroboam *had eſtabliſhed.*

To the laſt Inſtance I brought of the *Samaritans*, who ſent to the King of *Aſſyria* for an *Iſraelitiſh* Prieſt to teach them the accuſtomed worſhip of the God of the Land, who accordingly came 2 Kings 17. 26, 27, 28, 32, 33. and dwelt in *Bethel*, and taught it them, upon which it is ſaid, *They feared the Lord*; T. G. returns a ſtrange Anſwer, *viz. That* T. G. p. 168. *there is no mention at all made of his teaching them to worſhip him in the Calves as Symbols of his preſence*; here T. G. nodded again; For if he would but have held his Eyes open ſo long as to have looked back on the 22d and 23d Verſes of the ſame Chapter, he would have found theſe words, *For the Children of* Iſrael *walked in all the Sins of* Jeroboam *which he did, they departed not from them; until the Lord removed* Iſrael *out of his ſight, as he had ſaid by all his Servants the Prophets. So was* Iſrael *carried away out of his own Land to* Aſſyria; and then immediately follows this Story of the *Samaritans*, deſiring to know the *worſhip of the God of the Land*; what can this refer to, but to the worſhip eſtabliſhed by *Jeroboam*? I leave this to be conſidered by *T. G.* when he is awake, for he ſeems to have written theſe things in a Dream. As to what he T. G. p. 168. ſaith, *of his having confuted my Conjectures, or rather* Monceius *his*; (when it is apparent I differ from *Monceius* in his main ground, to any Man that hath read him) I leave it as a freſh token of his kindneſs, when he will not ſo much as ſuffer me to be the Author of ſuch weak Conjectures, which he hath ſo eaſily, and ſo pleaſantly confuted; and for the Phraſe of *my Plowing with his Heifer*, I ſuppoſe it hath relation to the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel*; which I take notice of, that he may not think his Wit is loſt upon me.

§. 19. To conclude this point of the meaning of the *Second Commandment*, I ſaid, *That ſince the Law-giver hath thus interpreted his own Law*, we need not be ſolicitous about the *ſenſe* of any others, yet herein I ſay we have the Concurrence of the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian Church*. The *Jews* have thought the Prohibition to extend to all kinds of Images for Worſhip, and almoſt all for Ornament, and the Image-worſhip of the Church of *Rome* is one of the great Scandals to this Day, which hinder them from embracing Chriſtianity. All that T. G. p. 169. T. G. anſwers to this is, *That he would gladly know whether we muſt ſtand or fall by the Interpretation of the* Jews? Did I bring their Teſtimony for that purpoſe, or intimate the leaſt thing that way? Did I not uſe ſo much Caution on purpoſe to prevent ſuch a Cavil? I declared that I did not need their Teſtimony in ſo clear a Caſe; and yet it is no ſmall Advantage to our Cauſe, that we have herein the Concurrence of all that had any Reverence to this

Law of God, whether *Jews* or *Mahometans*; and not barely of them, but of the whole Chriſtian Church for ſo many Ages, as I have fully proved in the precedent Chapters. As to the *Prophetical Confutation of my Opinion* about Idolatry and the Second Commandment by Mr. *Thorndike*, I do aſſure him if I could have thought what that learned Perſon had ſaid in this matter, to have been agreeable either to Scripture or Reaſon, or the *ſenſe* of the Primitive, or our own Church, it might have prevented my writing, by changing my Opinion; for I was no ſtranger to his Writings, or his Arguments. But he that can think *the* Iſraelites *believed the Golden Calf delivered their People out of* Egypt *before it was made*, may eaſily believe that Mr. *Thorndike's Book of 1662. was a Confutation of mine, long before it was written*; and upon equal reaſon at leaſt, I may hope that this *Anſwer* will be a *Prophetical Confutation* of all that T. G. will ever be able to ſay upon this Subject. T.C.p.175

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

An Anſwer to T. G.*'s Charge of* Contradictions, Paradoxes, Reproach *of the ſecond* Council *of* Nice, School Diſputes; *and to his parallel* Inſtances.

§. 1. UNder theſe Heads I ſhall comprehend all that remains ſcattered in the ſeveral parts of his Book, which ſeem to require any farther Anſwer. The firſt thing I begin with is, the Head of Contradictions, for he makes the charge of Idolatry to be inconſiſtent with my own Aſſertion in another Place; *Becauſe I had ſaid that Church doth not look on our negative Articles againſt the Church of* Rome, *as Articles of Faith, but as inferior Truths; from whence,* he ſaith, *it follows, that their Church doth not err againſt any Article of Faith; but Idolatry is an error againſt the moſt Fundamental point of Faith, and therefore for me to charge the Church of* Rome *with Idolatry, muſt, according to my own Principles, be the moſt groundleſs, unreaſonable, and contradictory proceeding in the World.* Upon my word a very heavy Charge! And I muſt clear my ſelf as I can from it. Had not a Man need to have a mighty care of dropping any kind Words towards them, who will be ſure to make all poſſible Advantages from them to overthrow the force of whatever can be ſaid afterwards againſt them? Thus have they dealt with me; becauſe I allowed the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church, as holding all the eſſential Points of Chriſtian Faith; therefore all the Arguments I have uſed to prove them Idolaters, are preſently turned off with this, *That herein I contradict my ſelf.* Thus I was ſerved by that feat Man at Controverſie, *J. W.* who thought it worth his while to write two Books (ſuch as they are) chiefly upon this argument: And he makes me to pile *Contradictions on Contradictions,* as Children do Cards one upon another, and then he comes and cunningly ſteals away one of the ſupporters, and down all the reſt fall in great Diſorder and Confuſion; and herein he is much applauded for an excellent *Artiſt,* by that mighty Man at Eccleſiaſtical Fencing, *E. W.* the renowned Champion of our Lady of *Loretto,* and the miraculous Tranſlation of her Chappel; about which he hath publiſhed a Defiance to the World, and offers to prove it againſt all Comers (but eſpecially my inconſiderable ſelf) to be *an undeniable Verity.* I muſt have great leiſure, and little care of my ſelf, if I ever more come near the Clutches of ſuch a Giant, who ſeems to write with a Beetle inſtead of a Pen; and I deſire him to ſet his Heart at reſt, and not to trouble himſelf *about the ways of my attacking him;* for he may lie quietly in his Shades, and Snore on to Doomſday for me; unleſs I ſee farther reaſon of diſturbing his Repoſe than at preſent I do. But this Charge being reſumed by ſo conſiderable an Adverſary as *T. G.* is, in compariſon with the reſt, I ſhall, for his ſake, endeavour more fully to clear this whole Matter. When *J. W.* had objected the ſame Thing in effect againſt me; the ſubſtance

T.G. p. 13, 14, 15.

Rational Account, *p.* 54.

Dr. *Still.* againſt Dr. *Still. A.D.* 1675

Infallibility of the *Roman* Catholick Church againſt Dr. *Still.* by *E. W.* 1674. Preface.

Anſwer to ſeveral Treatiſes, Firſt part, p. 19, &c.

ſtance of the Anſwer I made him was this. 1. That it was a diſingenuous way of Proceeding, to oppoſe a Judgment of Charity concerning their Church, to a Judgment of Reaſon concerning the nature of Actions, without at all examining the force of thoſe Reaſons which are produced for it. This was the Caſe of *J. W.* but Ingenuity is a thing my Adverſaries are very little acquainted with: And therefore I ſaid. 2. There was no Contradiction in it: For the notion of Idolatry as applied to the Church of *Rome*, is conſiſtent with its owning the general Principles of Faith, as to the true God and Jeſus Chriſt, and giving Sovereign Worſhip to them; when therefore we ſay, that the Church of *Rome* doth not err in any Fundamental Point of the *Chriſtian Faith*, I there at large ſhew, the meaning to have been only this, that in all thoſe which are looked on by us as neceſſary Articles of Faith, we have the Teſtimony and Approbation of the whole *Chriſtian* World of all Ages, and are acknowledged to be ſuch by *Rome* it ſelf; but the Church of *Rome* looks upon all her Doctrines, which we reject, as *neceſſary Articles of Faith*: So that the force of the Argument comes only to this, that no Church which doth own the Ancient Creeds can be guilty of *Idolatry*. And I farther add, that when we enquire into the Eſſentials of a Church, we think it not neceſſary to go any farther than the *Doctrinal Points of Faith*; becauſe Baptiſm admits Men into the Church upon the Profeſſion of the true Faith in the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*: But if beyond the Eſſentials we enquire into the moral Integrity and Soundneſs of a Church, then we are bound to go farther than the bare Profeſſion of the eſſential Points of Faith; and if it be found that the ſame Church may debauch thoſe very Principles of Faith, by damnable Errors, and corrupt the Worſhip of God by Virtue of them, then the ſame Church which doth hold the Fundamentals of Faith, may notwithſtanding lead Men to *Idolatry* without the ſhadow of a Contradiction. But *T. G.* ſaith, *That Idolatry is an Error againſt the moſt Fundamental point of Faith.* What doth *T. G.* mean by this? I ſuppoſe it is, that *Idolatry* doth imply *Polytheiſm*, or the belief of more *Gods* than one, to whom *Sovereign Worſhip* is due; then I deny this to be the proper Definition of *Idolatry*, for although, where ever this is, it hath in it the Nature of that we call *Idolatry*; yet himſelf confeſſes, the true Notion of it to be, *The giving the Worſhip due to God, to a Creature*; ſo that, if I have proved that the Worſhip of *Images* in the *Roman Church*, is the giving the Worſhip due only to *God* to a *Creature*; then, although the Church of *Rome* may hold all the Eſſentials of Faith, and be a true Church, it may be guilty of *Idolatry* without Contradiction. But it may be *J. W.* in his Reply, ſaith ſomething more to purpoſe; (at leaſt it will be thought ſo, if I do not anſwer him:) I muſt therefore conſider what he ſaith, that is material, if any thing be found ſo. *However*, he ſaith, *that if the* Roman *Church doth hold any kind of Idolatry to be lawful, ſhe muſt needs hold an Error deſtructive to a Fundamental and Eſſential Point of Faith, and by Conſequence a Fundamental Error inconſiſtent with the Eſſence of a true Church. And ſince no kind of Idolatry is lawful, if the* Roman *Church hold it to be ſo, ſhe muſt needs hold an Error Inconſiſtent with ſome Truth.* Moſt profoundly argued! He only ought to have ſubſumed, (as I think ſuch *Logicians* as *J. W.* call it) *but all Error is Fundamental and Inconſiſtent with the Eſſence of*

Dr. Still. againſt Dr. Still. p. 95.

a

a true Church; *or That Infallibility is neceſſary to the Being of a Church*, and when he proves that, I promiſe to renounce the charge of *Idolatry*. *Now it is not poſſible*, ſaith *J. W. that the* Roman *Church ſhould hold any Idolatry lawful* (knowing it to be *Idolatry*) *unleſs ſhe holds that ſome Honour, which is due only to God, may be given to a Creature.* I am afraid to be ſnapt by ſo cunning a *Sophiſter*, and therefore I diſtinguiſh in time. The *Roman* Church doth not hold any *Idolatry*, lawful which it judges to be *Idolatry*, or the Honour due only to *God*; but the *Roman* Church may give the real Parts of Worſhip due only to *God* to a meer Creature, and yet at the ſame time, tell Men it is not a part of the Honour which is due to *God*. To make this plain even to the Underſtanding of *J. W.* The Church of *Rome* may entertain a falſe Notion of *Idolatry*, or of that Worſhip which is due only to *God*: which falſe Notion being received, Men may really give the Worſhip that only belongs to *God* to His Creatures; and the utmoſt Error neceſſary in this Caſe is no more than having a falſe Notion of *Idolatry*, as, that there can be no *Idolatry* without giving Sovereign Worſhip to a Creature, or that an *Idol* is the Repreſentation only of an Imaginary Being, &c. Now on theſe Suppoſitions, no more is neceſſary to the Practice of *Idolatry*, than being deceived in the Notion of it. If therefore *T. G.* or *J. W.* will prove that the Church of *Rome* can never be deceived in the Notion of it, or that it is repugnant to the Eſſence of a Church to have a falſe Notion of *Idolatry*, they do ſomething towards the proving me guilty of a Contradiction in acknowledging the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church, and yet charging it with *Idolatry*. But *J. W.* ſaith, *That 'tis impoſſible the* Roman *Church ſhould teach or hold any kind of Idolatry, whatſoever it be, but ſhe muſt hold expreſly or implicitly, that ſome Honour due only to God, may be given to a meer Creature.* p. 97. Such kind of ſtuff as this would make a Man almoſt repent ever reading *Logick* (which this Man pretends ſo much to) for ſurely Mother Wit is much better than Scholaſtick Fooling. Such a Church which commits, or by her Doctrines and Practices leads to *Idolatry*, needs not *to hold*, i. e. *deliver as her Judgment that ſome Honour due only to God may be given to a Creature.* It is ſufficient if ſhe Commands or Allows ſuch things to be done, which in their own Nature, or by the Law of *God* is really giving the Worſhip of *God* to a Creature. Yet upon this miſtake, as groſs as it is, the poor waſpiſh Creature runs on for many Leaves, and thinks all that while he proves me guilty of a Contradiction. But the Man hath ſomething in his Head which he means, although he ſcarce knows how to expreſs it, *viz.* that in good *Catholick Dictionaries, a Fundamental Error, and a Damnable Error, and an Error Inconſiſtent with the Eſſence of a true Church, are terms Synonymous.* p. 101. Now I know what he would be at, *viz.* that Infallibility is neceſſary to the *Being* of a Church: therefore to ſuppoſe a Church to Err, is to ſuppoſe it not to be a Church: But will he prove me guilty of Contradiction by *Catholick Dictionaries?* I beg his Pardon: for in them *Tranſubſtantiation* implies none; but whoſoever writes againſt them, muſt be guilty of many. If he would prove me guilty of Contradiction, let him prove it from my own Senſe and not from theirs. Yet he would ſeem at laſt to prove that *the Practice of any kind of Idolatry, eſpecially being approved by the Church is deſtructive to the Being of a Church*, p. 102, &c.

Which is the only thing, he ſaith, that deſerves to be farther conſidered, by enquiring into two things. 1. Whether a Church allowing and countenancing the Practice of *Idolatry* can be a true Church? 2. Whether ſuch a Church can have any Power or Authority to conſecrate Biſhops, or ordain Prieſts? For this is a thing which *T. G.* likewiſe Objects, as conſequent upon my Aſſertion of their *Idolatry*, that thereby I *overthrow all Authority, and Juriſdiction in the Church of* England, *as being derived from an Idolatrous Church.* Theſe are Matters which deſerve a farther Handling, and therefore I ſhall ſpeak to them.

§. 2. 1. Whether a Church may continue a true Church, and yet al-
low, and practice any kind of *Idolatry?* And to reſolve this, I re-
ſort again to the Ten Tribes; ſuppoſing what hath been ſaid ſuf-
ficient to prove them guilty of *Idolatry*, my Buſineſs is to enquire,
whether they were a true Church in that time. This *J. W.* denies; ſay-
J.W.p.78. ing, *I ought to have proved and not barely ſuppoſed that the Idolatry in-
troduced by* Jeroboam *was not deſtructive to the being of a true Chuch:
And ſeveral Proteſtants,* he ſaith, *produce the Church of* Iſrael *to ſhew
that a true viſible Church may ceaſe.* Alas poor Man! he had heard
ſomething of this Nature, but he could not tell what, they had
produced this as an Inſtance againſt the *perpetual Viſibilty of the
Church*, and he brings it to prove that it ceaſed to be a true Church;
and the time they fix upon by his own Confeſſion is, when *Elias*
complained *that he was left alone in* Iſrael; which was not when the
Idolatry of the *Calves*, but when that of *Baal* prevailed among the
People of *Iſrael*; *i. e.* when they worſhipped *Beel-ſamen* or the *Sun*
inſtead of *God*. Now that they were a true Church while they
worſhipped *Jeroboam*'s *Calves*, I prove by theſe two Things.

1. That there was no time from *Jeroboam* to the Captivity of
Iſrael, wherein the Worſhip of the *Calves* was not the eſtabliſhed
2 King. Religion of the Ten Tribes; this is evident from the Expreſſion
17.22, 23. before mentioned, *that the Children of* Iſrael *departed not from the Sins*
1 Kings *of* Jeroboam, *till God removed* Iſrael *out of his Sight.* And it is obſerva-
15.26, 34. 16.13, 19. ble of almoſt every one of the Kings of *Iſrael*, that is ſaid particu-
26, 31. 22. 52. larly, *that he departed not from the Sins of* Jeroboam.

2 Kings 2. That during that time God did own them for his People,
3. 3. which is all one with making them a true Church. Thus *Jehu* is
10. 29. ſaid to *be anointed King over the People of the Lord.* And there is a
13. 2. 14. 23. remarkable Expreſſion in the time of *Jehohaz*, *that the Lord was gra-
15. 9, 18. cious unto them, and had reſpect unto them, because of his Covenant with*
24. 28. Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob, *and would not deſtroy them, neither caſt he*
2 Kings 9. 6. *them from his Preſence as yet.* Would God have ſuch reſpect to thoſe
13. 23. whom he utterly diſowned? Nay the Prophet *Hoſea* ſaith, *that God*
Hoſea 11. *was ſtill the Holy one in the midſt of* Ephraim; *and How ſhall I give*
8, 9. *thee up* Ephraim? *how ſhall I deliver thee* Iſrael? Which ſhews
God had not yet diſcarded them: and afterwards he ſaith to
14. 1. *Iſrael, Return unto the Lord thy God*; and *Amos* ſaith, *prepare to meet*
Amos 4. *thy God, O* Iſrael: and both he and *Micah*, call them ſtill God's Peo-
12. ple. From whence it is evident, that they were ſtill a true Church
8. 2. Micah 6.2, notwithſtanding the *Idolatry* of *Jeroboam*.

3. 2. Suppoſing a Church to continue a true Church, what reaſon can there be to queſtion the Authority of that Church as to the Conſecration of Biſhops, or the Ordination of Prieſts? I have for-

merly ſhewed that no Act of Ordination is invalid in caſe of any Hereſie or Crime of the Giver; and that the contrary Doctrine is condemned for Hereſie by the Church. I now ſhall particularly ſhew that the Power of giving Orders is not taken away by the guilt of *Idolatry*; which I prove from the caſe of the *Arian Biſhops.* I have at large made it manifeſt, that the *Arians* were condemned for *Idolatry* by the Conſent of the Fathers of the greateſt Reputation, St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Baſil*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Nyſſen*, *Epiphanius*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Auguſtine*, &c. And the Second *Nicene Council* ſaith, *that the Catholick Church looked on them as Idolaters.* Now, if I can make it appear, that the *Arian Ordinations* were allowed, I ſhall put this Matter paſt Diſpute, that the charge of *Idolatry* doth not null the Ordinations of our Church as being derived from thoſe who were guilty of *Idolatry*. For this Purpoſe, *the Second Nicene Council* affords us plentiful Aſſiſtance in the Firſt Seſſion; wherein *Peter* the Popes Vicar declares, *that* Meletius *was ordained by Arian Biſhops, and yet his Ordination was never queſtioned*; and this was received by the Council as true. *Epiphanius*, *Socrates* and *Sozomen* all agree, that *Meletius* received his Conſecration from the *Arian Faction*; and *Epiphanius*, ſaith, *he had it from the Hands of* Acacius *Biſhop of* Cæſarea; *the worſt of all the Arians*, ſaith *Baronius*. *Socrates* and *Sozomen* do ſeem to imply, that the Followers of *Euſtathius* at *Antioch* would not joyn with *Meletius* and his Party though both conſenting in the *Nicene Creed*, becauſe of his Ordination by the *Arian Faction*, and the Peoples being baptized by *Arian* Prieſts; but *Theodoret* mentions no ſuch thing, and ſaith the firſt Breach began there, when *Meletius* was baniſhed by the *Arian Party*; and *Euzoius* the *Arian* was made Biſhop of *Antioch*: And *Baronius* makes the Schiſm to begin from the Ordination of *Paulinus* by *Lucifer Calaritanus*; however this were, we never find the Ordination of *Meletius* diſputed by the Catholick Biſhops; and when St. *Athanaſius* writes a Synodical Epiſtle to thoſe of *Antioch*, to compoſe the Differences among them upon the Ordination of *Paulinus*, he gives this Direction to the other Catholick Chriſtians concerning *Meletius* his Party, who met ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ (ſo the Place of their meeting was called, being in the old City, which the Interpreter of *Athanaſius* renders *in veteris Eccleſiæ communione*) *that they ſhould receive thoſe who came to them from the Arians without requiring any more from them, than the renouncing Arianiſm and ſubſcribing or owning the Nicene Creed*; Whereby, the *Arian* Baptiſm and Orders were allowed. But we have a fuller Teſtimony of the general Senſe of the Church of that Age as to this matter of the *Arian Ordinations*; *Ruffinus* ſaith, *that when the Catholick Biſhops were returned from Baniſhment, ſeveral of them met together at* Alexandria *to conſult what was to be done with thoſe who had received Orders from the Arian Biſhops; and after Conſultation about it, it was decreed in Council, that only the Heads of the Party ſhould be rejected, but others received to the Exerciſe of their Prieſtly Office: Upon which* Aſterius *was diſpatched into the Eaſtern Parts to ſettle the Churches there, and* Euſebius *into the Weſtern: But he returning to* Antioch, *found that* Lucifer *in the mean time had broken his Promiſe in the Conſecration of* Paulinus *and* Euſebius *therefore would not own him as Biſhop; which ſo enraged* Lucifer, *that he quarrelled with the Decree of the Alexandrian Council about receiving the*

Anſwer firſt part Gener. pref. in fin.

Part 1. Ch. 1. ſect. 17.

Concil. Nicen. 2. act. 6 p. 411.

Act. 1. p. 82.

Epiph. hær 73. n. 28.

Socr. l. 2. c. 44.

Sozom l. 4. c. 28.

Baron. ad A. D. 360. n. 52.

Theod. l. 2. c. 31.

Baron. ad A. 408. n. 31.

Athanaſ. ep. ad Antioch. p. 575.

Ruffin. hiſt Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 28.

Arian Biſhops and Prieſts upon diſowning their Hereſie. And ſo the *Luciferian Schiſm* began: For the Followers of *Lucifer* charged the *Catholick Church* with being the Synagogue of Antichriſt for receiving *Hieron. ad verſ. Luciferian. init.* the *Arian Biſhops*, as appears by St. *Hierom*; for they yielded to the receiving the Penitent Laity but not the Clergy; allowing the *Arian Baptiſm*, but not their Ordinations: upon which St. *Hierom* triumphs over them. And he ſaith, *that Eight Arian Biſhops were received in the Council of* Nice, *although their Arianiſm were declared before: and that the decree of the Alexandrian Council was univerſally received by the Church:* which is as ample a Teſtimony to our purpoſe as can be deſired.

§. 3. Next to Contradictions, *T. G.* charges me with maintaining *T.G. p. 76.* ſtrange Paradoxes, which he puts into the Title of one of his Chapters in theſe Words, *A ſtrange Paradox advanced by* Dr. St. *What can an Image do to the Heightning of Devotion or raiſing Affections?* Not finding my ſelf to be any great lover of Paradoxes, but of plain and uſeful Truths, I was the more curious to find out what Paradox it was I had broached. And ſearching for the Place I found theſe Words, “ And can any one imagine, there ſhould be greater Irreverence of God ſhewn in calling him to witneſs upon every ſlight Occaſion, than there is in bowing down before a block or a hewn Stone, repreſenting God to my Mind by it? What can SUCH an Image do to the heightening of Devotion or raiſing Affections? This is the monſtrous Paradox advanced by me, *viz.* that ſuch a groſs Repreſentation of God by an Image doth tend more to abate than raiſe our Eſtimation of him: which is ſo far from being a Paradox, that I have herein the Conſent not only of the Ancient Fathers, but of the greateſt Patrons of Images in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches, till the latter times, as I have ſhewed already. But T. G. *T.G. p. 86. to 90.* ſets him-ſelf very induſtriouſly to prove *that Pictures have an advantage in Repreſentation above living Creatures*; which he doth with great force of Wit and Strength of Reaſon; *becauſe Ladies ſit for their Pictures*, (ſometimes to make *Madonna*'s by) *and Authors Pictures are ſet before their Books*; (it is pity we want our Authors on ſo juſt on Occaſion) and *Men keep the Pictures of their Friends* (and Sign-poſts are very uſeful in *London* Streets, and may ſuggeſt many good Meditations to Men, as the three Nuns or the like) *but to hold the contrary Opinion, is the way to undo the Company of Picture-Drawers* (which would be a great Unkindneſs to all ingenious Artiſts) but the moſt diſmal Conſequence of my Doctrine is, *that the Ladies inſtead of the Pictures of their Friends ſhould wear Ants and Flies in Chryſtal Caſes; and inſtead of their own Pictures the Apes and Aſſes ſhould be ſent them; which I brought in ſo lamely, and the Tygers too if they can catch them, as greater Reſemblances of their Perfections.* Theſe paſſages, I hope, were intended for ſallies of Wit; which do become *T. G.* as well in this Argument, as dancing upon the Ropes would do a *Capucin Friar* in his Habit. But whence comes all this Rage of Wit? this arming all the Pencils and Bruſhes of the Town againſt me? this Appeal to the Ladies againſt the pernicious Conſequences of my Opinion? this hurrying of me from the Play-houſe and the Scenes there to the Bear-garden, to the Apes and Aſſes, and Tygers? All this ariſeth only from this innocent ſaying, “ that it ſeems more reaſon-

" able to me to Worſhip God by proſtrating my ſelf to the Sun, " nay to an Ant or a Fly, than to a Picture or an Image; for in the " other I ſee great Evidences of the Power, and Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God, which may ſuggeſt venerable Apprehenſions of God " to my Mind; whereas theſe can have nothing worthy Admira-" tion, unleſs it be the skill of the Painter or Artificer. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ!* Cou'd I ever have imagined that theſe Words being ſpoken meerly with a reſpect to the Repreſentation of God in order to Worſhip, ſhould have raiſed the *Arrierban* of all the Ladies and Painters againſt me? If nothing will ſatisfie *T. G.* but having it under my Hand that I had no malicious Intention againſt the *Ingenious art of Painting,* nor any deſign to ruin the Company of Picture-drawers, I do hereby give it him, and with this humble Acknowledgement I hope the Parties concerned will reſt ſatisfied. It is not in the point of bare Repreſentation I compare Pictures and God's Creatures; but it is in Repreſenting thoſe Perfections which are the Ground and Reaſon of Worſhip; and here I ſtand to it, that the leaſt living Creature is a far better Image of God, than an old Man in Pontifical Habits, or the beſt Crucifix in the World can be, *i. e.* it repreſents more thoſe Perfections for the ſake of which I give divine Worſhip to God. But *T. G.* ſaith, *that Atheiſts will deny the Perfections of the Creatures to be any Evidence at all of the Being we call God; but cannot deny a Crucifix to repreſent to their own Thoughts that Perſon whom we believe to be God?* T.G. p.89. This is very ill put; for he ſhould have parallel'd blind Men and Atheiſts together; and I dare ſay no blind Man diſcerns more of the Excellency or Likeneſs of a Picture, than Atheiſts do of the Perfections of God by his Creatures. If Men will ſhut their Eyes, what can a Crucifix do to raiſe Affections? and if their Eyes be never ſo open, it can only repreſent that which falls infinitely ſhort of being a Reaſon for Divine Worſhip. For, as to the meer Repreſentation of Chriſt's Humanity by an Image, whoever diſputed with *T. G.* about the Lawfulneſs of it? but if he goes no farther than Repreſentation, or a help to Memory or Apprehenſion, *T. G.* knows well enough, he falls ſhort of what is required of him, by the Decrees of their Councils, and the conſtant Practice of their Church, about which our Controverſie with them is.

§. 4. To the former Paradox I added theſe Words, " That I cannot " for my Heart underſtand why I may not as well, (nay better) " burn Incenſe and ſay my Prayers to the Sun, having an Intention " only to honour God by it, as to do both thoſe to an Image? Here *T. G.* gives me warning *not to ſay my Prayers to the Sun no more than they do to Images*; T.G. p.90. he needs not give me that warning, for I never intend to do it ſo much; for although he would inſinuate that I know they do not, I hope he will change his Mind when he reads the Account I have given of their Practices in that particular; but I only pretend to pray to the Sun having an Intention to honour God by it; and in this Senſe I am ſure *T. G.* cannot deny, that they pray to their Images. *But if I do not ſay my Prayers to the Sun, but only bow down to it, ſo it be not out of Ignorance, or Heatheniſm, or to give Scandal to weak Brethren,* he gives as much liberty as I could wiſh, and he quotes St. *Leo* for it too; in that very Place where he condemns it, as appears by the laſt Words he cites out of him; *let the*

p. 91. *Faithful therefore abſtain from ſo perverſe and worthy to be condemned a Cuſtom, nor let the Honour due to God alone, be mixed with their Rites who ſerve the Creatures, for the Holy Scripture* ſaith, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Where the Reaſon he gives againſt it, is not as T. G. inſinuates, *becauſe there were ſome Reliques of Paganiſm Remaining*, but becauſe it was *giving the Creature part of that Honour which is due to God alone.* But *T. G.* offers to give p. 93. me a clear ſolution to my Scruple; which he does in two Particulars. 1. *That although the Creatures do repreſent God after their manner, yet it is ſo rudely, remotely, darkly, and imperfectly, that there is need of a great deal of Diſcourſe to diſcover the Analogy or Proportion to their Creator; and they are called the Footſteeps of God; whereas an Image (for Example) of Chriſt is ſo apparently Repreſentative of him, that upon Sight* Rom. 1. 20 *thereof our Thoughts fly preſently unto him.* By which Argument St. *Paul* was ſtrangely miſtaken when he talked of the *Eternal Power of God being ſo known or manifeſt by the things that are ſeen, that even the Heathens were left without Excuſe; no ſuch matter,* ſaith, *T. G. the Creatures repreſent God rudely, remotely, darkly and imperfectly*; which make an excellent Paraphraſe on the Words of Pſalmiſt, *the Heavens declare* Pſal. 19. 1. *the Glory of God, and the Firmament ſhews his Handy-work.* Mens Handywork by Images will do it rarely, preſently, effectually, inflamingly; but *God*'s *Work doth it dully, remotely, rudely, and imperfectly.* O how much the Skill of a Painter exceeds the Power of God! Whereas in truth the leaſt Work of Nature infinitely exceeds the greateſt Art of Man in Curioſity, Beauty, Strength, Proportion, and every thing that can diſcover Wiſdom or Power. *But,* ſaith *T. G. they are called God*'s *Footſteps, and to gather the height and bigneſs of* Hercules *from his Footſtep was not the Work of every vulgar Capacity,* which is a very Childiſh way of reaſoning, and taken only from ſuch a Metaphorical Expreſſion that *Vaſquez* calls it a frivolous Argument that is taken from it. I, but the pretty Story of *Hercules* and that put together make a pleaſant Jingling: and looks like Reaſon to thoſe that know not what it means. Muſt Men take the Meaſure of God juſt by the ſame Geometrical Proportions that he did, that gathered the height and bigneſs of *Hercules* by his Foot? This ſort of Wit is a delicate Thing, and endures no rough handling. But ſtill I ſay it is not in the meer quickneſs of Repreſentation, but in the Perfections repreſented, that natural Things do ſo far exceed the moſt artificial Images; and we are to conſider that in all Repreſentations of Objects of Worſhip, thoſe are the moſt Excellent which beſt ſet forth the Nature of that Being as it deſerves our Worſhip. Now in this Reſpect, the Works of Creation manifeſt God's Eternal Power, and what is it the Image of an Old Man Repreſents? So that comparing theſe two, the Sun, Moon and Stars do in regard of real Vaſquez diſ. 110. c. 2. Repreſentation of the Divine Being, much more deſerve to be worſhipped than any Image whatſoever. And *Vaſquez* doth well prove that upon the principles of Worſhipping Images, one may lawfully *Worſhip God in any Creature whatſoever.* For if the Preſence of God in the Image by a meer fiction of the Mind, be a ſufficient Ground to Worſhip that Image; is not God's real Preſence in every Creature a far better Ground and Reaſon to Worſhip it? and all the Diſtinctions and Evaſions which ſerve in one will equally ſerve in the other Caſe. How earneſty did T. G. contend for *the Worſhip of God*'s

Footſtool? and why may not His Footſteps be worſhipped as well as His Footſtool? I am ſure *T. G.* himſelf could not have taken the height and bigneſs of *Hercules* from his Footſtool, which he ſaith, was done from his Footſteps; and therefore one comes nearer to the thing worſhipped than the other. Cardinal *Lugo* gives an excellent anſwer to this Metaphor of the *Creatures being Gods Footſteps*; *For,* ſaith he, *they may be worſhipped for all that; for do not we worſhip the Footſteps of Saints in many Churches? how much more ought we to adore the Footſteps of God?*

Lugo de Myſterio Incarn. diſp. 37. *Sect.* 1.

But *T. G.* gives another reaſon againſt worſhipping the Creatures, *viz. That there is greater danger of terminating the Worſhip upon them, than upon an Image; becauſe they are Creatures ſubſiſting of themſelves, and are the Cauſes of real Benefits to Mankind.* If there be more danger in the one, there is more folly in the other, in the Judgment of the Fathers, who looked on the worſhip of Images as the moſt ſilly and childiſh thing in the World; while they thought the worſhip of the Heavens very excuſable. Upon this ground, I had ſaid before, it follows, that what deſerves moſt Honour ſhould have the leaſt given it, and that which deſerves leaſt, ſhould have moſt; for the danger is ſtill greater where the excellency is greater; and by this reaſon we ought rather to worſhip a Beaſt than a Saint, for there is leſs danger of terminating the worſhip on one than on the other, and ſo the *Egyptians* were more excuſable than the *Papiſts.* Theſe Words he returns upon me, on a very ſlight Occaſion, *viz. Setting the Sun before an Ant or a Fly*; as though they had been a Reaſon of my giving, whereas I only ſhew the Ridiculouſneſs of this which is the only pretence they have for not worſhipping God by a living Old Man, as well as by the Picture of one. And if this be all *T. G.* hath to ſay, I ſee ſtill the diſtinctions of Sovereign and Inferior, of Abſolute and Relative Worſhip, will bear any Man out in the Worſhip of any Creature with a reſpect to God, as well at leaſt as it doth them in the Worſhip of Images. *Vaſquez* ſaith there are theſe ſeveral grounds for the worſhip of a Creature among them. 1. *Repreſentation, which belongs to an Image.* 2. *Contact, although long ſince paſt; thence they worſhip the Croſs, Nails, Garments, and other things that had touched the Bodies of Chriſt or the Saints.* 3. *Union; thence they worſhip all Reliques which had been parts of the Saints.* 4. *Preſence; thence God being more preſent in his Works, than any Saint can be in a Garment he did once wear; there is more Reaſon to worſhip God in his Works, than any Saint in Reliques.* Cardinal *Lugo* aſſigns theſe ſeveral Reaſons for the worſhip of God in any Creature. 1. *Becauſe they worſhip the work of Mens Hands, as the Hand-writing of any Saint, much more ought we to worſhip Gods Works with a Relative Worſhip.* 2. *Becauſe they worſhip the very Places where the Saints have been; as a Stone on which they have ſate, for the ſake of Contact and Propinquity; much more ought we to worſhip God's Creatures, to whom he is far nearer than the Body of a Saint to a Stone.* 3. *Becauſe they receive Gifts from Princes with great Veneration, although mean in themſelves; therefore ſince all the Creatures are God's Gifts we may worſhip them for his ſake.* 4. *Becauſe a Man is the living Image of God, therefore as a Wooden Image may be worſhipped for the ſake of the Exemplar, much more,* ſaith he, *ought ſuch a lively Image as Man is.* Thus we ſee how Men of the greateſt Underſtanding among them have diſcerned the neceſſary Conſequence of their own Principles of Worſhip, and find there is no defending them

§. 5.

T. G. p. 93, 94.

T. G. p. 86.

Vaſq. ubi ſup.

Lugo ubi ſup.

them, without yielding the lawfulneſs of worſhipping God through any of his Creatures; and living Men rather than dead Images, on the account of a fuller Repreſentation of God; and ſaith *Lugo*, *With the worſhip of* Latria, *in reſpect of God, and an Inferior Worſhip on the* *n.* 8. *account of his proper Excellency.* If Men had ſet themſelves to oppoſe the Doctrine of the Primitive Church about Divine Worſhip, they could not have thought of a Principle more direct oppoſite to the general ſenſe of it than this is, of the lawfulneſs of the worſhip of Creatures. But there are two Caſes wherein they will not allow it. 1. In the Caſe of Indecency, although there have been a real Contact; thus the Lips of *Judas* are excepted, although they touched Chriſt. And *Cardinal Lugo*, with particular Caution, *excepts the Tail of the Aſs, on* *n.* 11. *which Chriſt rode to* Jeruſalem. But, ſaith *Arriaga*, *There was* indig- *Arriag. de Myſter. Incarn. diſp* 57. *ſect.* 2. *ſubject.* 2. *n.* 10. nitas moralis, *that did hinder the worſhip of* Judas *his Lips; however, he doth not underſtand how this can cut off the adorability of them on the Principles of* Vaſquez *and* Lugo. *As to the Aſs, on which Chriſt rode, there are ſome,* ſaith he, *do yield that it might be worſhipped; and the Mule, and the Aſs which ſtood by the Manger, as well as the Manger it ſelf: But it may be, it were better denied, becauſe there is,* ſaith he, *I know not what meanneſs in it which hinders Adoration*; but he adds, *that in all theſe moral Things very much depends on the Apprehenſion of the Perſons; and in caſe the Intention be rightly directed, he thinks it very hard* (upon their Principles) *to prove that God cannot be worſhipped in any Creature.* 2. In Caſe of publick Scandal they do not allow it. Not from any real hurt in the thing, but becauſe the People have been only hitherto accuſtomed to worſhip Images, and Reliques of Saints. *The danger,* ſaith *Vaſquez* from *Cajetan*, *would be none to Underſtanding Men, but only to the rude and ignorant People, that cannot ſo eaſily apprehend God in his Creatures, as in an Image, and withal it would ſavour of Heathen Superſtition.* But it were well they would conſider the Anſwer they give us in this Caſe, when we urge the ſame Argument againſt the *Tſamb. de Myſter. Incarn. ad Qu.* 25. *diſp.* 3. *art.* 15. worſhip of Images: *Hold,* ſay they, *a meer Scandal is no reaſon to take away the uſe of a thing, if it be ſuch as doth not ariſe from the nature of the thing; but only by accident through the Malice or Ignorance of the Perſons.* So that in this Caſe nothing is wanting, but well inſtructing the People; and upon their Principles of Worſhip they may revive the worſhip of the Hoſt of Heaven, the Fire, and Water, and Trees, and the Earth it ſelf; and it is but conquering a little ſqueamiſhneſs of Stomach at firſt, *the very Tail of the Aſs* on which our Saviour rode, will go down with them. And now I leave the Reader to judge which of us two is guilty of the greater Paradoxes.

§. 6. I now come to the great Rock of Offence, the ſecond Council of *Nice*: *Which,* he ſaith, *I moſt irreverently call that wiſe Synod*; upon T.G.p.118 which he falls into a very Tragical Exclamation, that I ſhould dare to reflect ſo much diſhonour on a Council, *wherein there were* 350 *p.* 119. *Fathers, with the Pope's Legates, and the Vicars of the Oriental Patriarchal Sees*; and yet himſelf calls the Council of *Conſtantinople* a Conventicle, wherein there were 338 *Biſhops*, (and doth he think the number of twelve more in one than in the other, makes ſuch a huge difference in point of Wiſdom?) But the Author of the *Caroline* Book ſaith, *That by their own Confeſſion they were but* 306. And the *Carol. de Imag. l.* 4. *c.* 13. Council of *Francfort* (which oppoſed this, and of which *T. G.* ſpeaks not very honourably, as I ſhall make appear) conſiſted of about 300 Biſhops, by the Confeſſions of their own Writers: So that if number carries it, I have above 600 Biſhops of my ſide; and if they were wiſe, the *Nicene Council* was not ſo. It is therefore in *T. G.*'s choice to call 300 or 600 Biſhops, Fools. *But if he be guilty of the ſame fault, that doth not excuſe me for ſpeaking ſo Ironically of ſo lawful, ſo general, ſo judicious a Council, as that at* Nice *was: And therefore he adviſeth me to recant, and to follow the Example of* Gregory *of* Neocæſarea: I hope he doth not mean in the way of St. *German*; although one of that Name was a great Patron of Images about that time. But if this *Council* were neither ſo lawful, ſo general, nor ſo judicious as *T. G.* pretends, for all that I know, the Rector of a *Parochial Church never to be found in the Liſt of any General Council* (which is a ſhrewd Aggravation of my fault) may have leave to call the ſecond *Council of Nice*, a wiſe *Synod*.

1. I ſhall enquire whether this were a *lawful General Council, and ſo received by the Church*: There are three things *T. G.* inſiſts on to make this out. 1. *That it was called by the Pope's Authority*; which he knows we deny to be ſufficient to make a lawful General Council; for then every Aſſembly of Biſhops at *Rome* called by the Pope would be a *General Council*. 2. *The conſent and preſence of the Patriarchs.* 3. *That it hath been received as ſuch by the Church.* But I ſhall make it appear, that it was juſt ſuch another *General Council as that of* Trent *was*, and manag'd with as much fraud and colluſion; and that it was not received by the *Church as a General Council*. 1. As to the preſence and conſent of the Patriarchs; this *Council* in their *Synodical Epiſtle boaſt that they had the concurrence of Eaſt, Weſt, North and South*: Which is ſuch an extravagance that no ſober Men would have been guilty of, that had any regard to Truth or Honeſty, or did in the leaſt conſider the State of the World at that time. The Weſtern Biſhops were never ſo much as ſummon'd, the Patriarch of *Jeruſalem* was dead, the Eaſtern Patriarch, and the Patriarch of *Alexandria* were neither in Condition to appear themſelves, nor to ſend Legates thither, which *Baronius* ingenuouſly confeſſeth, *Becauſe* Aaron, *who was then Caliph of the* Saracens, *was a great Enemy to the Chriſtians, under whoſe Dominion at that time they were.* Although *Chriſtianus Lupus*, a *Profeſſor of Divinity* at *Lovain*, makes him a great Friend to the *Chriſtians* in *Egypt*; which is not only contrary to *Baronius*, but to the Synodical Epiſtle, the two *Monks carried to the Council*, from the Monks of *Paleſtine*, and was read and approved by the *Council*. *Theophanes* ſaith, *That the Empreſs and Patriarch both ſent to the Patriarchs of* Alexandria *and* Antioch, *while the Peace continued; but ſoon after upon* Aaron'*s being made Caliph, the Peace was broke, and there was no liberty for the Patriarchs either to go or ſend.*

Act. 7. *p.* 586.

Baron. ad A. D. 785. *n.* 40.

Chriſtian. Lup. in Conc. T. 2. *p.* 1210.

Theoph. Chronogr. p. 388. *Hiſtor. Miſcell. l.* 23 *p.* 333.

But do we not read in the *Acts of the Council, that* John *appeared and ſubſcribed as Vicar of the Oriental Patriarchs*; *and* Thomas *as Vicar of the Patriarch of* Alexandria? Very true: But *Baronius* gives an excellent account of this notorious Cheat. *The Legates that were ſent to the Patriarchs did never arrive at* Antioch *or* Alexandria; *but coming into* Paleſtine, *they there underſtood what a grievous Perſecution the Chriſtians ſuffered under the new Caliph, and that if it ſhould be diſcovered what Errand they went upon, it would not only hazard their own Lives, but of all the Chriſtians of thoſe Parts; therefore they forbore going any* *farther, and acquainted the Monks of* Paleſtine *with their Deſign; who met together, and took upon them to ſend theſe two,* John *and* Thomas *as the Legates of the Patriarchs of* Antioch *and* Alexandria : For *Theodorus*, Patriarch of *Jeruſalem* was lately dead. And theſe two were the goodly Vicars of the Patriarchal Sees which ſate and ſubſcribed in their Names in this moſt *Oecumenical Council*; and paſſed in all the *Act. 7. p. 558.* Acts of it for the Legates of the Oriental Patriarchs. For they ſubſcribe themſelves *Legates of the three Apoſtolical Sees*, Alexandria, Antioch *and* Jeruſalem: And yet the Summons never came to either of the Patriarchs, but they were in truth only the Plenipotentiary Monks of the Patriarchal Monks of *Paleſtine*: So both *Baronius* and *Binius* confeſs they were only the Monks that ſent them, and they call themſelves *Eremites* in the beginning of their Epiſtle; and yet in *Bin. not. in Concil. Nic. 2. Concil. Nic. Act. 3. p. 187, 190.* the Acts of that Council they paſs for very great Men of the Eaſt, and *Euthymius*, Biſhop of *Sardis*, calls them *the Patriarchs of the Eaſt*: And *Epiphanius* takes it for granted, *that the Letters were ſent by the very ſame to whom* Taraſius *directed his*; when the very Letters themſelves, which were read in the Council, ſhew that the Patriarchs of *Antioch* and *Alexandria* were never conſulted with. And yet *Chriſtianus* *Lup. not. in Can. Concil. Sept. To 2. p. 1109.* *Lupus* in his late Notes on the Canons of the *General Councils*, very fairly tells a formal Story of *Politian*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and *Theodoret* of *Antioch*, and *Elias* of *Jeruſalem*, *ſending theſe for their Legates to this Council* (I had thought it had been only the Pope's Prerogative to make titular Patriarchs) and he gravely magnifies the *Zeal and Courage both of the Patriarchs and Legates for venturing ſo much in ſuch a time of Perſecution*: And then falls into a mighty *Encomium* of the *two Legates, that* Taraſius *ſent, for venturing through a thouſand Deaths to get to the Patriarchs*, when God knows they never came near them. But which is far more to be wondred at, Pope *Adrian*, in his Anſwer to *Charles the Great*, about the *Nicene Synod*, had the face to ſay, *That the Synodical Epiſtle of the three Patriarchs*, of *Coſmus* of *Alexandria*, and *Adriani Epiſt. Synod. Nic. To. 7. Concil. p. 924.* of *Theodore* of *Antioch*, (it ſeems *Elias* is turned to *Theodore* again) and *Theodore* of *Jeruſalem* was *read and approved in this Council of* Nice; than which (with his Holineſs's leave) there never was a more notorious falſhood, unleſs it were that of *Taraſius*; who, upon the Ap-*p. 154.* probation of theſe Letters of the Monks, cry'd out, *That the Eaſt and the Weſt, the North and the South were all agreed*: And the whole Council followed this with an Acclamation of, *Glory be to God that hath united us*; when the Eaſtern Patriarchs knew nothing of the Council, the Weſtern Biſhops oppoſed it as ſoon as ever they knew it. And *T. G. p. 118* was not this a very hopeful *General Council*, having, as *T. G.* ſaith, *The Pope's Legates for Preſidents, and the Vicars of the Oriental Patriarchal Sees aſſiſting in it?*

§. 7. 2. That it was not received for a General Council by the *Church*. For even in the *Greek Church* it ſelf *Theophanes* only ſaith, *That the Emperor* *Theoph. Chron. p. 389.* *called together all the Biſhops within his own Dominions*; which is ſaid likewiſe by *Landulphus Sagax*; only *Theophanes* would have it believed, *Paul. Diacon. l. 23. p. 733.* *That the Oriental Patriarchs ſent their Legates*, which was very falſe: As not only appears from the very Acts of the Council, wherein the Monks Letter is inſerted, but becauſe this Council was not receiv'd many Years after in thoſe *Patriarchal Sees*; which is evident from *Photius* his *Encyclical Epiſtle* to the Patriarch of *Alexandria* and others, not long ſince publiſhed in *Greek* from a *MS.* brought out of the *Eaſt*; wherein *Photius* expoſtulates the caſe, why the *Nicene Council was not received among them, as the ſix General Councils were.* In that Copy which is extant in *Baronius*, tranſlated by *Metius*, and with great diligence compared with two *MSS.* whereof one was a *very ancient one*, it is ſaid expreſly, *That it was reported among them that none of the Churches under the Apoſtolical See of* Alexandria *did own the* Nicene *Synod for a General Council*; which in *B. Moantague's Copy* is mitigated into ſome; but by the tenour of his Diſcourſe it appears, *it was not publiſhed in their Churches, nor received among them as a General Council*: And he uſeth many Arguments to perſwade them to it; among the reſt he ſaith, *That* Thomas *was preſent in it from his See, and others with him*; but he doth not ſay, *he came as a Legate.* And he hath found out Companions for him too, which is more than the *Nicene Council* diſcovered; and yet he acknowledges *that by reaſon of the Perſecution of the* Saracens, *the Acts of that Council never came to them*; which would be very ſtrange, if the Patriarch of *Alexandria* ſent a *Legate* thither. *Baronius* ingenuouſly confeſſes *that this* Nicene *Council was not received as an Oecumenical Council in any of the Eaſtern Patriarchates, excepting only that of* Conſtantinople; and he is very hard put to it to prove that it was owned as ſuch even at *Rome* it ſelf; becauſe *Nicholaus* 1. in a *Council* at *Rome* in the Cauſe of *Photius* reckons up but *ſix General Councils*, which *Photius* upbraids him with; and it is but a pitiful Pretence which *Baronius* hath for it, viz. *That they had only a bad Tranſlation of it*; ſuch a one as it was, it was of *Hadrian*'s procuring, as *Anaſtaſius* ſaith. If they had received it as a *General Council*, where were the Authentick Acts of it? Or if they did not underſtand *Greek*, could they not have procured a better *Latine Tranſlation* before the time of *Anaſtaſius*? But the plain Truth was, although Pope *Hadrian* joined with it, and would not allow *Taraſius* his being Patriarch till he undertook to get the Worſhip of Images confirmed, yet the *Nicene Council* was ſo very ill received in the *Weſtern Church*, that the following Popes were aſhamed to call it an *Oecumenical Council*; as *Binius* confeſſes in the very Words of *Baronius*, according to his cuſtom. And long after their times it was ſo little known or eſteemed in the *Weſtern* Parts, that *Aquinas* and the ancient Schoolmen never mention it in the matter of Images, but determine expreſly againſt it. Which either ſhews it was not known, or had not any value put upon it; for if *Baronius* his reaſon hold good, as ſoon as *Anaſtaſius* had finiſhed his Tranſlation, this Council would have been as much known here as any other; and ſo much the more becauſe ſo many Schoolmen were concerned to juſtifie the Worſhip of Images, and they were ſo much to ſeek for Arguments to defend it, that they would have leaped for Joy to have had a Decree of an allowed *General Council* on their ſide; or if they had found it againſt them, they would ſome way or other have anſwered it.

Photii Epiſt. 2. *p.* 60.

Baron. A. D. 863. *n.* 33.

Ib. n. 6.

Anaſt. vit. Hadrian. 1 *p.* 119.

Concil. Gener. Tom. 8. *p.* 775.

§. 8. But the greateſt *Teſtimony* againſt it is the Council of *Francford*, which expreſly condemned it; and as *Sirmondus* confeſſes, *Did not look upon it as an Oecumenical Council, becauſe none but* Greeks *met in it, and other Churches were not asked their Opinion*; *nay*, he ſaith, *that Pope*

Sirmond. adm. de Can. 2. *Concil. Francford.*

T.G.p.481

Hadrian *himſelf, did not give it the title of a General Council.* To this T. G. anſwers, *That what weight ſoever that Exception carried at that time, yet it is certain now it hath no force at all, ſince the Council it ſelf hath for many hundreds of Years been accepted as a true and lawful General Council, and its Doctrine as Catholick by all the Provinces of Chriſtendom, and the contrary to it condemned for Hereſie.* This latter is evidently falſe, as I have ſhewed before, and there is no reaſon for the other; for by the confeſſion of their own Writers the Copies of this Nicene Council lay buried in theſe Weſtern parts for many Ages, which is the reaſon they give why the *Schoolmen* take no notice of it; and in the former Century, the Copies of it were firſt publiſhed from ſome *MSS.* that were very little known. The account whereof was, that this Council meeting with ſo brisk an oppoſition from the Council of *Francford* and afterwards from the *Gallican Biſhops*, and being rejected here in *England* by the conſent of our *Hiſtorians*, the very name of it was almoſt quite forgotten; thence it never was once cited either by *Jonas Aurelianenſis*, or *Walafridus Strabo*, as *Spalatenſis* obſerves, when they had the greateſt occaſion to do it in the matter of Images. But when the worſhip of Images began to be oppoſed here in *England* by *Wickliffe*, the defenders of it finding themſelves concerned to find out every thing that made for their advantage, *Waldenſis* having heard of ſome ſuch thing as a Council againſt *Iconoclaſts*, by *Thomas* and *John*, two Dominicans of his time, from a certain Book; he adventures to ſet it down upon their report, but ſo faintly with *ut fertur*, as if he had been telling the ſtory of *Pope Joan*; and he ſaith, *it was called under the pious Emperor* Conſtantius *the ſecond* and *Paſcaſius*: by which we may ſee what an excellent account they had of this General Council, but in the laſt Century, *Pet. Crabb*, a *Franciſcan*, with indefatigable diligence ſearching five hundred Libraries for any thing pertaining to Councils, lights upon the old *Latin Edition* of this Council, and publiſhed it *A. D.* 1551. From that time this was looked on and magnified as the *ſeventh General Council* in theſe Weſtern parts, and its Authority ſet up by the Council of *Trent*: and the generality of Divines finding it in the Volumes of General Councils and there joyned with them, ſearch'd no farther, but imagined it was alwaies ſo eſteemed.

Spalat. de Rep. Eccleſ. l. 7. c. 12. n. 59.

Waldenſ. Tom. 3. Tit. 19. c. 150. n. 4.

§. 9.

Sirmond. Admon. To. 2. Concil. p. 191. Pet. de Marcâ de Concord. Sacerd. l. 2. c. 17. n. 2. Petav. de Incarn. l. 15. c. 11. n. 4. Sur. admon. ad Lect. de Concil. Franc. Cop. Dial. 4. c. 18, 19. Sander. de Imag. c. 5. Suar. in 3. p. To. diſp. 54. ſect. 3.

But it may be ſome will become confident of it, when they ſee ſo good an Author as *T. G.* ſpeaking with ſo much aſſurance, *That it hath been received for many hundred Years as a lawful General Council*; If he ſpeaks from the time of its being publiſhed, he might as well have ſaid for many thouſand Years. For 1. In the Age wherein it was firſt ſent abroad, it was utterly rejected by the Council of *Francford*; as not only appears by the Canon it ſelf, but by the confeſſion of ſome of the moſt learned and judicious perſons of the *Roman* Church: ſuch as *Sirmondus* and *Petrus de Marcâ* were: and *Petavius* confeſſes, *That the Council meant by the Council of* Francford *was the* Nicene *Council, and not the former of* Conſtantinople; as *Surius*, *Cope*, or *Harpsfield*, *Sanders*, *Suarez*, and others were of opinion: nay *Labbé* and *Coſſart* in their late Edition of the Councils, have moſt impudently ſet down this in the very Title of the Council of *Francford*, *That the Acts of the* Nicene *Council in the matter of Images were confirm'd therein*: whereas *Sirmondus* adds this to the Title of his Admonition about the ſecond Canon of that *Council*, *Quo rejecta eſt Synodus Nicæna*: all which Advertiſement they have very honeſtly left out, although they pretend to give all *Sirmondus* his *Notes*. But the main pretence for this was, becauſe the words of the Canon do mention the Council of *Conſtantinople*; which *Petavius* thinks was called ſo, *becauſe* Conſtantinople *was the Head of the Eaſtern Empire*; but the plain reaſon is, becauſe the Nicene Council was begun at *Conſtantinople upon the* 17 *of* Auguſt; *but the Emperors Guards would not endure their ſitting there, as* Theophanes *relates, upon which they were forced to riſe; and the Empreſs found out a trick to disband the ſuſpected Officers and Souldiers, and brought in new ones; however it was thought convenient the Council ſhould ſit no longer there, but remove unto* Nice. And what a mighty abſurdity was this to call a Council, which was begun at *Conſtantinople*, the *Conſtantinopolitan Council*? And it is obſervable, that *Gabriel Biel*, who lived in the latter end of the fifteen Century, quotes the Decree of this Council of *Nice*, under the name of a Decree of the Council of *Conſtantinople*. And the learned *P. Pithæus* ſpeaking of *Anaſtaſius* his Tranſlation, calls it the Council of *Conſtantinople*. The new French *Annaliſt* is ſatisfied with neither opinion, but he thinks, *That another Council of* Conſtantinople *was called between the* Nicene *Council, and that of* Francford, *which did in expreſs words determine that the ſame worſhip was to be given to Images, which is due to the B. Trinity, and that this was the Council condemned at* Francford: but this New Council is a meer invention of his own, there being no colour for it either from the *Greek* or *Latin Hiſtorians*; and in truth he pretends only to theſe reaſons, 1. *Becauſe it was a Council of* Conſtantinople *which was condemned.* 2. *Becauſe it is not to be ſuppoſed that the Council of* Francford *ſhould condemn the Council of* Nice: For he ſaith, *it is not to be believed that ſo many Biſhops, the Popes Legates being preſent, ſhould miſunderſtand the doctrine of that Council*: yet this is all the refuge *T. G.* hath in this matter: and he offers from *Peter de Marca, to give a particular account of it.* To which I anſwer, That the Author of the Caroline Book (as I have already obſerved) takes notice of this paſſage of the Biſhop of *Conſtantia* in *Cyprus*; and although there were a miſtake in the Tranſlation of it, yet it ought to be obſerved that, he ſaith, *the whole Council meant the ſame which* Conſtantine *ſpake out, although in words they denied it*, and he there quotes the very words of their denying it, *Non adoramus Imagines ut Deum, nec illis Divini ſervitii cultum impendimus, &c.* From whence it is plain, that the *Weſtern Church* underſtood well enough what they ſaid, and what they denied; but they judged, notwithſtanding all their words to the contrary, that they did really give that worſhip to Images which was due only to God; and no man that reads the *Caroline Book* can be of another opinion. And *T. G.* is content to *yield it of the Author of that Book*, from the Teſtimonies I brought out of him; but he ſaith, *That Author was not contented with what the Council of* Francford *had condemned.* Which is a lamentable anſwer; ſince *Hincmarus* ſaith, *That this very Volume was it which was ſent from the Emperor to* Rome *by ſome Biſhops againſt the* Greek *Synod*; and he quotes the very place out of it which is ſtill extant in that Book. And is it credible that the *Emperor* ſhould publiſh a Book in his own name as a *Capitular*, as *Pope Hadrian* calls it, that was different from the ſenſe of the Council of *Francford*, which was called on purpoſe to reſolve this Queſtion about Images, as well as to condemn the *Hereſie* of *Felix* and *Elipandus*? *Petavius* indeed would have the main Book to have been written ſome years before

Concil. Gener. To. 7. p. 1013.

Theop. Chronogr. p. 389.

Gab. Biel. in Can. Miſſ. c. 49.

P. Pithæi præfat. ad hiſtor. Pauli Diac.

Annales Eccleſ. Franc. ad A. D. 794. n. 26. To. 6.

n. 31.

T. G. p. 144.

Carol. de Imag. l. 3. c. 17.

T. G. p. 146.

Hincmar. Opuſc. c. 20. p. 457. Carol. l. 4. c. 28.

the *Council, as ſoon as the Acts of the* Nicene *Synod were known in theſe parts* (and *Caſſander* probably ſuppoſes *Alcuinus* to have been the Author of it) *but when the Council of* Francford *had condemned the* Nicene *Synod, only ſome* excerpta *were taken out of it and ſent to the Pope.* I am not ſatisfied with *Petavius* his Reaſon, *Becauſe the Pope doth not anſwer all of it,* (a better cauſe may be aſſigned for that) but in the Preface of the Book the Author declares that it was done with the *Advice of the Council* (*Quod opus aggreſſi ſumus cum conhibentiâ ſacerdotum in regno à Deo nobis conceſſo Catholicis gregibus prælatorum*) and *Bellarmine* and *Baronius* both grant, *That this Book contains the Acts of the Council of* Francford; However if the Book were extant before under the name of *Charles,* it is ſo much the more improbable that if the Council differed in opinion from it, the Excerpta out of this Book ſhould be ſent as the Reaſons of rejecting the *Nicene Synod.* And that paſſage which *Hincmarus* cites out of this Book, is very conſiderable to our purpoſe; for the deſign of it is to ſhew, *That the* Greek *Synod could have no pretence to be eſteemed a lawful General Council,* becauſe *the doctrine of it was not Catholick, neither were the Acts of it done by the univerſal Church:* and in another place, *That Synod is charged with folly and perſumption, in that being but one part of the Church, it ſhould dare to impoſe its Decrees upon the Church without adviſing and conſulting with the other parts of it,* (debuerat enim ad circumjacentium provinciarum Eccleſias legationem ſciſcitativam facere, utrum imagines adorari aut non adorari deberent.) *For what Rage and Madneſs is this, for the Church of one part to go about to determine that which was never determined by the Apoſtles or their Succeſſors, and to endeavour to Anathematize the Churches of the whole World? But this is curſing without reaſon, anger without Power, damning without Authority: and therefore they are charged with no leſs than Luciferian pride* for taking upon them to *pronounce Anathema*'s againſt thoſe who diſſented from them. *Petavius* ſaith, *That when Pope* Hadrian *ſent the Acts of the Council to* Charles *the Great, and would have a Council called to adviſe about it: the Pope had not yet declared it for an Oecumenical Council!* but if it were not then declared to be a General Council, it is very unlikely he ſhould do it afterwards when he found that *three hundred Biſhops* of *Germany, France,* and *Italy,* ſaith *Surius,* did ſo ſtiffly and reſolutely oppoſe the definition of it in ſpight of the *Pope's Legats,* whow ere preſent there. Which contradiction of theirs ſhews, how very far this Council was from being received by the Church as a *lawful General Council*; and from the *Anſwer* of *Hadrian* it appears that it was not then ſolemnly confirmed by the *Pope,* nor ever after, that we can find, till the Council of *Trent.*

Petav. de Incarn. l 15. c. 12. n. 8.
Caſſan. Ep. 15.

Bellarm. de Concil. l. 2. c. 8.
Baron. ad A. 794. n. 31.

Carol. de Imag. l. 3. c. 11.

Petav. de Incarn. l. 15. c. 12. n. 4. 10.

2. We have the *Teſtimony* of the beſt Hiſtorians of that and ſeveral Ages after, that the *Nicene Synod was not received as a lawful General Council.* In the *Annals* of *Eginhardus,* who was *Secretary* to *Charles* the *Great,* we have this Account, *that not many years before the Council of* Francford, *there was a Synod at* Conſtantinople, *which was called by themſelves, not only the ſeventh, but a General Council; but* Charles *having ſummoned together a Council of Biſhops out of all parts of his Dominions, it was there utterly rejected, ſo as not to be called or thought to be either the ſeventh, or a General Council.* The *Annales Tiliani, Loiſeliani, Bertiniani, Fuldenſes, Metenſes, Lauriſhamenſes, Moſſiacenſes, Egoſiſmenſes* being the beſt Records of that Age, all agree with *Eginhardus* in the *rejecting of the Greek Synod*; and moſt of them call it *the falſe Synod,* others ſay, *that*

Eginhardi Annales A. D. 794.

Hiſtor. Franc. Script. Coatan. Tom. 2. &. 3.

which would be called the Seventh and a General Council; and with theſe agree *Ado Viennenſis*, *Rhegino*, *Hermannus Contratus* and *Urſpergenſis* in their ſeveral Chronicles, wherein we have a plainer Teſtimony that this Council was rejected, than we have that any *General Council* was ever received.

§. 10. 3. That this was not barely the ſenſe of that Age, but continued to be ſo of ſucceeding Ages, appears from the Teſtimony I gave of the *Gallican Church* in the time of *Ludovicus Pius*, and the Synod of *Paris*, A. D. 824. wherein they perſiſted in condemning the *Nicene Synod*, and the Doctrine therein aſſerted: which ſhews evidently that it was no miſtake of the Words of the Council which cauſed the Council of *Francford* to condemn the *Nicene*: for Pope *Hadrian* had now written in Vindication of it, and endeavoured to clear the ſenſe of the Council; and yet after all this the *Gallican* Biſhops adhered to the Sentence of the Council of *Francford*. To this *T. G.* returns only this Anſwer, *that although they were of this Opinion at that time, yet afterwards the Doctrine of the Nicene Council was received in the Gallican Church.* I proceed therefore to ſhew, that in the time of the Controverſie between *Jonas Aurelianenſis* and *Claudius Taurinenſis* the *Gallican* Church had not changed its Opinion: (*Jonas* lived, ſaith *Labbé*, to *A. D.* 842.) For *Bellarmin* yields that Jonas *denied that any Worſhip was to be given to Images*, although he diſputed againſt *Claudius Taurinenſis* who followed the Opinion of *Serenus*, and would have them all deſtroyed. *Marg. de la Bigne* ſaith, *that* Jonas *was one of the Heads of thoſe who oppoſed the Pope and the Orientals*, i. e. *the Nicene Synod in this point of the Worſhip of Images, and he calls it a ſuperſtitious and pernicious Practice, from which the Gallican Church was free*; *and a deteſtable and moſt wicked Error*; *notwithſtanding the Orientals pretended that they did not worſhip the Images, but the exemplars by them*; *and he prays God they may be at laſt delivered out of that Superſtition*: with ſo much more to that purpoſe, that it were endleſs to repeat it. *Walafridus Strabo* who lived ſome Years after *Jonas*, and mentions the Death of *Ludovicus Pius*, is yielded by *Baronius to have been of the ſame Opinion with* Jonas *in this Matter*: and he ſaith, *all the Honour due to Images is barely Negative, not to miſuſe or deſtroy them.* In the ſame time with *Jonas* lived *Agobardus* Archbiſhop of *Lions*, and is at this day reckoned among the *Saints and Confeſſors of that City*; of whoſe Doctrine I had given before an account from the Abſtract of *Papirius Maſſonus*, and from thence I ſhewed how zealous he was againſt all Worſhip of Images: and I produced the Teſtimony of *Baluzius* to ſhew *that he ſaid no more than the whole Gallican Church in that Age believed.* T. G. gives up *Agobardus*; but he will not yield that *Baluzius* ſaith *any ſuch thing, for the French Biſhops allowed Images to be kept* ſaith *Baluzius, that the faithful ſeeing them might be excited to the Imitation of thoſe holy Perſons whom they repreſented: whereas* Agobardus *went ſo far as to affirm that they were kept for Ornaments to delight the Eyes, but not for the Inſtruction of the People*; *nay that they were not to be painted upon Church-Walls.* The Words of *Baluzius* are, *Ego crediderim Agobardum ſcripſiſſe quod omnes tum in Galliâ ſentiebant*; and what ſenſe can any Man make of theſe Words, if he did not believe, that what *Agobardus* wrote was the ſenſe of the *Gallican Church*? I cannot but pity *T. G.* in theſe ſtraights he runs himſelf into; he can creep in at a Mouſe-hole, but he ſoon grows too big

T.G.p.149

Bell. de Script. Eccleſ. A. 820.

Biblioth. Patr. To. 4 *p.* 533. *p.* 538. *p.* 547.

Walafrid. Strabo de reb. Eccleſ l. 8.

Baron. A. D. 794 *n.* 41.

T.G.*p.*150

Baluz. not in Agob. p. 88.

ever to get out again. For *Baluzius* ſaith *what I affirmed*, and *Agobardus* ſaith no ſuch thing, as he affirms of him: and in that very *Synopſis* of his Doctrine by *Maſſonus*, to which he referrs, we have juſt the contrary; *Picturæ aſpectandæ cauſâ hiſtoriæ & memoriæ, non Religionis*; *Images are to be looked on for Hiſtory and Memory ſake, but not for Religion*; and what is this but for Inſtruction of the People? Whoſoever it was, that helped *T. G.* to this Citation, I deſire him as a Friend that he will never truſt him more; for I would think better of T. G. himſelf, than that he would wilfully Prevaricate. But if this were *Agobardus* his Opinion, why have we it not in his own Words? rather than thoſe of *Pap. Maſſonus*, who talks ſo ignorantly and inconſiſtently in that very Place where thoſe Words are, but are not ſet down by him as the Judgment of *Agobardus*. If *T. G.* would have taken no great pains to have read over *Agobardus* his Diſcourſe of *Images*, he would have ſaved me the labour of confuting him about his Opinion; for he delivers it plainly enough againſt all Worſhip of *Images*, though for the ſake of the Exemplar; but he expreſly allows them for Inſtruction. I am ſorry *T. G.* makes it ſo neceſſary for me to give him ſuch Home-thruſts; for he lays himſelf ſo open, and uſes ſo little art to avoid them, that I muſt either do nothing, or expoſe his Weakneſs, and want of Skill.

Papir. Maſſon. Synopſ. Agob. c. 10.

Agobard. de Imag. c. 19. 32.

But all this while we are got no farther than towards the middle of the Ninth Century, the Church of France *might change its Opinion after this time, and aſſert the Council of* Nice *to have been a General Council, and ſubmit to the Decrees of it.* I grant all this to be poſſible, but we are looking for Certainties, and not bare Poſſibilities. *Hincmarus* of *Rhemes*, a ſtout and underſtanding Biſhop of the *Gallican Church*, died ſaith *Bellarmin*, A. D. 882. and he not only calls *the Nycene Synod a Falſe General Council*, but he makes that at *Francford* to be truly ſo: (And theſe latter Words of his are cited with Approbation by *Card. Cuſanus*) and he condemns both Factions among the *Greeks*, of the *Iconoclaſts*, and of the *Nicene Fathers*. In the ſame Age lived *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, who made it his Buſineſs to recommend all the *Greek Canons* and *Councils* to the *Latin Church*; (he was alive ſaith *Baronius*, A. D. 886.) He firſt tranſlated the *Eighth General Council*, at which himſelf was preſent; and when this was abroad, he tells the *Pope what a Solœciſm it would be, to have the Eighth, without a Seventh*, (*ubi ſeptima non habetur*, are his very Words) from whence it appears in how very little Regard that Council was in the *Weſtern Church*. *It is true*, he ſaith, *it was tranſlated before*; *but it was, almoſt by all ſo much contemned, that it was ſo far from being tranſcribed, that it was not thought worth reading*. This he would have to be laid upon the badneſs of the Tranſlation, (he hath mended the matter much) when in his Lives of the Popes, he ſaith, *it was done by the Particular Command of Pope* Hadrian, *and laid up in his Sacred Library*. But when he hath ſaid his utmoſt for the *Catholick Doctrine of Image-worſhip*, as he would have it believed) he cannot deny that the admirable uſefulneſs of this *Doctrine was not yet revealed to ſome of the Gallican Church; becauſe they ſaid it was not lawful to worſhip the Work of Mens Hands*. After this time, came on the Midnight of the Church; wherein the very Names of Councils were forgotten, and Men did only dream of what had paſt; but all things were judged good, that were got into any vogue in the practice of the Church; yet even in that time

Hincmar. ubi ſupr.

Cuſan. de Concord. Cathol. l. 8 *c.* 1.

Anaſt. Biblioth. Præfat. in ſept. Synod.

we meet with ſome glitterings of Light, enough to let us ſee the *Council of Nice* had not prevailed over the *Weſtern* Church. *Leo Tuſcus*, who was a Secretary to the *Greek Emperor*, and lived, ſaith *Geſner*, A. D. 1170. giving an account of the Schiſm between the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*, hath theſe Words, (ſaith *Caſſander)* *That among the Cauſes of the Breach, that Synod was to be aſſigned which was called by* Conſtantine *and* Irene, *and which they would have called the ſeventh, and a General Council*; and he adds moreover, *That it was not received even by the Church of* Rome. About the Year 1189. was the Expedition into *Paleſtine* by *Fredericus Ænobarbus*, and *Nicetas Acominatus*, who was a great Officer under the *Greek Emperor*, *Iſacius Angelus*, (and preſent in the Army ſaith *Baronius*) gives this Account of the *Germans* Opinion in thoſe times about the worſhip of Images. *When*, ſaith he, *all the* Greeks *had deſerted* Philippopolis, *the* Armenians *ſtaid behind, for they looked on the* Germans *as their Friends, and agreeing with them in Religion, for the worſhip of Images is forbidden among both of them.* Which being a Teſtimony of ſo conſiderable a Perſon, and not barely concerning the *Opinion* of ſome *Divines*, but the *general Practice* of the *People* doth ſhew, that in the twelfth *Century* the *Nicene Council had not prevailed all over the* Weſtern *Church*, when T. G. affirms it did *for many hundreds of Years before the Reformation.* Eſpecially if we conſider what the Judgment and Practice of the *Armenians* was, as it is delivered by *Nicon*, (who is ſuppoſed to have been a Saint and Martyr in *Armenia*,) who ſaith, *That they do not worſhip Images, and their Catholick Biſhop or Patriarch Excommunicates thoſe that do.* Which is confirmed by what is ſaid to the ſame Purpoſe by *Iſaac* an *Armenian Biſhop*, who lived in the ſame *Century*, viz. *That they do not worſhip the Images either of Chriſt, the Bleſſed Virgin, or the Saints.* And *Pet. Pithæus*, a learned and ingenious Papiſt, confeſſes, *That it was but very lately that thoſe of the Gallican Church began to be fond of Images:* And he writ that Epiſtle wherein thoſe Words are extant, *A. D.* 1568. Surely he did not think the Doctrine of the *Nicene Council* had been received in the *Gallican Church for many hundred Years.*

Geſner. Biblioth. To. 1. v. Leo.
Caſſand. Ep. 19.
Nicet. Chonias. l. 2. *Iſ, Angeli.*
Baron. A. 1178. *n.* 10
Biblioth. Patr. To. 3. *p.* 151.
Auctur. Biblioth. Patr. To. 2. 409.
P. Pithæi Præf. ad Pauli Diac. hiſt.

§. 11. *But ſuppoſe the* Nicene *Synod were not owned for a General Council, yet it might be a very wiſe and judicious Aſſembly*; to ſay that, is to reflect on the Emperor *Charles* the Great, and all the *Weſtern* Biſhops in his Dominions. And I am ſure their Expreſſions would juſtifie me, if I had ſpoken ſharper without an Irony; for in the *Caroline Book* we frequently meet with ſuch Expreſſions as theſe concerning thoſe grave Fathers: *Ut illi ſtultiſſimè & irrationabilitèr putant*; *indoctè & inordinatè dicunt*; *quam abſurdè agant*; *quod magnæ ſit temeritatis dicere*; *quod non minus omnibus ſed pene plus cunctis Tharaſius deliraſſe dignoſcitur*; *Deliramento plena dictio Leonis. Ut illi delirant*: *Ut illi garriunt*: *Ridiculoſè & pueriliter dictum*; *infauſtè, præcipitantèr, ſive inſipienter*: *Dementia prolatum & riſu dignum. Inutile & mendacio plenum. Dementiſſimum & ratione carens Deliramentum, errore plenum. Falſiſſimum & riſu dignum. Ridiculoſiſſimum Dictum. Supercilioſè & indoctè dixerunt.* When *T. G.* hath conſidered theſe Expreſſions, and the force and pungency of them, being all applied to the Fathers of that *Nicene* Synod, by the *Weſtern* Biſhops under the name of *Charles* the Great, he may poſſibly cool and abate his Rage towards

Lib. Caroli de Imag. l. 1. *c.* 16. *c.* 13. *c.* 15. *c.* 19. *c.* 20. *c.* 25. *l.* 2. *c.* 8. 16. *c.* 25. *l.* 3. *c.* 10. 17. *c.* 19. *c.* 23. 29. 31. *l.* 4. *c.* 1. *c.* 17. *c.* 23.

me for uſing only that *Ironical Expreſſion* of *That Wiſe Synod.* And there is nothing conſiderable ſaid by the *Nicene* Fathers which is not anſwered in that Book, to whom I may therefore better refer him than he doth me to the Anſwers of *Epiphanius* in the *Nicene* Council for Satisfaction of no leſs than *eight Arguments* (as himſelf numbers them) of the *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers* againſt the Worſhip of Images.

But that he may not think the greateſt weight lies in any thing that is paſſed by, I ſhall briefly conſider the Defence he makes for the *Nicene Synod* in the Particulars mentioned by him. 1. He ſaith,
T.G.p.125. *That the* Nicene *Fathers did juſtly plead the continuance of Chriſt's King-*
Zach.13.2 *dom againſt the Idolatry of Chriſtians, becauſe God hath promiſed that he will take away Idols from the Earth, not for four or five hundred Years, but to the end of the World.* I deſire *T. G.* to conſider, whether this Argument would not have held as well againſt the *Catholick Biſhops* who charged the *Arians* with Idolatry; and what Anſwer he gives himſelf about that, will ſhew the feebleneſs of his Anſwer in this caſe. And the Prophecies of the *Old Teſtament* relating to Events under the *New* (ſuppoſing that doth ſo, which is far from being clear) do certainly ſhew what the Deſign and Tendency of the *Chriſtian Doctrine* is, and what would be if Men did obſerve it. As it is in all the Prophecies of the Peace and Tranquility of the World, notwithſtanding which, we find the World at the old Rate of quarrelling and fighting under new Pretences: Juſt ſo it is with Idolatry, no Doctrine in the World would preſerve Men more effectually from it if they would obſerve it; but if under the colour of Chriſtianity they bring in only a new Scheme of it, it is ſtill the ſame kind of thing, although it appears in a freſher Dreſs. *But then,* ſaith *T. G. the Gates of Hell would prevail againſt the Church.* Againſt what *Church?* The whole *Chriſtian Church?* Whoever ſaid they could, or how doth that follow? The Church of *Conſtantinople*, or the Church of *Jeruſalem?* Have not the Gates of the *Turk* been too ſtrong for them? The Church of *Rome?* The *Gates* of *Hell* do certainly prevail againſt that, if it doth Unchurch all other Chriſtians that are not of its Communion? And why may not Idolatry prevail, where *Luciferian Pride*, and *Helliſh Cruelty*, and *deſperate Wickedneſs* have long prevailed? Hath *Chriſt* made Promiſes to ſecure that Church from Error, which hath been over-run with all ſorts of Wickedneſs by the Confeſſion of her own Members and Friends? Theſe are Gobbets fit only to be cramm'd down the Throats of very implicite Believers.

T.G.p.127 2. He undertakes to ſhew, *That the Saying of the Fathers againſt the* Arians *cannot reach to thoſe that worſhip Images, becauſe* Epiphanius *ſaith, The* Arians *truſted in Chriſt, and gave properly Divine Honour to Chriſt, which they do not to the Images of Chriſt.* To anſwer this, I ſhewed that *Aquinas* and his Followers did declare that *Latria was to be given to the Images of Chriſt*; therefore this could not, at leaſt, excuſe them from being *parallel* to the *Arians*, and if their Arguments hold good, then all that worſhip Images fall under the
T.G.p.128 like Condemnation. This he beſtows the name of *many Fallacies upon*; and runs on ſo briskly with ſhewing the Inconſequence of it, as though he did in earneſt believe it were an impertinent Anſwer; by which he would inſinuate, *that I had made uſe of* Aquinas *his O-*

Opinion to prove thoſe guilty of Idolatry which were of another Opinion. No ſuch matter; for the queſtion was, whether the Saying of the *Fathers* concerning the *Arian Idolatry* can be juſtly applied to thoſe that worſhip Images? Yes, ſay I, upon *Epiphanius* his own ground they may, *if they who worſhip Images give Divine Honour to them*; but *Aquinas* and his *Followers* contend that *Divine Honour is to be given to them*; and therefore they fall under the like Cenſure. And by their Argument, all that worſhip Images muſt come under it; for either they *worſhip Images* for *themſelves*, and then they all acknowledge it is *Idolatry*; or for the ſake of the *Exemplar*: Which if it be the Reaſon and Object of *Worſhip* as repreſented by the *Image*, it muſt have the ſame Worſhip which the thing conſidered in its own being deſerves; which being *Divine Honour* that muſt be given to the *Image*. But *T. G.* ſuppoſes the force of all this *to depend upon their being of this Opinion, and becauſe the* Nicene *Fathers are not mentioned by me as agreeing with* Aquinas, therefore he repreſents this arguing as ridiculous. Whereas my Deſign was to ſhew (that ſince *Divine Honour* being given to Images, was confeſſed to make the caſe *alike)* that it was confeſſed by the moſt prevalent Party in the Church of *Rome*, that ſuch Honour was to be given to them, and that others did it, although they would not own the doing it. And whether Men acknowledge it or no, if they give that which is *really Divine Worſhip*, they become guilty of *Idolatry* as well as the *Arians*; and let Men call it by what Names they will, of *Relative* or *Abſolute*, *Sovereign* or *Inferior Worſhip*, if it be that which God hath forbiden to be given to any *Creature*, it becomes *Idolatry*.

3. *T.G.* ſaith, *That the Argument doth not hold, that if the union of the Divine and Humane Nature be the reaſon of the Worſhip given to Perſon of Chriſt, then there muſt be an equal Preſence or Vnion between Chriſt and the Image to make that an Object of Worſhip*; *for*, ſaith he, *Not only Vnion, but Repreſentation may occaſion Worſhip.* Who doubts of that? But may it not as well occaſion People to commit *Idolatry?* But the queſtion is not whether *Repreſentation* may occaſion the Worſhip of God or no; for ſo an *Ant* or a *Fly*, or any *Creature* may occaſion it. But this is notorious ſhuffling to talk of *Images* being only an *Occaſion* of *Worſhip*, whereas I have at large ſhewed that the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of their *Church* makes them *Objects* of *Worſhip*. And ſince the Chriſtian Church acknowledged the *Humanity* of *Chriſt* to be capable of *Worſhip* only on the account of an *Hypoſtatical Vnion* with the *Divine Nature*; I deſired to know how a meer *Image* of that *Humane Nature* can be an Object of *Lawful Worſhip?* If *T. G.* ſaith, *That the Image is a fit Object of Worſhip, and Repreſentation the reaſon of it*; let him ſhew how *Repreſentation* comes to be an *equal Reaſon* with *Perſonal Vnion*; and at laſt, this *Repreſentation* is nothing but an act of *Imagination*, which doth not make the Object any more *really preſent* there than any where elſe; againſt which *Imagination* we ſet the *poſitive Law* of *God*, forbidding any ſuch kind of Worſhip, as I have already proved. T.G.p.134

4. He ſaith in defence of his Nicene *Fathers*, *That although the Image of Chriſt can only repreſent the Humane Nature as ſeparate from the Divine, yet the charge of Neſtorianiſm doth not follow*; *becauſe the Object of their Worſhip is that which is conceived in their Minds*; *and Worſhip being an act of the Will, it is carried to the Prototype, as it is conceived in the Un-* T.G.p.136

derſtanding; *but their Underſtandings being free from Neſtorianiſm, their Wills muſt be ſo too*, which is all the Senſe I can make of *T. G*'s Anſwer. Who doth not ſeem at all to conſider there are two things blamed by the Church in *Neſtorianiſm*. 1. The *Heretical Opinion*. 2. The *Idolatrous Practice* conſequent upon that Opinion, of the *ſeparation* of the two *Natures* in *Chriſt*. Now the Argument of the *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers* proceeds not upon their *Opinion*, as though they really believed the *Principles* of *Neſtorianiſm* who worſhipped *Images*; but they were guilty of the ſame kind of *Worſhip*; for ſince an Image can only repreſent the *Humane Nature* of *Chriſt*; if it were lawful to worſhip that Image on the account of Chriſt, then upon the *Neſtorian Principles* it would be as lawful to worſhip the *Humane Nature* of *Chriſt*, although it had no *Hypoſtatical Union* with the *Divine*. For could not the *Neſtorians* ſay that when they conſidered *Chriſt* as a *Humane Perſon*, yet that *Humane Perſon* did repreſent to them the *Divine Perſon*, who was the *proper object of Worſhip*; and although they were not really and *hypoſtatically united*, yet by *Repreſentation*, and an *Act* of the *Mind*, they directed their Worſhip towards the *Divine Perſon*. For if a bare Image of the *Humane Nature* be a ſufficient *Object* of *Worſhip*, much more is the *Humane Nature* it ſelf; and if on the account of ſuch *Repreſentation* the *Worſhip* of *Chriſt* may be directed to his Image, with much greater reaſon it might be towards *Chriſt*, as *Homo Deiferus*, in regard of that *Humane Nature*, which had the *Divine Nature preſent*, although not *united*. And upon this Ground the *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers* did juſtly charge the *Worſhippers* of *Images* with *Neſtorianiſm* as to their *Worſhip*; and that they could not defend themſelves, but they muſt abſolve the *Neſtorians*, whom the *Chriſtian Church* and this *Nicene Synod* it ſelf would ſeem to condemn. For there is a greater Separation between the *Image* of *Chriſt* and *Chriſt*, than the *Neſtorians* did ſuppoſe between the *Divine* and *Humane Nature*; for they did ſtill ſuppoſe a *Real Preſence*, although not a *Real Union*; but in the caſe of Images there is not ſo much as a *Real Preſence*, but only by *Repreſentation*; therefore if the *Neſtorians* were to blame in their *Worſhip*, much more are thoſe that *worſhip Images*.

T.G.p.138 As to the laſt Anſwer, being only a deſire *that I would bear in Mind againſt a fit Seaſon, that the Euchariſt is called by the* Conſtantinopolitan *Fathers an honourable Image of Chriſt*, I ſhall do what he deſires; and I promiſe him farther to ſhew the *Nicene Fathers Ignorance* and *Confidence*, when they ſaid, *It was contrary to the Scriptures and Fathers to call the Euchariſt an Image of Chriſt*. All the other Arguments of the *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers*, to the number of eight, *T. G.* paſſes over, and ſo muſt I.

§. 12. From hence I proceed to the next *Charge*, which is, *That I mix School Diſputes with matters of Faith*; for I deſired ſeriouſly to know, whether any Worſhip doth belong to Images or no? If there be any due, whether is it the ſame that is given to the Prototype, or diſtinct from it? If it be the ſame, then proper Divine Worſhip is given to the Image; if diſtinct, then the Image is worſhipped with *Divine Worſhip*, for it ſelf, and not relatively and ſubordinately as he ſpeaks; and which ſide ſoever is taken, ſome or other of their *Divines* charge the Worſhip with Idolatry; ſo that it is in Mens choice which ſort of Idolatry they will commit when they worſhip Images, but in neither way

T.G.p.192

they can avoid it. To this *T. G.* anſwers ſeveral ways. 1. *That this is a Point belonging to the Schools, and not at all to Faith:* Which I ſaid, was their common Anſwer when any thing pincheth them; but to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of that way of anſwering, I added that both ſides charge the other with Idolatry, and that is a Matter of Conſcience, and not a *Scholaſtick Nicety*. For if the *worſhip* of *Images* be ſo aſſerted in the Church of *Rome*, that in what way ſoever it is practiſed, there is by their own confeſſion ſuch *danger* of *Idolatry*; the *General Terms* of *Councils* ſerve only to draw Men into the Snare, and not to help them out of it. 2. He anſwers this by a drolling Compariſon, *about the Worſhip due to the Chair of State, whether it be the ſame which is due to the King or no; if the ſame, then proper Regal Worſhip would be given to ſomething beſides the King, which were Treaſon; If diſtinct, then the Chair would be worſhipped with Regal Honour for it ſelf, and not relatively, which were for a Man to ſubmit himſelf to a piece of Wood.* This he repreſents pleaſantly, and with advantage enough: And ſuppoſing the *Yeomen of the Guard* to have done laughing, I deſire to have a difference put between the *Cuſtoms* of *Princes Courts*, and the *worſhip* of *God*: And it is ſtrange to me *T. G.* ſhould not ſee the difference. But whatever *T. G.* thinks, we ſay, that *God* by his Law having made ſome Acts of Worſhip peculiar to himſelf by way of acknowledgment of His *Sovereignty* and *Dominion* over us, we muſt not uſe thoſe Acts to any Creature; and therefore here the moſt material *Queſtion* can be asked, is, whether the Acts of Worſhip be the ſame which we are to uſe to *God* or no, *i. e.* whether they are *Acts forbidden* or *lawful?* For if they are the ſame, they are forbidden; if not, they may be lawful. But in a *Prince's Court*, where all expreſſions of Reſpect depend on Cuſtom, and the *Prince's Pleaſure*, or Rules of the Court, the only Queſtion a Man is to ask, is, whether it be the cuſtom of the Court, or the Will of the Prince to have Men uncovered in ſome *Rooms* and not in others; no Man in his Wits would ask, whether that be the *ſame Honour* that is due to the King himſelf? Or who but *T. G*'s Clown could ſuſpect it to be *Treaſon to put off his Hat in the Preſence Chamber, or to the Chair of State*, let it be done with what Intention he pleaſes? If the Yeomen of the Guard ſhould ſee an old Courtier approach with many bowings to the *Chair* of *State*, and there fall down upon his Knees, and kiſs the Arms of the Chair, and deliver his Petition to it for a good Office at Court, and obſerve that he doth this frequently, and with great gravity, I am afraid they would hardly hold their Countenances long to ſee ſuch a *ſolemn Fop*; and yet this pleaſant Courtier might pretend that he did all this as imagining the King to be there *preſent* by *Repreſentation*, and that he did not give this Honour to the *Chair* of *State abſolutely*, conſidered *as a piece of Wood*; but only *Relatively*, and for the ſake of his Maſter; that he knew better what belonged to the Honour due to *Sovereign Worſhip* than ſuch rude Fellows as they; that his Intention was to ſhew what Eſteem he had for his Prince by all this; and though as to the ſubſtance of the *Act* this was the ſame that was done to the *Perſon* of the *King, yet it fell upon the Chair of State after an inferiour Manner, as a thing relating to the King, and purely for his ſake.* I leave the *ſubſtantial Yeomen* of the Guard *(T. G's Judges* in this *Controverſie)* to determine in a *General Council* among them, whether *T. G*'s *Quaker*, or this *old Courtier* were the more ridiculous.

T.G.p.186.

By which Inſtance we ſee that even in Princes Courts Men may over-act their Reverence, and make themſelves laughed at for their fooliſh and extravagant Relative Worſhip; for in all ſuch caſes the Rules of the Court are to be obſerved where there is no Intrenchment upon Divine Laws; and every Man that comes to Court enquires after the Orders of the Court, and he that keeps within them doth his Duty, and never fears the Yeomen of the Guard. If the Orders of the Court were for Men to paſs through the Preſence, or other Chambers without any Ceremony, would not the Yeomen of the Guard be as ready to obſerve thoſe who uſed it? Their Buſineſs is to obſerve Orders themſelves, and to ſee that others do it. And this is the only way how this parallel can reach to our Caſe; all that we plead for, is, that *the Rules and Orders be obſerved which God hath given us for his Worſhip*; ſince He hath given Laws we ought to obey them; and ſince He hath appointed what He will have done, and what He will not, we muſt follow His Rule, and not our own Extravagant Fancies, pretending that we have pretty Devices to honour Him with, which he hath expreſly forbidden. In ſuch a Caſe, we have Reaſon to enquire, whether the Acts of Worſhip be the ſame that He hath forbidden or no: but not where the whole matter depends on Cuſtom, and general Rules, which every Man may eaſily know; and no one hath any Reaſon to be ſcrupulous as long as he keeps within the Meaſures of Decency.

But withal, the force of my Queſtion lay in the Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, who acknowledge on one ſide, *That if the Act of Worſhip by the ſame that is given to the Prototype, it is Idolatry*; on the other ſide, *if it be diſtinct it is Idolatry*; and then I had all the reaſon in the World to put this Queſtion, becauſe either way they are entangled by the Confeſſion of their own Party. But as if Yeomen of the Guard ſhould be ſo ſenſeleſs, as ſome of them to tell a poor Countryman, when he is going through the *Preſence Chamber*, *that if he gives the Chair of State the ſame Honour he gives the King, he commits Treaſon*; and others ſay, *if he does not, he worſhips the Chair for it ſelf, and ſo commits Treaſon*; would not any Man ſay, the Countryman had reaſon to ſtand, and ſcratch his Head, and conſider what he does, for he doth not care to commit Treaſon, and if he muſt do it one way or other, for his part he would go ſome other way, or be better reſolved what he is to do. Thus in our Caſe *Bellarmine* ſaith, *It is Idolatry to give the ſame Worſhip to an Image which is due to God: Vaſquez* ſaith, *It is Idolatry to give diſtinct Worſhip*; therefore if a Man would avoid Idolatry, he muſt give none at all: eſpecially when there is no neceſſity at all of doing it; and therefore it is in no caſe parallel *with the Difficulties about Sight and Motion*, which T. G. T.G.p.188 189. makes uſe of, *to ſhew that ſuch Subtilties ought not to hinder Men from doing things. Not when they are in themſelves neceſſary to be done*; but when it is a doubtful Caſe, and ſo doubtful that their moſt learned Men ſay there is danger of Idolatry either way, I do not know a more prudent Conſideration to keep a Man from the Practice of it.

§. 13. Therefore *T. G.* after all his Complaint of *mixing theſe School Diſputes*, and letting me know *what Edge-tools theſe School Diſtinctions are* (as any one might gueſs by his manner of handling them) yet at laſt he reſolves to venture upon clearing the point. 1. He ſaith, T.G.p.176 188. *The Councils declare in this matter that we are not to give Latria to Images, or the Worſhip due only to God*; and this without any Diſtinction of abſolute or relative *Latria*. 2. He confeſſes, *That St.* Thomas, p. 189. *and thoſe of his Way, do hold that the ſame Worſhip is to be given to Chriſt and to his His Image.* Can any two things appear with a face of greater Oppoſition than theſe two? *But,* ſaith *T. G. Latria is twofold, one* p. 190. *abſolute, and that is due to God himſelf; and the other Relative, that may be given to the Image: or rather, in the ſame act of Worſhip is a double Notion, the one as it tends to God himſelf, which is abſolute Latria, the other as it reflects on the Image for His Sake, which is relative Latria.* Which Diſtinction I have already examined, and ſhewed the Vanity of in ſeveral Places; and that there are many in the Church of *Rome* who hold abſolute *Latria* to be given to Images, and that upon the Grounds of a Relative Latria any Creature may be worſhipped; therefore I ſhall keep to what is proper to this Place. 1. “ I ſaid this Diſtinction is juſt as if an unchaſte Wife ſhould plead to her Husband, that the Perſon ſhe was ſo kind with, was extremely like him, and a near Friend of his, that it was out of reſpect to him, that ſhe gave him the Honour of his Bed; can any one think that ſuch an excuſe as this would be taken by a jealous Husband? How much leſs will ſuch pretences avail with that God who hath declared himſelf perticularly jealous of His Honour in this Command above others, and that he will not give *His Glory to another*, but hath reſerved all Divine Worſhip as peculiar to himſelf, and no ſuch fond excuſes of Relative Inferior, and Improper Worſhip will ſerve, when they encroach upon His Prerogative. To this *T. G.* Anſwers, *That the Object of Jealouſie is* T.G.p.180 *a Rival, or what hath Relation to or Union with Him, not what may ſerve to expreſs Affection and Reſpect to the Perſon who ought to be loved.* But I have already ſhewed, from the Confeſſion of their own Writers, and the ſenſe of the *Chriſtian Church*, that even an Image of Chriſt becomes a Rival when it hath Divine Honour given to it: and *T. G.* himſelf will not allow *Sacrifice to be offered to an Image; and he denies* T.G.p. 182 183. *from the Catholick Catechiſm* (althouh contrary to the *Catholick Practice*) *that they do pray to Images*: let us then ſuppoſe that Men do Pray and Sacrifice to the Image of Chriſt. Is all this only *like the Wifes kiſſing the Picture for the Husbands Sake?* If it be no more, it is lawful and commendable to do them according to *T. G*'s Principles; if it be more, then an Image of Chriſt may have ſuch Honour done to it as makes it an Idol, and conſequently a Rival with God for His Honour. And ſo the Diſpute comes to this, whether the Practices of the *Roman Church* in the Worſhip of Images do not imply giving Divine Honours to them: of which I have treated at large already. 2. “ By this Diſtinction Men might ſay the Lord's Prayer to Saints, or offer up the Hoſt to an Image, ſo they were done abſolutely to God, and only Relatively to the Saints or Images. *T. G.* being nettled with this, tells me in ſome Paſſion; *That I can no where* T.G.p. 189 *contain my ſelf within bounds of Mediocrity*; he ſhall ſee I can by not following his Extravagancy: but he lets me know *that the Church of God hath no ſuch Cuſtom*; I do not ask whether the *Church* of *Rome* have any ſuch Cuſtom (the Church of God I know hath not) but whether it may not have that as well as ſome others, and upon the ſame grounds of *Relative Worſhip*? But if *I muſt not underſtand this till I become a Proſelyte*, I hope I ſhall be always contented with my T. G. ib. *Ignorance*; if I can be no otherwiſe informed, I am not ſorry to ſee ſuch evidence of their *Inability* to anſwer who make ſuch *put-offs*.

§. 14. Having thus paſſed through the ſeveral *Charges* drawn up againſt me, I come in the laſt Place to conſider his *parallel Inſtances*, by which he hopes to clear and vindicate their Worſhip of Images. To his firſt about the *Chair* of *State*, and the third about the *Jews worſhipping towards the Ark* and *Cherubims*, I have anſwered already, (the fifth belongs to the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*.) There remain only three to be examined, 1. *The Reverence ſhewed to the Ground by* Moſes *and* Joſhua. 2. *The bowing at the Name of Jeſus.* 3. *The bowing towards the Altar.* If I can clear theſe from being of the ſame Nature with the worſhip of Images as allowed and practiſed in the *Roman Church*, I know no ſhadow of difficulty which remains throughout his Book.

1. *To the Reverence ſhewed to the Holy Ground where God himſelf appeared by* Moſes *and* Joſhua, *being commanded to pull off their Shooes.* I anſwered, " That (whatever *T. G.* thinks of it) there is ſome difference to be made between what God hath commanded, and what he hath forbidden; for in the caſe of *Moſes* and *Joſua*, there was an expreſs Command, but in the caſe of Image-worſhip there T.G.p.198 is as plain a Prohibition: The former part he calls *a ſhort Deſcant on the former erroneous Ground*, and the latter, *a Note above Ela*. I am glad to ſee the ſecond Commandment ſet to *Muſical Notes* among them, for I was afraid it had been quite caſt out of their *Churches*. " 2. That the ſpecial Preſence and Appearance of God doth ſanctifie a Place to ſo high a degree, that we may lawfully teſtifie our *Reverence* towards it, but this will not hold for Images, unleſs *God* be proved preſent in them, in the ſame manner as he appeared to *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, and yet even then, the *Reverence* he required was not *kiſſing* it, or *bowing* to it, much leſs *praying* to it, T. G. ib. but only *putting off their Shooes*. Upon this *T. G.* being in a Muſical Vein, ſings his *Io Pæan*; and cries out *of the wonderful force of Truth, that after long ſtanding out makes all her Adverſaries ſubmit to her Power.* I wiſh we could ſee ſuch effects of the *Power* of *Truth*; for it would ſoon rid us of many *Fears* and *Jealouſies*. But what is it I have ſaid p. 199. ſo much amiſs to gain T. G's good word? *Enough as he thinks to ruin our own Cauſe and eſtabliſh theirs.* That were indeed confuting him with a Vengeance. But what's the matter? wherein have I given up the Cauſe? I yield, *That the ſpecial Preſence and Appearance of God doth ſanctifie a Place to ſo high a degree, that we may lawfully teſtifie our Reverence towards it.* And what then? *Why then* ſaith T. G. *all my Darts which I have ſo ſpitefully thrown in the Face of the Images of Chriſt* (or the *Holy Trinity* and the *Saints*) *recoil with double force on my own Head.* How *with double force*? Nay, how doth it appear that they recoil at all? for to the beſt of my Sight they ſtick faſt where they did; and I do not by my feeling perceive they *recoil upon my Head*. *Well, but a ſubtle Logician would ask me, whether this Reverence be abſolute or Relative:* And he doth not queſtion my Anſwer would be, *That it was not to the Ground for it ſelf, but meerely out of a Reſpect to God.* Is this indeed the fatal Blow I have given the Cauſe of our Church, when I

expreſly mention a Command of God going before it? and who doubts but we may give a Reverence to Places, with reſpect to God, eſpecially when God requires it, as he did in this Caſe? And when *T. G.* hath made the moſt of this Ceremony of *pulling off the Shooes*, he will find that it was of no other Signification in the *Eaſtern Parts*, than having our Heads uncovered is with us; which is the loweſt Teſtimony of Reſpect that may be. Yet this was all which God himſelf required when he was preſent after a ſignal and extraordinary Manner: And what is all this, to the *Conſecrating*, *Bowing*, *Kneeling*, *Praying to Images*, as they do in the *Roman* Church? and this I ſay and have proved, *againſt an expreſs Command of God*; and that not upon any real, but imaginary Preſence of the true Object of Worſhip. He that cannot ſee the difference of theſe things, hath ſome Cataracts before his Eyes, which need Couching. But ſtill *T. G.* demands, *is this the ſame Reverence that is due to God, or diſtinct from it*? I ſay, it is diſtinct from it; *then*, ſaith he, *Vaſquez comes upon you with his Artillery*; *for then you expreſs your Submiſſion to an inanimate thing, that hath no kind of Excellency to deſerve it from you.* Alas poor *T. G!* how doth he argue like a Man ſpent and quite gone! That which *Vaſquez* ſaith is, *that for a Man to uſe all the Acts of Adoration to Images which are performed in the Roman Church without reſpect to the exemplar, were to expreſs our Submiſſion to an inanimate thing, which is Idolatry.* Where it is to be obſerved, that he ſpeaks of all the Acts of Worſhip which in the Church of *Rome* they give to Images, and which being given to an Image makes it Idolatry, becauſe thoſe Acts are ſuch which do imply *a Submiſſion to the thing*, *i. e.* they are the higheſt Expreſſions of Adoration; and thoſe who aſſert that Inferior Worſhip do hold it to be Internal as well as External, and to be terminated on the Images themſelves; which is the Reaſon why *Vaſquez ſaith it were Idolatry*; But *Vaſquez* was not a Man of ſo ſhallow an Underſtanding to charge this upon thoſe who declare they *put off their Shooes or Hats*, out of no *Intention or Deſign to Worſhip the Ground or Place*, but meerly to expreſs ſome outward Reverence to a Place on the account of its being Sacred to God. Thoſe who contended for that Worſhip which *Vaſquez* charges with Idolatry, did agree with him in all External Acts of Adoration to Images; and went farther than *Vaſquez* thought fit as to the Internal; for they ſaid, both ought to concurr in the Worſhip of Images, and that this inferior Worſhip was *terminated on the Images themſelves* (as I have ſhewed at large in the ſtate of the Controverſie.) Now ſaith *Vaſquez*, to aſſert and practiſe Worſhip of Images after this manner is *Idolatry*, *for it is expreſſing our Submiſſion to a meer inanimate Thing.* But do we ſay, that all Acts of Worſhip are to be performed to the Ground that is Holy; or that any one Act of Worſhip is to be terminated upon it; or that any Submiſſion of our Minds is to be uſed towards it? All theſe we utterly diſavow as to the Reverence of Sacred Places, and theſe things being declared, we yet ſay there is a Reverence left to be ſhewed them on the account of their Diſcrimination from other Places and Separation for Sacred uſes; which Reverence is beſt expreſſed in the way moſt common for Men to ſhew Reſpect by, which was putting off Shooes in the *Eaſtern Parts*, and of Hats here; (of the Difference of Reverence and Worſhip, I have ſpoken before.) I hope by this time, *T. G.* ſees a little better the force of the Argument

T.G p. 291

ment of *Vaſquez*, and how very far it is from *recoiling on my Head*, becauſe I aſſert a *Reverence to ſacred Places* to have been ſhewed by *Moſes* and *Joſhua* on the account of *God's Special Preſence:* And ſo all that inſipid Diſcourſe of Idolatry which follows, ſneaks away as being T.G.p.202 203. aſhamed to be brought in to ſo little purpoſe here; but hath been fully handled in the Firſt Part.

§. 15. 2. To his Inſtance of *Bowing at the name of Jeſus*, I anſwered, “that
“ he might as well have inſtanced in our going to Church at the tolling
“ of a *Bell*, for as the one only tells us the time when we ought to go
“ to *worſhip God*, ſo the mentioning the name of *Jeſus* doth only put us
“ in mind of him to whom we owe all manner of Reverence, without
“ diſhonouring him as the Object of our worſhip by any Image of him,
“ which can only repreſent that which is neither the Object nor reaſon
“ of our worſhip. At this Anſwer. *T. G.* is inflamed, and when he hath nothing elſe to ſay, he endeavours to ſet me *at variance with the Church of* England. This runs quite through his Book, and he takes all occaſions to ſet me forth as a cloſe and *ſecret Enemy to it*, although I appear never ſo much in its Vindication. If my Adverſaries were to be believed (as I ſee no great reaſon they ſhould be) I muſt be a very *prodigious Author* in one reſpect; for they repreſent me as a Friend to that which I write againſt, viz. *Socinianiſm*; and an *Enemy* to that which I have defended, *viz.* the *Church of England.* But wherein is it, that *T. G.* thinks me ſuch a back-friend to our *Church*? *In diſavowing* T.G.p.208 *all Reverence to the Sacred Name of Jeſus, which* he ſaith, *our Church hath enjoyned, and hath been defended by* Fulk, Whitgift, *and* B. Andrews. I am glad I know my charge, and I do not doubt to clear my ſelf to hold nothing in this or any other matter, but what the *Church* of *England* hath declared to be her ſenſe. Witneſs, as to this point, the Book of Canons, 1603, c. 18 *Declaration* of the *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops* in *Convocation*, “When in
“ time of Divine Service, the Lord Jeſus ſhall be mentioned, due and
“ lowly Reverence ſhall be done by all Perſons preſent as hath been
“ accuſtomed; teſtifying by theſe outward *ceremonies* and *geſtures*,
“ their inward *humility*, *Chriſtian Reſolution*, and due *acknowledgment*
“ *that the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the true and Eternal Son of God is the only*
“ *Saviour of the World.* Is this bowing to the very *name* of *Jeſus*, and *worſhipping* that as they do *Images*, when the *Convocation* declares that Defence of the Anſw. *tr.* 21. *c.* 7. *div.* 3. only a *ſignificant Ceremony* is intended by it. *Arch-B.* Whitgift, in the very place cited by him ſaith, *that the Chriſtians uſed it to ſignifie their faith in Jeſus; and therefore they uſed bodily reverence at all times when they heard the name of Jeſus, but eſpecially when the Goſpel was read.* Dr. *Fulk*, *Fulk* againſt *Rhem. Phil.* 2. 10. another of his Authors ſaith, *that the place alledged* by *T. G.* to prove it, *pertains to the ſubjection of all Creatures to the Judgment of Chriſt; however*, he ſaith, *the ceremony of bowing may be uſed out of Reverence to his Majeſty*; not to the bare name; *and that their Idolatrous worſhip is unfitly compared with the bowing at the name of Jeſus. Biſhop* *Andrews* *Ser.* 9. of Reſur. Speech in Star-chamb. *p.* 50. *Andrews* ſaith, *we do not bow to the name, but to the ſenſe*; which anſwers and clears all the long allegation out of him. *Archbiſhop Laud* calls it, *the Honour due to the Son of God at the mentioning of his Name*, which are almoſt the very words I uſed. And *Whittington* and *Meg* of *Weſtminſter* will altogether ſerve as well for his expreſſion as that uſed by me. But *T. G.* need not be ſo angry at my mentioning *the tolling of a Bell*, when he remembers the *Chriſtening of Bells* among them, and what mighty Power they have

after that, and what *Reverend God-fathers* they have, and what *Saints names* are given to them; ſo that I ſhould rather have thought he would have drawn an argument from the *Bells*, than have been ſo diſturbed at the naming of them. For all this *T. G.* fanſies *a ſtrange Analogy between Words and Pictures, a picture being a word to the Eye, and a word being a Picture to the Ear:* which ſounds juſt like *Whittington* to my ears: and I deſire him to conſider, that *Suarez* tells us, *that ſome of their own Divines ſay, no worſhip is due to any Name, becauſe they ſignifie only by impoſition, and do not ſupply the place of the thing repreſented as Images do: of which opinion,* he ſaith, *Soto* and *Corduba* are: and *Suarez* himſelf grants, *that a name being a tranſient ſound can hardly be apprehended as conjoyned with the Perſon, or the Perſon in it, ſo as to be worſhipped together with it*; And one of their lateſt *Ritualiſts* ſaith, *that when the name of Jeſus is mentioned they bow to the Crucifix*; which ſhews that even among them, they do not think the *Name* of *Jeſus* equal to an *Image* of *Chriſt*.

Suarez in 3 p. Th. q. 25. diſp. 54. art. 3. ſect. 6.

Paul. Maria Quarti in Rubr. Miſſæ p. 264, 266.

§. 16.

T.G.p.218

I am now come to his laſt Inſtance, viz. *bowing towards the Altar*; he would inſinuate, as though the *Church* of *England were for giving ſome kind of worſhip to the Altar, although under the degree of Divine Worſhip due to God alone*; and ſaith, *that as the allowing this would render me a true Son of the Church of* England, *ſo the allowing the like to the ſacred Images of Chriſt would make me in this point, a perfect Proſelyte of the Church of* Rome. Which is in effect to ſay, that the *Church* of *England*, in allowing *bowing to the Altar*, doth give the very *ſame worſhip* to it, which their *Church* requires to be *given to Images*; and that they who do one and not the other, do not attend to the *Conſequence* of their own *Actions*. I ſhall therefore ſhew. 1. That the *Church* of *England* doth not allow *any worſhip* to be given *to the Altar*. 2. That the adoration allowed and practiſed in the *Church* of *England* is of a very different *Nature* from the Worſhip of Images.

1. That the *Church* of *England* doth not allow any Worſhip to be given to the *Altar*. For this I appeal to that *Canon* wherein is contained the Explication of the ſenſe of our Church in this particular: "Whereas the Church is the Houſe of God, dedicated to his Holy "Worſhip, and therefore ought to mind us, both of the Greatneſs and "Goodneſs of his Divine Majeſty, certain it is that the acknowledgment "thereof, not only inwardly in our hearts, but alſo outwardly with our "bodies, muſt needs be pious in it ſelf, profitable unto us, and edifying "unto others. We therefore think it very meet and behooveful, "and heartily commend it to all good and well affected People, mem- "bers of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the "ſaid acknowledgment, by doing Reverence and obeyſance both at "their coming in and going out of the ſaid Churches, Chancels, or "Chappels, according to the moſt ancient Cuſtom of the Primitive "Church in the pureſt times, and of this Church alſo for many "years of the Reign of Q. *Elizabeth*. The reviving therefore of this "ancient and laudable cuſtom, we heartily commend to the ſerious "conſideration of all good People, NOT WITH ANY IN- "TENTION TO EXHIBITE ANY RELIGIOUS "WORSHIP TO THE COMMUNION TABLE, "THE EAST OR THE CHURCH, or any thing therein contained in ſo doing, or to perform the ſaid geſture in the Celebration of the Holy Euchriſt, upon any Opinion of the CORPORAL

Canons and Conſtit. c. 7. 1640.

ment of *Vaſquez*, and how very far it is from *recoiling on my Head*,
becauſe I aſſert a *Reverence to ſacred Places* to have been ſhewed by *Moſes*
and *Joſhua* on the account of *God's Special Preſence*: And ſo all that
inſipid Diſcourſe of Idolatry which follows, ſneaks away as being
*TG.p.*202 203. aſhamed to be brought in to ſo little purpoſe here; but hath been
fully handled in the Firſt Part.

§. 15. 2. To his Inſtance of *Bowing at the name of Jeſus*, I anſwered, "that
" he might as well have inſtanced in our going to Church at the tolling
" of a *Bell*, for as the one only tells us the time when we ought to go
" to *worſhip God*, ſo the mentioning the name of *Jeſus* doth only put us
" in mind of him to whom we owe all manner of Reverence, without
" diſhonouring him as the Object of our worſhip by any Image of him,
" which can only repreſent that which is neither the Object nor reaſon
" of our worſhip. At this Anſwer. *T. G.* is inflamed, and when he
hath nothing elſe to ſay, he endeavours to ſet me *at variance with the*
Church of England. This runs quite through his Book, and he takes
all occaſions to ſet me forth as a cloſe and *ſecret Enemy to it*, although I
appear never ſo much in its Vindication. If my Adverſaries were to
be believed (as I ſee no great reaſon they ſhould be) I muſt be a very
prodigious Author in one reſpect; for they repreſent me as a Friend to
that which I write againſt, viz. *Socinianiſm*; and an *Enemy* to that
which I have defended, *viz.* the *Church* of *England*. But wherein is
it, that *T. G.* thinks me ſuch a back-friend to our *Church*? *In diſavowing*
T.G.p.208 *all Reverence to the Sacred Name of Jeſus, which* he ſaith, *our Church*
hath enjoyned, and hath been defended by Fulk, Whitgift, *and B.* Andrews.
I am glad I know my charge, and I do not doubt to clear my
ſelf to hold nothing in this or any other matter, but what the *Church*
Book of Canons, 1603, c.18 of *England* hath declared to be her ſenſe. Witneſs, as to this point, the
Declaration of the *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops* in *Convocation*, "When in
" time of Divine Service, the Lord Jeſus ſhall be mentioned, due and
" lowly Reverence ſhall be done by all Perſons preſent as hath been
" accuſtomed; teſtifying by theſe outward *ceremonies* and *geſtures*,
" their inward *humility*, *Chriſtian Reſolution*, and due *acknowledgment*
" *that the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the true and Eternal Son of God is the only*
" *Saviour of the World*. Is this bowing to the very *name* of *Jeſus*, and
worſhipping that as they do *Images*, when the *Convocation* declares that
Defence of the Anſw. *tr.* 21. *c.* 7. *div.* 3. only a *ſignificant Ceremony* is intended by it. *Arch-B.* Whitgift, in the
very place cited by him ſaith, *that the Chriſtians uſed it to ſignifie their*
faith in Jeſus; *and therefore they uſed bodily reverence at all times when they*
heard the name of Jeſus, but eſpecially when the Goſpel was read. Dr. *Fulk*,
Fulk againſt *Rhem. Phil.*2.10. another of his Authors ſaith, *that the place alledged* by *T. G.* to prove it,
pertains to the ſubjection of all Creatures to the Judgment of Chriſt; *however*,
he ſaith, *the ceremony of bowing may be uſed out of Reverence to his Majeſty*;
not to the bare name; *and that their Idolatrous worſhip is unfitly compared*
Andrews Ser. 9. of Reſur. Speech in Star-chamb. *p.* 50. *with the bowing at the name of Jeſus.* *Biſhop Andrews* ſaith, *we do not bow*
to the name, but to the ſenſe; which anſwers and clears all the long allegation
out of him. *Archbiſhop Laud* calls it, *the Honour due to the Son of*
God at the mentioning of his Name, which are almoſt the very words I
uſed. And *Whittington* and *Meg* of *Weſtminſter* will altogether ſerve
as well for his expreſſion as that uſed by me. But *T. G.* need not be
ſo angry at my mentioning *the tolling of a Bell*, when he remembers the
Chriſtening of Bells among them, and what mighty Power they have
after

after that, and what *Reverend God-fathers* they have, and what *Saints names* are given to them; ſo that I ſhould rather have thought he would have drawn an argument from the *Bells*, than have been ſo diſturbed at the naming of them. For all this *T. G.* fanſies *a ſtrange Analogy between Words and Pictures, a picture being a word to the Eye, and a word being a Picture to the Ear:* which ſounds juſt like *Whittington* to my ears: and I deſire him to conſider, that *Suarez* tells us, *that ſome of their own Divines ſay, no worſhip is due to any Name, becauſe they ſignifie only by impoſition, and do not ſupply the place of the thing repreſented as Images do: of which opinion,* he ſaith, *Soto* and *Corduba* are: and *Suarez* himſelf grants, *that a name being a tranſient ſound can hardly be apprehended as conjoyned with the Perſon, or the Perſon in it, ſo as to be worſhipped together with it;* And one of their lateſt *Ritualiſts* ſaith, *that when the name of Jeſus is mentioned they bow to the Crucifix;* which ſhews that even among them, they do not think the *Name* of *Jeſus* equal to an *Image* of *Chriſt*.

Suarez in 3 p. Th. q. 25. diſp. 54. art. 3. ſect. 6.

Paul. Maria Quarti in Rubr. Miſſæ p. 264, 266.

§. 16. I am now come to his laſt Inſtance, viz. *bowing towards the Altar;* he would inſinuate, as though the *Church* of *England were for giving ſome kind of worſhip to the Altar, although under the degree of Divine Worſhip due to God alone;* and ſaith, *that as the allowing this would render me a true Son of the Church of* England, *ſo the allowing the like to the ſacred Images of Chriſt would make me in this point, a perfect Proſelyte of the Church of* Rome. Which is in effect to ſay, that the *Church* of *England*, in allowing *bowing to the Altar*, doth give the very *ſame worſhip* to it, which their *Church* requires to be *given to Images*; and that they who do one and not the other, do not attend to the *Conſequence* of their own *Actions*. I ſhall therefore ſhew. 1. That the *Church* of *England* doth not allow *any worſhip* to be given *to the Altar*. 2. That the adoration allowed and practiſed in the *Church* of *England* is of a very different *Nature* from the Worſhip of Images.

T. G. p. 218

1. That the *Church* of *England* doth not allow any Worſhip to be given to the *Altar*. For this I appeal to that *Canon* wherein is contained the Explication of the ſenſe of our Church in this particular:
“ Whereas the Church is the Houſe of God, dedicated to his Holy
“ Worſhip, and therefore ought to mind us, both of the Greatneſs and
“ Goodneſs of his Divine Majeſty, certain it is that the acknowledgment
“ thereof, not only inwardly in our hearts, but alſo outwardly with our
“ bodies, muſt needs be pious in it ſelf, profitable unto us, and edifying
“ unto others. We therefore think it very meet and behooveful,
“ and heartily commend it to all good and well affected People, members
“ of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the
“ ſaid acknowledgment, by doing Reverence and obeyſance both at
“ their coming in and going out of the ſaid Churches, Chancels, or
“ Chappels, according to the moſt ancient Cuſtom of the Primitive
“ Church in the pureſt times, and of this Church alſo for many
“ years of the Reign of Q. *Elizabeth*. The reviving therefore of this
“ ancient and laudable cuſtom, we heartily commend to the ſerious
“ conſideration of all good People, NOT WITH ANY INTENTION
“ TO EXHIBITE ANY RELIGIOUS
“ WORSHIP TO THE COMMUNION TABLE,
“ THE EAST OR THE CHURCH, or any thing therein contained in ſo doing, or to perform the ſaid geſture in the Celebration of the Holy Euchriſt, upon any Opinion of the CORPORAL PRE-

Canons and Conſtit. c. 7. 1640.

PRESENCE OF THE BODY OF JESUS CHRIST ON THE HOLY TABLE, OR IN THE MYSTICAL ELEMENTS, but ONLY ſor the advancement of Gods Majeſty, and to give him ALONE that honour and glory that is due unto him and NO OTHERWISE. And in the practice or omiſſion of this Rite, we deſire that the Rule of charity preſcribed by the Apoſtle may be obſerved, which is, That they which uſe this Rite deſpiſe not them who uſe it not, and they who uſe it not, condemn not thoſe that uſe it. This is the full Declaration of the ſenſe of our Church about it, made by thoſe who met in *Convocation*, Speech in Star-Chamber. p. 43. and were moſt zealous for the practice of it. Agreeably to this *Archbiſhop Laud* ſpeaks, when this was charged as an *Innovation*; *To this I anſwer*, ſaith he, Firſt, *That God forbid that we ſhould worſhip any thing but God himſelf.* 2. *That if to worſhip God when we enter into his Houſe, or approach his Altar be an Innovation, it was a very old one, being practiſed by* p. 46. Jacob, Moſes, Hezekiah, *&c.* *And were this Kingdom ſuch, as would allow no Holy Table ſtanding in its proper place, yet I would worſhip God when* p. 47. *I came into his Houſe.* And afterwards he calls it, *doing Reverence to Almighty God, but towards his Altar: and Idolatry it is not to worſhip God towards his Holy Table.* p. 48. *Now with us the People did ever underſtand them* p. 52. *fully and apply them to God, and to none but God.* From whence it appears that God is looked on as the *Sole Object* of this *Act* of *Worſhip*, and that our *Church* declares, that it allows no *intention* of *exhibiting any Religious worſhip to the Communion Table*, or *Eaſt*, or *Church*, or any *Corporal Preſence of Chriſt*.

2. That the adoration allowed and practiſed in the *Church* of *England*, is of a very different nature from the worſhip of Images. For, (as I have fully made it appear in the *State* of the *Controverſie*) the *Church* of *Rome* doth by the *Decrees* of *Councils*, require *Religious worſhip to be given to Images*; and that thoſe who aſſert *this inferiour worſhip* do yet declare it to be *truly Religious worſhip*, and that the *Image themſelves* are the *Object* of it: (whereas our Church declares point-blank the contrary) nay, that thoſe *Perſons* are looked on by the *Generality* of *Divines* in the *Roman Church*, as ſuſpected at leaſt, if not condemned of *Hereſie*, who practiſe all the *external acts of adoration* to *Images*, but yet do not in their minds look on them as *Objects*, but only as *Occaſions* of *Worſhip*, which make the difference ſo plain in theſe two caſes, that *T. G.* himſelf could not but diſcern it.

But to remove all ſcruple from mens minds, that ſupect this practice to be too near the *Idolatrous worſhip*, which we reject in the *Roman Church*, I ſhall conſider it not only as to its *Object* (which is the main thing, and which I have ſhewed to be the *proper Object* of *worſhip*, viz. *God* himſelf, and nothing elſe) but as to the *nature* of the *Act*, and the *local circumſtance* of doing it *towards the Altar*. 1. As to the *nature* of the *Act*, ſo it is declared to be *an Act of external adoration of God*; which I ſhall prove from *Scripture* to be a *Lawful* and proper *Act* of *Divine Worſhip*. I might prove it from the general *conſent* of *Mankind*, who have expreſſed their *Reverence* to the *Deity* by *Acts* of *external adoration*, from whence I called it a *natural Act of Reverence*, but I rather chooſe to do it from *Scripture*; and that, both before the *Law* had determined ſo punctually the *matters* of *Divine Worſhip*, and *under the Law* by thoſe who had the greateſt regard to it; and *under the Goſpel*, when the *Spiritual Nature* of its Doctrine would ſeem to have ſuperſeded ſuch exter-

nal Acts of Worſhip. 1. *Before the Law*, I inſtance in *Abraham's ſervant*;
becauſe *Abraham* is particularly commended for his care in inſtructing
his *Houſhold to keep the way of the Lord* in oppoſition to *Heathen Idolatry*, Gen. 18.
and this was the *Chief Servant* of his Houſe, of whom it is ſaid three 19.
times in one Chapter, *That he bowed his head worſhipping the Lord*; the Gen. 24.
Hebrew words ſignifie, and *he inclined and bowed himſelf to the Lord*; for 26,48,52.
the word we tranſlate worſhip doth properly ſignifie *to bow*, and both
the *Jews* and others ſay, *It relates to ſome external act of the body, whereby* Pet. Pichte-
we expreſs our inward Reverence or Subjection to another. So it is ſaid of the rell de
People of *Iſrael*, when they heard that the Lord intended to deliver Imag.
them out of *Egypt*, *They bowed their heads and worſhipped*; when *Moſes* p. 225.
declared the *Inſtitution* of the *Paſſover* to all the *Elders* of *Iſrael*, it is Exod. 4.
ſaid again, *The People bowed their heads and worſhipped*. 2. *Under the Law*; 31.
when they were ſo ſtrictly forbidden in the ſame words *to bow down or* 12. 27.
worſhip any Image or ſimilitude; yet the outward *Act* of *Adoration* towards
God was *allowed* and *practiſed*. So *Moſes* commanded *Aaron* and the *ſeventy*
Elders of *Iſrael* to *bow themſelves afar off*; the very ſame word 24. 1.
which is uſed in the *ſecond Commandment*. And when God had ſo
ſeverely puniſhed the Iſraelites *for bowing to the Golden Calf*; yet when
He appointed the *Pillar* of *Fire* for the *Symbol* of His *own preſence*, it is 32. 8.
ſaid, *That when all the People ſaw the Cloudy Pillar ſtand at the Tabernacle*
door, they roſe up and bowed themſelves every man in his Tent-door. When 33. 10.
God appeared to *Moſes*, it is ſaid, *That he made haſt and bowed his head toward*
the earth and worſhipped. And when *Moſes* and *Aaron* came to the 34. 8.
door of the *Tabernacle* of the *Congregation*, they are ſaid *to fall upon their* Numb. 20.
faces. In the time of *David*, upon his ſolemn thankſgiving to *God* it is 6.
ſaid, *All the Congregation bleſſed the Lord God of their Fathers, and bowed* 1 Chron.
down their heads, and worſhipped the Lord and the King. And in the time 29. 20.
of *Hezekiah*, *When they had made an end of offering, the King and all that* 2 Chron.
were preſent with him bowed their heads and worſhipped. 3. *Under the Goſpel*, 29. 29.
we are to obſerve the difference between the ſame *external act of worſhip*,
when it was uſed towards *Chriſt* and towards His *Apoſtles*.
When the *Syrophœnician Woman* came to our *Saviour*, in one place it is
ſaid, *She worſhipped Him*; and in another, *That ſhe fell at His feet*; but Matth. 15. 25.
in no place is there the leaſt mention of any check given to her or any Mark 7.
others, who after that manner *worſhipped Chriſt*: But when *Cornelius* 25.
came to S. *Peter*, and *fell down at his feet and worſhipped him*, he would Acts 10.
by no means permit it, but ſaid, *Stand up, I my ſelf alſo am a man*: 25, 26.
And when S. *John fell down at the feet of the Angel*, he would not ſuffer it, Revel. 19.
but bade him worſhip God. That which I obſerve from hence is, that 10. 22. 9.
even under the *Goſpel* the *external acts of Religious adoration* are *proper* and
peculiar to *God*, ſo that men are to blame when they give them to any
Creature, but no *Perſons* are condemned for giving them to *God*. And
I deſire thoſe who ſcruple the *lawfulneſs* of *giving to God ſuch external adoration*
under the Goſpel, how they can condemn thoſe for *Idolatry*, who
give it to any *Creature*, if it be not a thing which doth ſtill belong to
God.

But if all the ſcruple be about the *directing* this *Adoration*, one way more than another, I ſay ſtill *it is done in conformity with the Primitive Church*, as our *Canon* declares, and which every one knows, *did worſhip towards the Eaſt*; and this at the moſt is but a *local circumſtance* of an *Act* of *Worſhip*, which I have already ſhewed to be very different from an *Object* of it, when I diſcourſed of the *Nature* of the *Iſraelites worſhipping toward the Ark and the Cherubims.*

Thus, through the Aſſiſtance of God I have gone through all the material points of *T. G*'s *Book*, which relate to the *General Nature* of *Idolatry*; and have diligently weighed and conſidered every thing that looketh like a *difficulty* in this *Controverſie* about the *Worſhip* of *Images*, and do here ſincerely proteſt, that I have not given any *Anſwer*, or delivered any *Opinion* which is not agreeable not only to the inward *ſenſe* of my *Mind*, but to the beſt of my underſtanding to the *ſenſe* of *Scripture*, and the *Primitive Church*, and the *Church* of *England*. And if the *ſubtilties* of *T. G.* could have ſatisfied me, or any other Argument I have met with, I would as freely have retracted this *Charge* of *Idolatry*, as I ever made it. For I do not love to repreſent *others* worſe than they are; but I daily pray to *God* to make both my ſelf and *others* better: and therein I know I have the hearty concurrence of all who are truly *Good.*

FINIS.

AN
ANSWER
TO
Mr. CRESSY's Epiſtle Apologetical
TO A
Perſon of Honour,
Touching his
VINDICATION
OF
Dr. Stillingfleet.

TO THE
SUPERIOURS
OF THE
Benedictines in *ENGLAND.*

Gentlemen,

I *Find it diſputed among your* Caſuiſts, *whether a* Book *written by a* Member *of Your* Order, *doth belong to the* Author *or to the* Society; *the Arguments, I confeſs, are very weighty on both ſides: For in behalf of the* Society *it is pleaded with great reaſon, that by the* Rules *of your* Order, *no particular* Member *is to have* property *in any thing; and in behalf of the* Author, *that a Book being the proper iſſue of his own Brain, cannot belong to any one elſe:* Caramuel, *finding the difficulties ſo great, undertakes to reſolve the* Caſe *by a very ſubtle diſtinction of the* Paper *and* Ink *of which the Book is compoſed, and the* Conceptions *of the Mind contained therein; the former he gives to the* Society, *and the latter to the* Author, *which he proves very ſubſtantially;* for, *ſaith he,* the Conceptions of the Book being the outward Images of what was only in the Mind of the Author can belong to no other

Caramuel. Comment. in Regul. S. Bened. n. 831.

ther than to him that formed them ; *but againſt this ariſeth a ſhrewd Objection, that by this means every Man hath right to the* Picture *that is made of him, and the Painter only to the* Canvas *and* Colours. *To which he anſwers very gravely,* That the Picture is not properly the immediate repreſentation of the Perſon, but of that Idea of him which was in the fancy of the Painter. *But upon this another Controverſie ariſes (as we find every Day that one doth beget another) whether that* propriety *which the Author hath in the* Conceptions *of his Book, can be diſpoſed of by way of* Legacy, *or no ; and all the reſolution I can meet with is, that it is* probable *he may ; but on the other ſide, the* Superiours *of the* Order *may make uſe of the contrary* probability, *and challenge the* Book *for their own.*

It is very well known to You, that Mr. Creſſy *was lately a* Member *of Your* Order, *who was the* Author *of the Book, to which this following Anſwer is made ; What* Right *You have challenged in it, I know not, but I think it not likely he ſhould diſpoſe of it to any but to Your ſelves ; ſince he ſaith, his firſt Writing againſt me was by his Superiours Command, and in this Book he declares,* That what he Writes was not his own Opinion alone ; *and therefore 'tis probable You may have ſome Right to the Conceptions, as well as to the Paper and Ink.*

Since his Death (which I knew not of till I had undertaken this Service and Duty in behalf of a Perſon *of* Honour, *to whoſe Kindneſs I am ſo extreamly obliged) I know not to whom ſo properly to addreſs my ſelf, as to You, who were his* Superiours ; *eſpecially ſince there are ſo many things in it wherein the* Honour *of Your* Order *is concerned ; to which I aſſure You I bear no Malice, no more than I do to Your Perſons, or to Mr.* Creſſy's *Memory. If I am guilty of Miſtakes, I beſeech You to correct them with the ſame Civility that I writ them. I have of ſo late been ſomewhat uſed to Writing, but I am yet to learn the Art and Terms of Railing, and I hope I ſhall not find that any ſuch* Legacies *are bequeath'd to You by any of Your Order.* I am

Gentlemen,

London, Nov.
14. 1674.

Your Humble Servant,

Edw. Stillingfleet.

TO

TO

My Lord Cornbury.

My Lord,

SINCE *Your Lordſhips* going from *London*, Mr. *Creſſy's Epiſtle Apologetical to a* Perſon *of Honour, touching his Vindication of Dr.* Stillingfleet *came to my hands*; and bears date, *from his Cell, March* 21. *A. D.* 1674. *being the Anniverſary day of* S. Benedict. And he is not only thus punctual in the date of his *Epiſtle*, but he begins it with a very particular Account, in what manner the *Perſon* of *Honour*'s Book was ſent to him; viz. *by the Letter-Poſt, but partly to abate Charges, and likewiſe to diſguiſe the ſhape of a Book, it was folded up in looſe ſheets, with all the Margins cloſe pared to the very quick.* After I had obſerved ſo much *niceneſs* in theſe, not very material Circumſtances, I could hardly expect that the leaſt Line of the Book ſhould eſcape without numbering the Words, Syllables and Letters in it, and giving every one a diſtinct and punctual Confutation. But I ſoon found ſeveral conſiderable Parts gently paſſed over, and indeed by the very bulk of his Book, I preſently perceived, that he was more curious to give the World an account, how the other came to him, than careful to anſwer it. For if he had treated every thing that was of like Moment with equal Exactneſs, it might very well have paſſed for the *Second Tome* of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*. And in truth, the Matter of ſome part of it is not much unlike, for he tells ſo long a Story in the middle of it, *of the Kindneſs of ſome and the Unkindneſs of others in* England *to him, and of the Books he had written*, that it look'd very like a *Legend* of himſelf; only I do not find any *Miracles* he had done in any of them.

Before he comes to his *Apology* for himſelf, he takes great care to make me underſtand the mighty Obligation laid upon me by that *Perſon* of *Honour*, who was pleaſed with ſo much *Kindneſs* to undertake my Vindication from the impetuous Aſſaults of an enraged Adverſary. Which I was ſo juſtly ſenſible of before, that Mr. *Creſſy* might have ſpared his Pains; for ſurely it was no ſmall Favour to be delivered from the Paws of ſo fierce a Creature, as he appeared to be in his former Book; but to have it done in ſo obliging a manner, by a *Perſon* of ſo great *Honour* and *Abilities*, was as much beyond my Preſumption to hope for, as it is now above my Power to requite. I wiſh I were a Perſon of that *Credit* and *Intereſt* to be able to expreſs my Gratitude in that very way Mr. *Creſſy* directs me to; for of all things I deſire to avoid *the odious Cha-*

racter and Brand of Ingratitude. But ſince I make ſo ſmall a Figure in publick Affairs, the utmoſt I can do, is to ſave that *Honourable Perſon* the farther trouble of making *Animadverſions* on this *Epiſtle Apologetical.* Which is written with that ſhew of Humility and Reſpect, that thoſe who look only on the appearance, would imagine him ſtrangely come off from the Rage and Fury he was in, when he writ his former Book; but if we obſerve more carefully his ſly Reflections and crafty Inſinuations, we ſhall find that he hath only learnt to diſſemble his Paſſion, and to do the ſame Miſchief with a fawning Countenance.

The firſt part of his *Epiſtle* is wholly ſpent in *Vindication* of himſelf, as to the *ſharpneſs of Style* and bitter *Invectives* he had uſed againſt me, which I ſhall briefly conſider before I come to the more material parts of his Book.

AN

AN ANSWER TO Mr. CRESSY's Epiſtle Apologetical TO A Perſon of Honour, &c.

CHAP. I.

Of **Mr.** Creſſy'*s Apology for the ſharpneſs of his Style.*

§. 1. MR. *Creſſy* in his Preface to *Sancta Sophia,* finding it Preface n. 33. p. 23. neceſſary to put ſome ſhew of difference between the Pretences to extraordinary Illuminations in *F. Baker*'s way, and thoſe of the *Fanatick Sectaries* among us, hath unhappily pitched upon this for one of them; *That the lights here deſired and prayed for, are ſuch as do expel all Images of Creatures, and do calm all manner of Paſſions, to the end, that the Soul being in a vacuity, may be more capable of receiving and entertaining God in the pure fund of the Spirit.* Could any one after theſe words, have expected to have found this recommender of *Myſtical Divinity,* foaming and raging with the violence of Paſſion; and ſo tormented with the *creatures* of his own *imagination,* that he could not forbear expreſſing it to that degree in his *Book,* as deſerved rather the pity, than the anſwer of his Adverſary? This the *Perſon* of *Honour* took juſt notice of, in the beginning of his *excellent Diſcourſe,* "and wondered what inſupportable Provocation was given to him, P. 7. "that he could not reſtrain ſo free a vent of his unmanly Paſſions; "but upon an impartial view of the Places in my *Book,* at which "Mr. *Creſſy* was ſo highly offended, he did at firſt rather think he was "not the *Author* of the *Book* he anſwers, than that he ſhould be guilty P. 17, 19, 20. "of ſo much bitterneſs and unreaſonable Paſſion: But when the reaſons were ſo many to convince him, that he was the *Author,* he had "rather ſtill lay the fault of his manner of writing upon the Commands "of his *Superiours,* than his own Temper and Inclination. Upon this Mr. *Creſſy* makes many Apologies *for the ſharpneſs of his ſtyle againſt me*; and ſpins out a great part of his *Epiſtle* on this *Subject*; which he Epiſtle Apologetical, ſect. 1. 2, 3, from p. 6. to p. 39. needed not to have done, with any regard to me, as though I were concerned at it; for I aſſure him, if I would wiſh an Adverſary to write ſo, as to do the leaſt Prejudice to me, and the greateſt to himſelf

ſelf and his Cauſe, I would wiſh him to write juſt after that Copy; and I cannot eaſily think of a Provocation great enough to make me follow his Example. But he pleads for himſelf, *that Charity itſelf ſometimes requires ſharpneſs of ſtyle, and even bitter* (that is uncharitable) *Invectives.* P. 6. I ſuppoſe he means ſuch a ſort of *Catholick Charity*, as firſt *damns* us, and then brings *railing accuſations* againſt us: And I do not queſtion, but he that pleads for *bitter Invectives* out of meer *Charity*, could make as fine an harangue to ſhew not only the admirable *Charity*, but even the *Mercy* of Fire and Faggot: And he knows the *charitable* Method of the *Inquiſition* is, firſt to put on the *Sanbenits*, repreſenting the Perſons with *Pictures* of *Devils* upon them, and then to carry them to execution. I remember I have read, that *Machiavil*'s Son being ſummoned to appear before the *Court* of *Inquiſition*, to anſwer to ſome things laid to his Charge; the grave *Inquiſitors* asked him, *Whether he believed as the Church believed*; he anſwer'd, *Yes, and a great deal more*; at which they were not a little pleaſed, hoping to get from his own Words enough to condemn him; and asking him, *What that was which he believed more than the Church believed*, he gravely told them, it was, *That their Worſhips Informers were a pack of Knaves.* So indeed I ſhould think that I believed *more than their Church believed*, ſhould I believe that they damn us out of meer charity, and write bitter Invectives for a demonſtration of their Kindneſs. Alas! how hath the World been miſtaken in them! Their Cruelty is meer Pity; their Invectives, Compaſſion; and their Railing, Charity.

§. 2. But Mr. *Creſſy* wants not great Examples for this; for he brings in no meaner than *of* Moſes *and the Prophets, St.* John Baptiſt, P. 7. *Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and ſeveral Fathers of the Church for it.* It ſeems then, the practice of railing hath Antiquity, Univerſality, and Conſent for it; which is much more than they can ſhew for many other of their Practices; and which is the greateſt wonder of all, they have *Scripture* too; and that, not one ſingle paſſage, like *Hoc eſt corpus meum*; but *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, nay, St. *John Baptiſt* too, do all *bear witneſs* to it. Any one would think, if Mr. *Creſſy* ſay true, the Bible were the railingeſt Book in the World. What, not *Moſes the meekeſt Man upon Earth*, forbear 1 Pet. 2. 23 ſuch *bitter Invectives?* Not our *Bleſſed Saviour*, who *when he was reviled, reviled not again*; *when he ſuffered, he threatned not, but committed himſelf to him that judgeth righteouſly!* Not he who hath threatned Hell-fire to him that uſes contumelious Expreſſions againſt his Brother! Mat. 25. 2. Such as *Zani*, or *Scarron*, or the like. Not he, who bids his 11. 29. Diſciples *learn meekneſs from him*, and was the moſt incomparable Pattern of it, that ever appeared in humane nature! Not his *holy Apoſtles*, who charge all Chriſtians *to put away bitterneſs and wrath, and* Eph. 4. 31. *anger, and clamour, and evil ſpeaking!* And would they indeed, do that themſelves, which they ſo ſeverely forbid in others? Where is Mr. *Creſſy's Charity* for them the mean while? While he produces theſe examples to juſtifie his own bitterneſs, he makes the moſt bitter Invective not only againſt them, but even *Chriſtianity* it ſelf. But what will not Men do, or ſay, to juſtifie their violent Paſſions? If he had ſtabbed me, he might as well have made *Phinehas* his Precedent; and if he had curſed me, have quoted ſome Paſſages in the

Pſalms for it. If *Moſes* was ſo *angry* that he brake the *Tables of the* Exod. 32. 19. *Law*; doth Mr. *Creſſy* think, it was at any that ſpake againſt the *Idolatry of the Golden Calf?* no, it was at thoſe who committed it; and it is probable he might have been ſo, at thoſe who would have ſtruck the *ſecond Commandment* out of thoſe *Tables*, or eluded the *force* of it by vain and idle Diſtinctions. The great anger of the *Prophets* was againſt thoſe who drew the People to Idolatry: And Mr. *Creſſy* is ſo pertinent in his Proofs, as to bring this to juſtifie his rage againſt me, *for writing againſt the Idolatry of the Roman Church*; for ſo much he expreſſes in ſeveral Places. *Our Saviour* and St. *John Baptiſt* P, 11. 12, 13, 15, 16. do expreſs great Zeal againſt the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*: But let Mr. *Creſſy* conſider, they were a ſort of ſowre, ill-natured Hypocrites, that would allow none a good Word, nor ſo much as *hopes* of *ſalvation* that were not of their way; that were full of Malice and Envy, and all evil Paſſions, and at the ſame time pretended highly to *mortification* and more *devotion* than others. I find nothing like *Invectives* in all the *Writings* of the *holy Apoſtles*; unleſs it were againſt the *oppoſers*, or *corrupters* of *Chriſtianity*; and when Mr. *Creſſy* proves me to be *guilty* of either of thoſe, I will lay my ſelf open to the Darts of the moſt Venomous Tongue among them. But inſtead of that, I know no other cauſe in any Books I have written, that ſhould expoſe me to the rage of theſe Men, beſide the Zeal I have therein diſcover'd for the *honour* and *purity* of the Chriſtian Religion, againſt the Fopperies and Corruptions of the *Roman Church*. And for ſuch a Cauſe as this, I am prepared to ſuffer whatever their Fury and Malice can raiſe up againſt me. This, this is the *Cauſe*, which I hope I ſhould not be aſhamed nor afraid to own and defend, although Mr. *Creſſy's Power* were as great as his *Charity*. The *Church* of *England* I do from my Heart honour and eſteem, (notwithſtanding all the baſe Suggeſtions of Mr. *Creſſy* to the contrary, even in this *Epiſtle Apologetical*,) but I do therefore ſo much eſteem it, becauſe in it the Chriſtian Religion is preſerved free from the frantick heats of Enthuſiaſm and the Dotages of Superſtition. If they will undertake to convince me, that the things I condemn in the *Church* of *Rome*, were any parts of the Chriſtian Religion delivered by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, I ſhall diligently weigh and conſider whatever they have to ſay; but if they only give hard Words, and betray impotent Paſſions; if they ſhuffle and ſhew tricks inſtead of Reaſoning; if all their *charity* towards me lies only in *bitter Invectives*, they will do but little good upon me, and I think not much to their own Cauſe.

§. 3. But I am miſtaken all this while, Mr. *Creſſy* doth not write P. 7. this *Apology* to give me ſatisfaction, but the *Perſon* of *Honour*, and the *genuine Learned Proteſtant Clergy of the* Engliſh *Church*; *and if theſe*, he ſaith, *after impartial conſidering the motives and grounds of his invectives ſhall determine, that in his late, to him* (alas!) *unuſual manner of treating with me, he hath offended againſt Chriſtian Charity, or purpoſely intended to fix any diſhonourable brand on the* Engliſh *Proteſtant Church or Diſcipline of it eſtabliſhed by Law, he will be ready without any reply to ſuffer whatſoever cenſure or puniſhment they ſhall think fit to inflict upon him.* What! *no offence againſt Chriſtian Charity* to charge Mr. Creſſ. Epiſtle Dedicatory. me *with deriding and blaſpheming the Saints in glory*; with *having a hatred horribly poiſonous againſt the Catholick Church militant, and that*

will

P. 35. *will not ſpare the Church Triumphant:* no offence at all, to call me
Theological Scarron, and to ſay, *that I act the Theological Zani*; that
P. 52. *all my Book, except twenty or thirty Pages, conſiſts of ſcurrilous Buffoonries,*
petulant Revilings of Gods Saints; and in effect by his *Epigram* out of
Martial, to charge me with downright Atheiſm; and twice in the
P. 12. ſame Paſſage with *impiouſly and profanely employed Wit:* none at all, to
Poſtſcript. p. 181. ſay, *That I had a Heart brimful of the Gall of Bitterneſs; that I writ*
P. 2. *with Ink full of Gall and Poyſon; that I gave free ſcope to all unchriſtian*
P. 3. *and even inhumane Paſſions; that my Book wholly compoſed of malignant*
Epiſt. dedic. *Paſſions, and new invented Calumnies againſt Gods Church, was only the*
private deſign of a malicious Brain, on purpoſe to feed the exulcerated
Preface to the Reader. *Minds of a malevolent Party among us; that, all the Weapons I make uſe*
of, pierce into the very Bowels of the Perſons, Fortunes and Condition of
Engliſh *Catholicks, whoſe deſtruction I ſeem to deſign.* What! none at
all, to charge me ſo often *with prevaricating with the Church of* England,
and deſigning to deſtroy her, under a pretence of defending her!
Theſe are ſome of the *Flowers* of Mr. *Creſſy's Charity* towards me,
which I have picked out of ſome few Pages of his *Book*; and he hath
taken abundant care to prevent any unlikeneſs in the parts of it.
And doth Mr. *Creſſy* in good earneſt think, it is no breach of *Chriſtian Charity* to charge me upon ſuch pitiful Grounds, with no leſs
than carrying on Blaſphemous, Atheiſtical, Treacherous and Cruel
Deſigns? But if this be his *Chriſtian Charity*, what would the effects
of his *Malice* be? Let now any indifferent Perſon judge, whether
P. 63. the *Perſon* of *Honour* had not reaſon to ſay, *That he never obſerved ſo*
many perſonal Reflections and Invectives, fuller of cauſleſs Paſſions, and
of bitterneſs and virulence in ſo little room in any Book.

But whatever the *Perſon* of *Honour* thinks, Mr. *Creſſy* makes his Appeal to the *Genuine Learned Proteſtant* Engliſh *Clergy.* If he had been a *Clergy-man* who had done me that great *kindneſs*, then Mr. *Creſſy* would have appealed to *Perſons* of *Honour*; and ſurely ſuch are the moſt competent Judges in caſes of Affronts and Injuries: but herein lies Mr. *Creſſy*'s Art which runs throughout his *Epiſtle*, that he would fain ſeparate me from the *Church* of *England*, and make *my Cauſe* diſtinct from *hers*: I do not wonder, that they would part me from my Company, and deprive me of my Shelter, when they have ſuch a mind to run me down. But theſe Arts are eaſily underſtood, and the Deſign is too fine to hold, and too apparent not to be ſeen through. Mr. *Creſſy* knows very well, the Uſe that was made at *Athens* of the *Fable* of the *Dogs* and the *Sheep*; and what good Words and fair Promiſes the *Wolf* made to the *Sheep*, if they would but conſent, that the *Dogs* might be given up to be deſtroy'd. And no doubt the crafty Wolf would have made a very fine Speech to the Sheep, to have perſwaded them, that he had no manner of *ill will to them*; for he had known them long, and loved them well, and always looked upon them as a Company of very innocent and harmleſs Creatures; but for thoſe *Dogs* that were ſet to watch them, he knew how different their Principles were, and how deſtructive to them, if occaſion ſerved; and for all that he knew, theſe *Dogs* might have *Covenanted* together to worry them, upon a fair opportunity; and therefore for his part, he could not but wonder at their patience, that ſome of the ſtouteſt Rams among them, did not ſet upon thoſe peſtilent Currs; or at leaſt, he hoped, they would not be ſo regardleſs of their own Safety, as not to ſuffer ſome well-wiſhers to the Flock, to take them quietly and deſtroy them. For alas! at the beſt, they do but make a Noiſe, and diſturb the repoſe of the Sheep; and if they were gone, there would be nothing but Unity and Love left. I need make no application of this to Mr. *Creſſy*; and I am far from the vanity of ſuppoſing this capable of being applied to my Caſe, any farther than as I am one of thoſe, who are at preſent engaged in the *Defence* of our *Church* againſt that of *Rome*. It is the Happineſs and Honour of our *Church* of *England*, that it hath in it at this Day ſuch ſtore of Perſons both able and willing to defend her *Cauſe*, (as, it may be, no *Church* in the World hath ever had together more Perſons of excellent Abilities, great *Learning*, and unaffected *Piety*;) and I look on my ſelf as one of the meaneſt of them: but it hath been my Lot to be engaged more early and more frequently in this *Cauſe* than others, which hath drawn ſo great a Hatred of my *Adverſaries* upon me; but I thank God, I have a good Cauſe and the teſtimony of a good Conſcience in the management of it, and ſo long I neither fear the Waſpiſhneſs of ſome, nor the Rage of others.

§. 4. But this is their preſent deſign to repreſent me as one of different Principles from the *Church* of *England*, and not only different, but ſuch as if well underſtood, are *deſtructive* to it, and therefore they very gravely adviſe our *Reverend Biſhops* to have a care of me, if they hope to preſerve the *Church* of *England*. And can we think it is any thing elſe but meer kindneſs and good will to our *Church*, that makes them ſo ſolicitous for its Welfare? *It is a ſad thing*, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, *that not one Proteſtant will open his Eyes, and give warning of the dangerous Proceedings of their Champion?* Nay, it is no doubt, a very ſad thing to them to ſee that we do not fall out among our ſelves? I am ſure it is no fault of theirs that we do not: for they make uſe of the moſt invidious and reproachful terms together concerning me, that if they cannot faſten on one Paſſion they may upon another: but theſe poor Deſigns have hitherto had but little ſucceſs, and I hope will never meet with greater. And yet if nothing elſe will do, Mr. *Creſſy* ſaith, *That it is a ſhame, that hitherto not one true Prelatical Proteſtant has appeared as a Defender of the* Engliſh *Church and State againſt me; but on the contrary, even ſome* Engliſh *Prelates themſelves have congratulated and boaſted of my ſuppoſed ſucceſsful endeavours againſt the Catholick Church, though ruinous only to themſelves.* Alas, good Man! his Heart is even broke for Grief, that our *Biſhops* take no more care to preſerve the *Church* of *England*. The *Church* he hath always ſo entirely loved, and ventured as much for her as any Body, while ſhe was in proſperity, and there was no danger; and only forſook her, when ſhe was not able to reward his Love. The truth was, he gave her for gone at that time; and then it was *the late Church of England* with him; and no wonder when he thought her dead, that he made Court to a richer Miſtreſs; but it was but a a Swooning Fit, ſhe is come to her ſelf again, and I hope like to hold out much longer than that which he hath choſen. And although Mr. *Creſſy*'s Hands be now tyed, and he hath entred into new Vows, yet he cannot, for his Heart, forget the kindneſs he had to her in her flouriſhing Condition, becauſe ſhe was then very kind to him; he remembers the marks of her Favour, and the rich Preſents ſhe made him; and therefore ſomething of the old Love revives in him

Preface to Fanat.

Ib.

towards her, at leaſt ſo far, that he cannot endure to ſee her ill uſed, when her *Guardians* neglect her, and her *Sons* prevaricate with her. If Mr. *Creſſy*'s *Faith* had been as great as his *Charity*, to have made him believe that ſhe would ever have come to her ſelf again, I cannot think he would have forſaken her ſo unhandſomely, and left her in a *dying* Condition: but who could ever have thought that things would have come about ſo ſtrangely? But what if all this preſent ſhew of kindneſs prove a meer colluſion and prevarication in him? What if it be only to divide her Friends, and thereby the more eaſily to expoſe her to the Malice of her Enemies? For as long as the *Church* of *England* ſtands, ſhe upbraids him, in his own Words, *with malignant Ingratitude:* and it is the plauſibleſt way for him that was once a Servant and a Lover, to compaſs her ruine with a pretence of Kindneſs.

Epiſtle Apologet. p. 12.
Preface to *Idolatry.*
Preface to the firſt part of the *Anſwer.*
Epiſt. Apologet. from *n.* 16. to *n.* 24.
Anſwer, firſt part from *p.* 260. to *p.* 291.
Epiſt. Apologet. from *n.* 72. to *n.* 84.

§. 5. But wherein is it, that *I have prevaricated with the Church of* England, *whilſt I have pretended to defend her?* The firſt thing he Inſtances in, is, *my charging the Church of* Rome *with Idolatry.* In very good time Mr. *Creſſy!* and, *is this prevaricating with the Church of* England? when I have already, in two ſet Diſcourſes, at large proved, that by all the means we can come to know the Senſe of a *Church*, this Charge hath been made good againſt her, from the beginning of the *Reformation* to 1641, and that even then the *Convocation* declared the ſame in the *Canons* then made. But what muſt I do with ſuch kind of Adverſaries, that will never Anſwer what I ſay for my ſelf; but do run on ſtill with the ſame Charge, as tho' they had nothing to do when they write, but to tell the ſame Story over and over: Let Mr. *Creſſy* do with his Readers as he pleaſes; for my part, I ſhall never follow him in that kind of impertinency: For there is not one Word there uſed by him, which I had not particularly anſwered, before he writ it. The like I may ſay of the ſecond Charge, *viz. That by the Principles laid down by me, I deſtroy the Authority of the Church of England*; which I have already ſhewed at large to be a very impertinent Cavil, and that I do maintain as much *Authority* in the *Church* of *England*, as ever the *Church* of *England* challenged to her ſelf. And to that Diſcourſe I refer Mr. *Creſſy* for ſatisfaction; If he will not read it, I cannot help that, but I can help the not Writing the ſame things over again: and ſo this other part of his *Epiſtle Apologetical* is wholly impertinent; unleſs he had taken off, what I had ſaid for my ſelf already in Anſwer to the very ſame Objections. But all the reaſon in the World ſhall never ſatisfie Mr. *Creſſy*, that I aim not at ſetting up a *Church* diſtinct from the *Church* of *England?* If it be any, I aſſure him, it is a very *inviſible Church*; for it is a *Church* without either *Head* or *Members*; I declare my ſelf to be not only a *Member*, but an affectionate hearty Friend to the *Church* of *England*; I perſwade ſome to it, I endeavour, what in me lies, to keep others from revolting from it. But where lies *this Dr. Stillingfleet's Church*, which Mr. *Creſſy* makes ſuch a noiſe with? I know none but *that of the many thouſands in* England *that have not bowed their Knees to* Baal: and to prevent any further ſuſpicion of my meaning, I do declare I am for no other *Church*, than that *Church* of *England* which is eſtabliſhed by *Law* among us. But it muſt be allowed to thoſe who plead for *ſeeing Viſions*, that ſometimes they may *dream Dreams*.

Having therefore cut off ſo much impertinency, I ſhall reduce the matter yet to a narrower compaſs, by caſting by the large Account he gives of the ſeveral Books written by himſelf, in all which tedious Diſcourſe, the wiſeſt thing he ſaith is, *That Books relating to perſonal things are ſcarce ever ſo long-lived, as a yearly Almanack, and ſerve only to increaſe the uncharitableneſs and injuſtice of the preſent Age, in which Men will be ſure to cenſure all Books and Perſons, and are indifferent whether they condemn the Plaintiff or Defendant, or both.* I ſhall not therefore feed ſo bad a Humour by medling with any *perſonal Diſputes*; but come now, to the main things, which deſerve any farther diſcuſſion, in the Paſſages between the *Perſon* of *Honour* and Mr. *Creſſy*.

From n. 53. to n. 72.

CHAP. II.

Of the Charge of Fanaticiſm *and* Myſtical Divinity.

§. 1. AND the *firſt thing* is about the *Charge* of *Fanaticiſm*; which gave the *Title* to that *Book* of Mr. *Creſſy's*, upon which the *Perſon* of *Honour* beſtows his *Animadverſions*. This, Mr. *Creſſy* ſaid *he would begin with, and particularly that part of my Book which concerns the Life and Prayer of Contemplation commended and practiſed only in the Catholick Church*; *it being a State*, he ſaith, *which from the Infancy of the Church hath been eſteemed the neareſt approaching to that of Glorified Saints: And this is that, from whence I took an occaſion to vilifie him*: but adds, *that he is very well content to receive his proportion of Scorn with ſuch Companions, as* Thaulerus, Suſo, Rusbrochius, Bloſius, *&c. But to the end I may not boaſt,* he ſaith, *of the Novelty of my Invention and profanely employed Wit, he doth aſſure me, that he heard the ſame way much better acted a long time ſince, but the Actor was obliged to make a Recantation Sermon for it.* I thank Mr. *Creſſy* for more of his *Charity* ſtill, in that he parallels the repreſenting the *Fanaticiſm* of their *Church* with the Hiſtrionical repreſenting the Life of our *Saviour* and his *Attendants*: it ſeems, there is no great difference to be made between the Reverence due to the Founders of their *Monaſtick* Orders, and to the Son of God himſelf. I do aſſure him if I had no better opinion of our *Bleſſed Saviour*, as to his *Wiſdom* and all manner of *Excellencies*, than as yet I ſee ground to have of the *Founders* of their *Orders*, I ſhould be far from that eſteem I now have of the *Chriſtian Religion*: But however, the *Perſon* of *Honour* hath better informed Mr. *Creſſy's* Memory, *viz. That the Recantation Sermon was made upon the account of State-matters*; and therefore Mr. *Creſſy* very wiſely paſſeth it over in his *Epiſtle Apologetical*.

Fanaticiſm ſect. 2. n. 10.

P. 2.

To this the *Perſon* of *Honour* adds, “ That Mr. *Creſſy* had no ſuch
“ reaſon to be enraged at me for this Charge, ſince the provocation
“ was given me by my Adverſary, by whom the beginning of ſo
“ many *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms* was laid to the charge of the *Church* of
“ *England*: Which unſeaſonable and untrue Reproach, made it neceſſary
“ for me to anſwer and refell that Calumny, and as reaſonable
“ to let them know that their own Church is much more lia-

Animadverſ. p. 26.

“ ble to that Accuſation than the other: And why this provocation “ ſhould be ſo innocent an Aſſault for the one, and the Defence by “ the other ſhould prove ſo heinous an Offence, will require an im“ partial Judge to determine. To this Mr. *Creſſy* thus anſwers; Epiſt. Apolog. Sect. 26. *That my Adverſary chanced unhappily, though innocently, to let drop out of his Pen one Line or two which has undone us all.* I know no deſign of *undoing* them that any of us have had; unleſs it be as ſome Men think, they are *undone* when they are kept from doing Miſchief: But I hope we may have leave to take care of our own preſervation, and of that Religion we ought to value above our Lives: But ſuppoſe it were ſo, whom may they thank for it? Him that gave the Provocation, or him that did but his Duty in Defence of his Church and Religion? But, come, come Mr. *Creſſy*, let us not flatter our ſelves, it is not the Fly upon the Wheel that raiſes the Duſt; we *Writers* of *Controverſies* are no great *Doers* or *Undoers* of Publick Buſineſs. But Mr. *Creſſy* denies, *that my Adverſary did lay the imputation on the Church of* England; *and craves leave with all due reſpect to tell the* Perſon *of* N. 27. Honour, *that it was a great Miſtake in him to ſay ſo.* Of that we may judge by the very Words produced by Mr. *Creſſy*, viz. *Whether the Judgment of King* Henry, viz. *in forbidding the Bible to be read in* Engliſh, *ought not to have been followed in after times, let the dire effects of ſo many new Sects and Fanaticiſms, as have riſen in* England *from the reading of the Scripture bear witneſs.* In which Words the riſe of *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms* is plainly imputed to the reading the *Scripture*, the reading of the Scripture in *Engliſh*, is an effect of the *Reformation* of the *Church* of *England*, (for it is the *Church* of *England* as reformed, that is only the Subject of the Diſpute.) And therefore I appeal to any indifferent Perſon, whether the *Reformed Church of England* doth not in their Opinion bear the blame of all the *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms?* But this is too plain a thing to be inſiſted upon: *No*, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, *the very naming of* Fanaticiſm *and* England *in the ſame Line, was provocation enough for me, who ſeemed with an impatient longing to have* Ib. *watched for ſuch an advantageous opportunity to empty my voluminous ſtore of Collections.* How ſtrangely may ſome be deceived by an overweening Imagination! I was ſo far from having a *Voluminous ſtore of Collections*, that I never thought of the Subject, till it came in my way to anſwer it; and then I remembred ſome things I had read to that purpoſe, which put me upon a farther ſearch into the *Hiſtory* of thoſe things. And ſince Mr. *Creſſy* will have it out, this is the true account of the birth of that terrible *Mormo* that hath brought ſo many Reproaches and Execrations upon me.

§. 2. There are two parts of this Charge of *Fanaticiſm*, which Mr *Creſſy* thinks himſelf particularly concerned in; and which I ſhall therefore handle diſtinctly; the one concerns *Myſtical Divinity*; and the other, the honour of St. *Benedict*, and his *Rule* and *Order*; theſe two Mr. *Creſſy* ſets himſelf with all his force to defend, and I hope before I have done to make Mr. *Creſſy* repent the heat he hath ſhewed about them.

I begin with that concerning *Myſtical Divinity*, of which Mr. *Creſſy* ſtill ſpeaks with the greateſt Veneration imaginable: He had before Fanaticiſm p. 1. P. 11. called it, *The practice of Chriſtian Vertues and Piety in the greateſt perfection this life is capable of; the neareſt approach to the ſtate of glorified*

Saints; the moſt divine exerciſe of contemplative Souls, more perfectly practiſed only in Heaven: And now he makes a Prayer for me, that it would *pleaſe God to give me and all my Friends a holy ambition to aſpire to the practice of comtemplative Prayer, though by me ſo much deſpiſed.* But of *the good effects*, he ſaith, *it would have upon me*, I do the moſt wonder at that which he adds, viz. *That it would exceedingly better my ſtyle.* I have hitherto thought the choice of clear and proper Expreſſions, ſuch as moſt eaſily and naturally convey my Thoughts to the Mind of another, to be one of the greateſt excellencies of Style; but all before Mr. *Creſſy*, that have been the greateſt *Friends* to *Myſtical Divinity*, have endeavoured to excuſe the hard Words of it. Surely never any Maſters of Style, before Mr. *Creſſy*, thought obſcure, ſtrained, affected, unintelligible Phraſes, were any Graces and Ornaments of Speaking: Would it not add much beauty to ones Style, to bring in the *ſtate of Deiformity, the ſuper-eſſential life, the union with God in the pure fund of the Spirit*, and abundance of ſuch Phraſes; which are ſo very many, that *Maximilian Sandæus* the *Jeſuit*, hath written a large Book only in explication of them: And this is the account he gives of the *Myſtical Style*; that it is *obſcure, involved, lofty, abſtracted and flatulent, that it hath frequent hyperbole's, exceſſes and improprieties.* And he tells us, *there were ſome who* (not unhappily) *compared them to Paracelſian Chymiſts, who think to make amends for the meanneſs of their Notions, by the obſcurity of their Terms. Carolus Herſentius* hath nothing to anſwer to this, but only, *that the matter cannot be plainer expreſſed in Myſtical Divinity*; which is ſo far from being an Argument to me that it can improve ones *ſtyle*, that it gives me very much ground to ſuſpect the very thing it ſelf. For God would never require from Men the practice of that (as certainly he doth the duty of *Prayer* and the greateſt *Love* of himſelf) which it is impoſſible for Men to underſtand, when it is propoſed to them. What obligation can there be to practiſe no Man knows what? The *Chriſtian* Religion is a very plain and intelligible thing; and if it had not been ſo, I do not know how Men could be obliged to believe it? I do not ſay, that Men could form a diſtinct Conception in their Minds of the manner of ſome of thoſe things which are revealed in it; as how an infinite Being could be united to Humane Nature; but this I ſay, that the terms are very intelligible, and the putting of thoſe Terms into a Propoſition, depends upon Divine Revelation, *viz.* That the Son of God was Incarnate; ſo that all the difficulty in this Caſe lies in the Conception of the manner, which by reaſon of the ſhortneſs of our Conceptions, as to what relates to an infinite Being, ought to be no prejudice to the giving our aſſent to this Revelation; ſince we acknowledge the union of a ſpiritual and material Being in the Frame of Mankind, and are as well puzzled in the Conception of the manner of it. But in *Myſtical Divinity*, I ſay, the very Terms are unintelligible; for it is impoſſible for any Man to make Senſe of that *immediate Union with God in the pure fund of the Spirit*, wherein the Myſtical Writers do place the *perfection* of the *Contemplative Life.*

P. 181.

Epiſt. Apologet. n. 37.

Maximil. Sandæi Clavis Myſtica c. 3.

Carol. Herſent. Comment. in Dio ſ. de Myſtica Theolog. præfat.

§. 3. But becauſe Mr. *Creſſy* refers the *Perſon* of *Honour* for the underſtanding thoſe *Myſtical Phraſes*, which I had quarelled with, to the *Author* of the *Roman Churches Devotions vindicated*, which was purpoſely writ in Anſwer to me upon this Subject: I ſhall therefore conſider what light he gives us in this Matter; for I am very willing to be better informed. In the beginning he ſaith, *that Prayer is the moſt Fundamental part of a Chriſtan's Duty*; if this relates to the **Roman** *Churches Devotions vindicated. Sect. 1.* matter in hand, *viz. Of Contemplative Prayer*, it muſt be implyed, that this is a part at leaſt of that *fundamental Duty*; and if it be ſo, I think my ſelf oblig'd to underſtand it; and it muſt be a very culpable Ignorance, not to underſtand ſo *fundamental* a part of a *Chriſtian's Duty*. Therefore I ſhall paſs by all his excurſions, and hold him cloſe to the Matter in debate. I confeſs he prepares his way with ſome artifice, which makes me a little jealous, for things plain *Sect. 6.* and eaſie need none. He inſinuates, 1. *That thoſe who have not theſe* *Sect. 7.* *things, cannot well know what they mean*; and then adds, 2. *That the means for obtaining them, are* (in his own words) *much frequent and continued vocal or mental Prayer, much ſolitude and mortifications of our Fleſh, and abſtraction of our Thoughts, and affections from any Creature: Much Recollection, much Meditation on ſelected Subjects, and the endeavouring a quieſcence as much as we can from former Diſcourſe, (theſe Actions of the Brain and Intellect now hindring the Heart and Will) and the bringing our ſelves rather to a ſimple Contemplation* (without any Action of the Brain or Intellect, or at leaſt as little as may be) *to exerciſe acts of love, adhere to, ſigh after, and entertain the object thereof: And after this, come paſſive Unions, which are rather God's acts in us than our own, and are particular Favours to ſome, and thoſe not conſtant.* By this Explication, I am fallen into utter deſpair of underſtanding theſe Things; for if *the acts of the Brain and Intellect prove ſuch hindrances to the deſired Union, and the quieſcence in order to it be that of Diſcourſe, viz.* Of all ratiocination; I am utterly at a loſs, how this ſhould ever be underſtood by the Perſons themſelves, and much more how it ſhould be explained to others: And I extreamly wonder at thoſe, who go about to explain things which themſelves confeſs are ſo far from being underſtood, *that the acts of the underſtanding are hindrances to the enjoyment of them.* But *Sancta Sophia tr. 3. Sect. 4. c. 1. n. 5.* *F. Baker* ſpeaks more plainly in this Mater, when he deſcribes this *Myſtick Contemplation*; *by which*, ſaith he, *a Soul without diſcourſings and curious ſpeculations, without any perceptible uſe of the internal Senſes, or ſenſible Images, by a pure, ſimple and repoſeful Operation of the Mind, in the obſcurity of Faith ſimply regards God as Infinite and Incomprehenſible Verity; and with the whole bent of the Will reſts in him, as her Infinite, Univerſal and Incomprehenſible Good. This is true Contemplation indeed.* *N.* 16. And afterwards he adds, *That as for the proper exerciſe of active Contemplation, it conſiſts not at all in ſpeculation, but in blind elevations of the Will, and ingulfing it more and more profoundly in God, with no other ſight or knowledge of him, but of an obſcure Faith only.* And towards the *C. 6. n.* 11. concluſion of his *Book* he hath theſe Words, *We mortifie our Paſſions to the end we may looſe them; we exerciſe Diſcourſive Prayer by ſenſible Images, to the end we may looſe all uſe of Images and Diſcourſe; and we actuate immediately by operations of the Will, to the end we may arrive to a ſtate of ſtability in Prayer above all direct exerciſes of any of the Souls Faculties. A State wherein the Soul being often brought to the utmoſt of her workings, is forced to ceaſe all workings to the end that God may operate in her. So that till the Soul be reduced to a perfect denudation of Spirit, a deprivation of all things, God doth not enjoy a ſecure and perfect poſſeſ-* *Sect. 1. c. 4. n. 14.* *ſion of it.* Nay, he ſaith elſewhere, *That all uſe of Meditation muſt be* *for a long ſpace paſſed and relinquiſhed, before the Soul will be brought to this good ſtate of having a continual flux of holy deſires.* I might produce much to the ſame purpoſe out of him; but this is enough to ſhew, that they leave no uſe of *Ratiocination* or *Memory*, in that which they call the *perfect ſtate of the Contemplative Life*; and how is it then poſſible, that it ſhould be either underſtood or explained? Nay, *F. Baker* ſaith, *that there is a ceſſation of all Workings of the Soul*, which is a little harder yet: But this is that *otium myſticum, or divine ſtate of quieſcency* which the *Myſtical Divines* magnifie ſo much; and which it is impoſſible to give any account of; either how the Soul being of ſo active a Nature, can ſubſiſt with a ceſſation of all her workings; or ſuppoſing that poſſible, how it can ever give an account of that ſtate wherein there was a ceſſation of all her workings? It is altogether as poſſible to give an account of the ſtate of *Not-being*, as of ſuch a ſtate, wherein there was no operations of the Soul; or at leaſt no uſe of *Ratiocination* and *Memory*. And of all things, methinks it is moſt improper to call that the *State of Contemplation*; the *State of Nothingneſs*, is much more agreeable to it. But *O. N.* defends this to be a *State of Contemplation*; *for although*, ſaith he, *it be applyed to the Will, yet its act is not ſingle, but accompanied with a ſimple intelligence or ſight of the object performed by the Intellect without any, or at leaſt much Diſcourſe thereof*: But this is not fair dealing; for *F. Baker* expreſly excludes all Diſcourſe, he ſaith, *not any*, or *at leaſt not much*; but if there be any, *Baker* makes it not the *ſtate of pure Contemplation*; however doth *O. N.* think that which he calls *ſimple Intelligence*, or the underſtanding things without *Ratiocination*, is a thing we are capable of, during the conjunction of *Soul* and *Body*? But *O. N.* acknowledges, *That theſe ſupernatural Communications of the Divine Majeſty to ſome of his choiceſt Servants in Prayer, are ſo ſublime and high, as that they are deſcribed by them not without great difficulty, and unuſal expreſſions, which are not ſo well underſtood but by ſuch as have experienc'd ſuch favours, which alſo happen to very few.* Why then do they undertake to explain them? Why do they write of them, and publiſh them to the World?

Sect. 61.

Sect. 8.

But commend me to Mr. *Creſſy* himſelf, *who* gives me a very plain reaſon *why I do not underſtand theſe things*, viz. *in the Words of S.* Paul, that, *The ſenſual Man neither does nor can poſſibly underſtand them, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned, and therefore no wonder if they be eſteemed fooliſhneſs by him who has never experienced them.* What, yet more of your *Charity*, Mr. *Creſſy*? I pretend to no *Myſtical Unions*; and ſhould think it no *perfection*, much leſs a ſtate of *pure contemplation*, to have *all operations of my Mind ſuſpended*; but what then? muſt I be a *ſenſual Man* for this, and *uncapable of underſtanding the things of the Spirit of God*? This Anſwer I ſhould have expected from a *Quaker*; and it is the common Place they run to, when any tell them, that they talk Non-ſenſe, or unintelligible Canting; and I dare ſay, they ſpeak nothing more *unintelligible* than this *Myſtical Divinity*; I might have expected this Anſwer from a follower of *Jacob Behmen*, who talks very ſublime things too in his way; and very much like *Myſtical Divinity*. I might have expected it from a *Roſycrucian*; for I find that he who writ the *Epiſtle Apologetical* for the *Brethren* of that *Order*, produces the very ſame places of *Scripture* to juſtifie them, that *O. N.* and Mr. *Creſſy* do for *Myſtical Divinity*, and ſaith, *that theirs was a Gift of Perfection, which God did not communicate to all, but only to his Elect; and therefore no wonder if others did not underſtand it.* But what

Epiſt. Apolog. n. 37.

1 Cor 2. 14.

Tract. Apolo.et.integ. Societ. de RoſeaCruce defendens. A. 1617. p. 17.

what if Mr. *Creſſy* doth not after all this *underſtand S. Paul?* and it is moſt evident he doth not. For St. *Paul* doth not there ſpeak of any that had embraced the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, and rejected any ſublime pretence of Devotion, as a thing not *intelligible* or *conſonant* to the *Chriſtian Religion* (which are the reaſons of my rejecting *Myſtical Divinity)* but he ſpeaks of ſuch, who rejected the Doctrine of Chriſtianity it ſelf, becauſe it depended upon Divine Revelation. And ſo the ψυχικὸς ἀνὴρ is not the *ſenſual Man*, as Mr. *Creſſy* out of meer *Charity* to me renders it; but the Man that ſuppoſes ſuch a *natural ſufficiency* in the *humane Soul*, in order to its own perfection and happineſs, (as the *Philoſophers* did) that there was no neceſſity either of *Divine Revelation* to diſcover any new Doctrine, or of *Divine Grace* to conduct us to our happineſs. This I could eaſily make appear to be S. *Paul*'s meaning, from the conſideration of the deſign of his Diſcourſe, as well as the importance of the Words, and the conſent of the beſt *Interpreters* of S. *Paul*; I mean S. *Chryſoſtome*, and his Diſciples, viz. *Iſidore Peluſiot*, and the *Greek Scholiaſts*; but I forbear, for fear Mr. *Creſſy* ſhould think, I take another opportunity to *empty my voluminous ſtore of Collections*. But notwithſtanding all the endeavours of Mr. *Creſſy* and his Friend *O. N.* to make the *State* of *Contemplation* as deſcribed by *F. Baker*, more *intelligible*, it hath yet ſo much of *darkneſs* and *ſhadow* in it, that the more they purſue it, the farther it flies from them.

§. 4. But that is not all the Quarrel I have to this *Myſtical Divinity*, that it is *unintelligible*; but that it leads Perſons into ſtrange illuſions of Fancy, and when they think themſelves freeſt from *Images*, they do then labour moſt under the power of a *ſtrong Imagination*, embracing only the *Clouds* of their own *Fancies* inſtead of ſuch *an immediate Union with the Divine Eſſence in the pure fund of the Spirit.* And this I take to be a great Injury, not only to thoſe melancholy *Souls* that are led through this Vally of Shades and Darkneſs; but to the Chriſtian Religion it ſelf, as though the way of perfection taught by it, were a low, mean, contemptible thing in compariſon of the *Myſtical* Flights of this *Contemplative way*. There are theſe two things therefore I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, 1. That this Myſtical way hath no foundation at all in the Chriſtian Doctrine. 2. The way and manner, how it came into the Chriſtian Church, and hath obtained ſo much favour in it.

1. That it hath no foundation at all in the Chriſtian Doctrine. It is the great excellency of the Chriſtian Religion, that it gives us ſuch incomparable Directions in order to the compleat Felicity of our immortal Souls. That it hath not only diſcovered more plainly and fully, the *bleſſed State* of another Life; but teaches Men the moſt effectual way to prepare their Minds for it, *viz.* by ſincere Repentance, by inward Purity, by ſubduing our Paſſions, and due government of our Actions, according to the Rules of Temperance and Juſtice, by dependence on Divine Providence as to the Affairs of this World, by patience under Afflictions, by doing Good to others, although our Enemies and Perſecutors; by deep Humility and mean Thoughts of our ſelves, by a large Charity, thinking as well of, as doing well to others; by valuing the concernments of another Life, above the advantages of this, (which is called *ſelf-denial)* and to that degree, that when our *Religion* calls for it, we

ſhould willingly part with our Lives for the ſake of it. This, as far as I can underſtand it, is the ſummary Comprehenſion of a *Chriſtian's Duty*, in order to his happineſs; and by *patient continuance in Well-doing*, he may with reaſon hope for the enjoyment of that *bleſſed State* which is reſerved to another Life. The which being made known to the World by the Doctrine of Chriſt, therefore *Faith* in *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* is made ſo neceſſary a part of a Chriſtian's Duty; and becauſe we want divine Supplies, and Aſſiſtance, to enable us to do our Duty, therefore we are ſo much commanded to be frequent and fervent in Prayer; and many promiſes and encouragements are given to the due performance of it, from God's readineſs to hear the Prayers of the *Righteous*, and to grant the Requeſts they make to him. All this is not only excellent in it ſelf, and moſt reaſonable to be done, but very eaſie to underſtand; but not a Word in all this tending to any immediate *Union* with *God* in the *pure fund of the Spirit*, or ſuch a *State of Contemplation* wherein the Operations of the Soul are ſuſpended; nothing of *paſſive Unions*, and *Viſions*, and *Raptures*, as ſuch things which every Chriſtian who looks for Perfection, may hope for. It is true, we are often commanded *to love God with all our Hearts*; but withal we are told, we muſt not fanſie this Love to be a meer languiſhing Paſſion towards an infinite Object (which we therefore love, becauſe we do not underſtand; but ſee him only in *profound Darkneſs*, and claſp about him with the cloſeſt Embraces, being united to him in the moſt immediate manner, and being melted in the fruition of him. *V. Joh. à Jeſu Maria Theolog. Myſtic. c. 6. p. 64.* Which are luſcious *Metaphors* brought into the *Chriſtian Doctrine* from that ancient *Family* of *Love*, I mean, the *School* of *Plato*; as I ſhall ſhew afterwards.) But the *Love* of *Chriſtians* towards *God* is no fond amorous Paſſion; but a due apprehenſion and eſteem of the Divine Excellencies; a hearty ſenſe of all his Kindneſs to us, and a conſtant readineſs of Mind to do his Will; *for this is the Love of God to keep his Commandments.* 1 Joh. 5. 3. *And if any Man ſay, I love God, and hateth his Brother, he is a Lyar; for he that loveth not his Brother whom he hath ſeen, how can he love God whom he hath not ſeen?* 4. 20. *No Man hath ſeen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us.* 12. Thus the *beloved Diſciple* who underſtood the greateſt Myſteries of *Divine Love* hath expreſſed them to us; and thus the *beloved Son of God* hath declared what he means by the *Love* he expects from his Diſciples: *If ye love me keep my commandments.* Joh. 14. 15. *And ye are my Friends, if you do whatſoever I command you.* 15. 14. Here is nothing of an *abſtracted Life*, or *internal* and *external Solitude*, or *ſelf-annihilation* in order to an immediate active Union with God in the ſupream Point of the Spirit; nothing of *blind elevations of the Will*, without the uſe of Reaſon and Diſcourſe, *ingulfing it more and more profoundly in God*; all theſe *Myſtical Notions* and Expreſſions had another Spring and more impure Fountain than the *Chriſtian Doctrine*.

§. 5. Not ſo, ſay *O. N.* and Mr. *Creſſy*, for if they may be believed, there is ground in Scripture for all the moſt lofty *myſtical Expreſſions*. If ſo, I muſt retract what I have ſaid; but I never knew any Men that needed more an infallible Interpreter of Scripture than they do, they make ſuch lamentable Expoſitions of it; if they can

but hit upon a Word or Phraſe to their purpoſe, away they run with
O. N. *Roman Devotions vindicated ſect.* 7.--- *ſect.* 51. that, and never conſider the deſign or importance of it. What
work doth *O. N.* make with his *Cor altum*, and *Regnum Dei intra*
vos? Whereas the firſt ſignifies nothing, but due conſideration, nor
the other any thing, but that the *Kingdom* of the *Meſſias* was then
come among them. And what are theſe to *Myſtical Divinity?* And
Fanaticiſm, p. 49. Mr. *Creſſy's accedite ad Deum & illuminamini*, is altogether to as much
purpoſe; for is there no inſtruction to be had from God, or his
Law, ſhort of *paſſive Unions?* No enlightning our Minds, but by
P. 41. immediate Inſpirations? But Mr. *Creſſy* thinks he hath done the Buſineſs,
and quite ſtopped my Mouth with S. *Paul's* ἄῤῥητα ῥήματα;
who being in a wonderful Ecſtaſie, ſaw and heard God only knows what:
which although he was willing to communicate, yet he had not the power
to do it. But as the *Perſon* of *Honour* hath already very well
Animadv. p. 58. told Mr. *Creſſy*, "What is this to thoſe who go about to expreſs
"what neither themſelves nor any elſe can underſtand? If they
"pretend to the ſame Ecſtaſies, why do they not imitate his Modeſty?
"Why do they go about to help S. *Paul* to Words to do
"it by, if himſelf declared it could not be done by Words? To
which Mr. *Creſſy* anſwers as much as was to be anſwered, which is,
Roman Devotions vindicated *ſect.* 9, 10, 11. juſt nothing. But his *Author O. N.* brings the ſame place, and not
only that, but all thoſe which mention the *Revelations of the Prophets*
or Apoſtles. To what purpoſe? Do I deny any *Divine Revelations?*
Do I give the leaſt intimation that I queſtioned, whether
there were any *true Inſpirations* in the *Writers* of *Holy Scriptures?*
God forbid! But how doth it follow, if God did inſpire Men to declare
his Will to Mankind; therefore all the pretences to *Revelations*
and *Inſpirations* in *the Roman Church* are true? If S. *Paul* had once a
true *Rapture*; therefore all S. *Tereſa's* were ſuch, and not the effects
of a vehement Imagination. Let us obſerve the difference, not only
in the value and excellency and judgment of the Perſons; but in the
very manner of relating them. Her Life, written by her ſelf (to
Roman Devotions vindicated *ſect.* 16. which *O. N.* appeals in this matter, *as the great inſtance of the ſtrictneſs*
and caution of the Roman *Church, in examining and approving Viſions*
and Revelations) conſiſts almoſt wholly of a very plentiful Narration
S. *Tereſa's* Life, *p.* 2. *c.* 1. Edit. 1611. at *Antwerp.* of her Raptures and Viſions. *She began*, ſhe ſaith, *to be awakened*
about ſix or ſeven years old, her Mother having made her to ſay
her Prayers, and be devout to our bleſſed Lady, and ſome other Saints;
wherein ſhe very much out-went S. *Paul*, who never ſo much as
C. 4. *p.* 16. once mentions her in all his Writings. After this, ſhe relates *her very*
great Sickneſs, ſo great that, ſhe ſaith, *it always deprived her almoſt of*
her Senſes, and ſometimes altogether; and after ſhe had read the third
A, B, C (a Book *of Myſtical Divinity*) ſhe ſaith, *ſhe came to quiet*
P. 17. *Prayer, and arrived to paſſive Unions before ſhe was twenty Years old*;
and herein again ſhe far out-went S. *Paul.* She confeſſes, *that ſhe*
was in ſo great Torment, that they were afraid, who were about her, that
C. 5. *p.* 25. *ſhe would have gone Mad; that ſhe was put into ſuch a heat, that her Sinews*
began to ſhrink with ſuch intolerable Pains, that ſhe could take no
reſt neither Day nor Night, but was continually oppreſſed with a moſt profound
Melancholy. Theſe are the very Words written by her ſelf, as
they are tranſlated out of *Spaniſh* by an *Engliſh Jeſuit*: After this
P. 26. ſhe ſaith, *ſhe fell into a Trance, ſo that ſhe remained without Senſe almoſt*
C. 6. *p.* 28. *four Days, after which ſhe remained under violent Torments, and her Head*

exceedingly diſtempered, and was not perfectly recovered in three Years. Then ſhe took S. Joſeph *for her Patron, whom ſhe called her Father and* P. 32. *Protector; and whereas other Saints help us in ſome one neceſſity, ſhe had experience that this Saint helpeth us in all; and that our Lord will give us to underſtand, that as he was ſubject to him on Earth, ſo likewiſe in Heaven he obtaineth whatſoever he asketh.* (I am very much miſtaken if this ſavour not of other kind of *Divinity* than ever St. *Paul* preached.) And ſhe adds, *That ſhe had a great zeal to perſwade others to be* P. 33. *devout to this glorious Saint: becauſe he helpeth thoſe Souls exceedingly which commend themſelves to him; eſpecially thoſe that deſire a Maſter to teach them how to pray;* (I ſuppoſe ſhe means this *contemplative way.*) After ſuch an Account given of her ſelf, I do not at all wonder at the frequency of her *Viſions* and *Raptures*; *in one,* ſhe ſaith, *ſhe ſaw Chriſt* P. 38. *more plainly with the Eyes of her Soul, than ſhe could have ſeen him with the Eyes of her Body; and ſhe looked upon it as a temptation of the Devil, that ſhe was ready to think, this was nothing but Imagination.* After this, C. 10, 11, ſhe relates at large *how ſhe came to be ſwallowed up in the depths of Myſtical Theology;* 12, &c. *and talks of God's ſuſpending the Operations of the Underſtanding; in which,* ſhe ſaith, *it underſtandeth more in the ſpace of a* P. 80. *Creed without diſcourſing, than we can underſtand with all our earthly diligences in many years:* This ſhe calls, *being wholly ingulfed in God;* P. 62. *and diſtinguiſheth this State, wherein the Soul ſeems to be altogether out of her ſelf, from Viſions;* and ſhe deſcribes *the third degree of Prayer, to be a glorious Frenzy, an heavenly Folly; in which,* ſhe ſaith, *ſhe had* P. 111. *been as it were frantick and drunken in this Love, and could never underſtand how it was; and in this State,* ſhe ſaith, *they ſpeak many Words in God's Praiſe without Order, at leaſt the Underſtanding is nothing worth here;* for ſhe adds, *that then ſhe ſpeaketh a thouſand Follies, and ſhe* P. 113. *knew one who, being no Poet, chanced to compoſe very ſignificant Verſes* extempore, *declaring his Pain very well, not made by his own Wit. But there is a degree beyond this,* which ſhe calls, *the State of not feeling,* P. 122. *but enjoying without underſtanding what we enjoy; but how this Union is, and what it is, ſhe cannot give it to be underſtood, but leaves it to the Myſtical Theology.* Afterwards ſhe diſtinguiſheth between *Union* and P. 140. *Raptures;* and ſaith, *that theſe exceed Union,* which he that writes the *Gloſſes* in the *Margin* ſaith, *that ſhe means that the Soul enjoyeth God more in Raptures;* but ſhe tells us, *that Union ſeemeth beginning, midſt and end; but our Lord muſt declare this, i. e.* ſhe knew not what ſhe meant her ſelf. In ſome of her *Raptures* ſhe ſpeaks *of God's carrying* P. 141. *away her Soul, and almoſt ordinarily her Head alſo after her, ſo that ſhe could not detain it, and ſometimes her whole Body lifting it up: in theſe,* P. 142. ſhe ſaith, *ſhe undergoes great violence, and ſhe was quite tired with them; at other times,* ſhe ſaith, *her Body was ſo light in Raptures, that all the* P. 148. *heavineſs of it was taken away; or rather, that the Body remaineth as it were Dead, without doing any thing, in which ſometimes the Senſes are wholly loſt, but ordinarily they are troubled: And in the height of Raptures,* ſhe ſaith, *they neither hear, nor ſee, nor feel in her Opinion; no power hath the uſe of it ſelf, nor knoweth what paſſeth in this occaſion,* P. 149. *nor are we capable of underſtanding it. In this State,* ſhe ſaith, *the Soul is ingulfed; or to ſay better, our Lord is ingulfed in her, and keeping her in himſelf for a little ſpace, ſhe remaineth with her Will alone;* and ſets P. 150. forth *the Body as bound for many Hours in it, and yet ſometime the Underſtanding and Memory diſtracted, and after they return to themſevels.*

When the Rapture is over, it happeneth ſometimes that our Powers are ſo
abſorpt, and as it were drowned for a Day or two or three, that it ſeemeth
they are not in themſelves. There are theſe Circumſtances more to be
P. 42. obſerved concerning her: 1. *That ſhe was under great bodily weakneſs all*
P. 138. *this while.* 2. That at this time when ſhe had ſo many of theſe
Raptures, ſhe confeſſes her ſelf, *that ſhe was very backward and in the*
P. 66. & *beginnings of Vertues and Mortifications.* 3. *That her great Friends who*
176. p. 236. *had examined and conſidered her Caſe, declared to her, that they looked upon*
P. 181. *all theſe things as deluſions of the Devil*; upon which *ſhe applyed herſelf to*
P. 194. p. 180. *the* Jeſuits, *who encouraged her very much*, and told her, *it was the Spirit*
P. 182. *of God*; and henceforward they were the great Men who gave her directions
P. 181. not to reſiſt thoſe *impulſions* and *elevations*, as ſhe had been adviſed
P. 184. before; and put her upon *greater perfection*; then ſhe fell into
P. 185. her *Raptures*, and underſtood in one of them, *that henceforward ſhe was*
not to converſe with Men, but Angels; and after this, *ſhe had ſuch kind of*
P. 187. *Voices very frequent within her, which*, ſhe ſaith, *are very formal words,*
but not heard with corporal Ears, but underſtood much more plainly, than
P. 204. *if they were heard*; *and theſe Speeches*, ſhe ſaith afterwards, *were very*
P. 215. *continual with her, and ſhe had Viſions very frequently*; in one of which
P. 216. *ſhe ſaw only the Hands of Chriſt*, and in another *his divine Countenance,*
which ſeemed wholly to abſtract her, and afterwards ſhe ſaw him all together,
but not with her Corporal Eyes, ſhe confeſſes; and ſhe ſatisfied herſelf,
P. 221. *it could not be her imagination only, altho her Confeſſor told her ſo, becauſe*
the beauty was ſo great, as to exceed her imagination; yet he ſtill encouraged
P. 224. her, when as appears by her *own confeſſion*, *others about her*
whom ſhe had a great opinion of, endeavoured to convince her it
was only her imagination, *to her great trouble*; inſomuch, that ſhe
P. 225. ſaith, *the contradiction of the good were ſufficient to have put her out of*
her wits. This *Viſion* of the *Beauty* of *Chriſt continued ordinarily with her*
P. 226. *for two years and an half, in which ſhe had a great deſire to ſee the colour*
of his Eyes, and what bigneſs they were of, but never could obtain that favour.
When the *Jeſuit-Confeſſor* was out of the way, others told her
P. 228. plainly, *it was the Devil that deluded her*, and they bid her *croſs* herſelf
P. 234. when ſhe ſaw a *Viſion*; ſhe held a *Croſs in her Hand to ſave herſelf the*
P. 229. *trouble, and Chriſt took it in his, and gave it her again with four precious*
Stones which had the five wounds artificially engraven upon them, which
P. 232. *no body could ſee but herſelf.* After this, *ſhe had a Viſion of Angels, and*
clearly diſcerned the Cæleſtial Hierarchy; *but ſhe ſuppoſed one of thoſe ſhe*
ſaw to be one of the Seraphins, who pierced her Heart with a fiery dart, and
when he pulled it out again, it left her wholly inflamed with great love to
God; *but under exceſſive pain, which yet cauſed ſo great pleaſure, that ſhe*
could not deſire to have it removed: *In the days that this continued*, ſhe
P. 233. ſaith, *ſhe was like a Fool*; *ſhe deſired neither to ſee nor ſpeak, but to embrace*
her pain. Not long after ſhe relates, *how ſometimes for three*
Weeks together her imagination would be ſo tormented with Trifles and Toys,
P. 238. *that ſhe could think of nothing elſe:* Then ſhe fell *into ſuch a fit of Dulneſs*
P. 240. *and Heavineſs, without any kind of Senſe or Remembrance of her former*
Viſions and Raptures; *or elſe no otherwiſe than as of a Dream to afflict,*
and then ſhe was full of Doubts and Suſpicions, that all was but Imagination;
P. 237. *and if ſhe converſed with any, the Devil put her in ſuch a diſtaſteful*
P. 240. *Spirit of Anger, that it ſeemed as if ſhe would eat all, not being able to*
P. 241. *do otherwiſe.* Then again, *ſhe had comfort in an inſtant, ſometimes with*
a Word, ſometimes with Viſions; which continued for a time *more frequent*
P. 242. *than before*; *then ſhe thought that her Bodily Sickneſs was the cauſe of*
her

her former Diſturbance, and that her Underſtanding was ſo unruly, that it
ſeem'd like a furious Fool, whom no body could bind, neither was ſhe able to
keep it quiet for the ſpace of a Creed. At other times again *ſhe compares* P. 244.
herſelf to an Aſs, being in a manner without any feeling : And ſo *it*
falleth out oft-times, ſhe ſaith, *that one while ſhe laughed at herſelf, and* P. 245.
other times ſhe was much afflicted ; and the inward motion provoked her to
put Poſies and Flowers upon Images, and ſuch kind of Employments.
After this, the Scene of her Imagination was quite changed, for it
repeſented nothing but Devils to her : in which ſtate, ſhe tryed one pleaſant
Experiment, *viz.* how much more the *Devils* are afraid of *Holy* P. 246.
Water, than of the *Sign* of the *Croſs ; from the Croſs they fly, but ſo*
as to return preſently, but from the Holy Water, ſo as to return no more, P. 247.
(Methinks then ſhe ſhould have uſed it but once) *and it was not more*
terrible to Devils, than ſhe found it comfortable to her Soul ; for ſhe
ſaith, *that ſhe found a particular and very evident comfort when ſhe took*
it, and ſuch a delight which ſtrengthned her whole Soul, which ſhe found
very often, and conſider'd it with great reflection : Then ſhe relates, *her* P. 261.
being in Spirit in Hell, and what ſhe endured there ; and towards the
concluſion, *her being placed in Heaven in a rapture, and ſeeing what was* P. 323.
done there, where ſhe ſaw her Father and Mother, &c. after which ſhe
adds, *that our Lord ſhewed her greater Secrets* (What! than what is P. 324.
done in Heaven ?) *for it is not poſſible,* ſhe ſaith, *to ſee more than was*
repreſented unto her ; the leaſt part of it was ſufficient to make her Soul
remain aſtoniſhed ; and found it impoſſible to declare ſome little part of it.
And now we find her at St. *Paul*'s height, and need go no further in
the account of her *Viſions,* which continues to the end of her Book ; Roman
but let me ask *O. N.* who hath particularly recommended *this life* Churches Devotions
to the *conſideration of any ſober Proteſtant,* whether he doth in good vindicated
earneſt think that *M. Tereſa* had the ſame kind of *Raptures* that P. 23.
St. *Paul* had ? I know he muſt not ſay otherwiſe, ſince the *Roman*
Church hath *canonized* her for a *Saint* ; but I think they had done
her a greater kindneſs, to have appointed her good *Phyſicians* in time,
inſtead of her *Jeſuitical Confeſſors.* I could hardly have thought, that
among *Chriſtians* I ſhould have found St. *Paul's Rapture* parallel'd by
ſuch as theſe ; but we have lived to ſee ſtrange things. If St. *Paul*
had diſcover'd in his Writings ſo many Symptoms of a diſturbed
fancy, ſuch an *oppreſſion* of *Melancholy,* ſuch rovings of *Imagination,*
ſuch an uncertainty of Temper ; could we ever think the World
would have believed that *Ecſtaſie,* which he expreſſeth with ſo much
Modeſty, and makes ſo many *Apologies* for himſelf, that he was
forced to mention it, by the falſe *Apoſtles* boaſting of their Revelations ?
It is not expedient for me doubtleſs to glory ; I will come 2 Cor. 12.
to Viſions and Revelations of the Lord. I knew a Man in Chriſt above 1, 2, 5, 6.
fourteen years ago, &c. *Of ſuch a one will I glory, yet of my ſelf I will not*
glory, but in mine Infirmities ; ——— but now I forbear leſt any Man
ſhould think of me above that which he ſeeth me to be, or that he heareth
of me. Although he had many *Revelations,* he mentions but *one* ;
and that with the greateſt modeſty that may be under a third Perſon,
and that above fourteen years ago. He tells no long ſtories of
a *ſucceſſion* of *Viſions,* and *Raptures,* and *ſights* of *Angels* and *Devils* ;
mixed with many impertinences and indications of a diſorder'd Imagination.
But ſaith *O. N. that could not be in St.* Tereſa, *conſidering*
the diligence that was uſed for ſeveral Years in the tryal of her Spirit, and
her

her Viſions were confirmed to be from God, by a general atteſtation of them throughout the Chriſtian World; *even thoſe who ſuſpected and queſtion'd them at firſt, afterwards magnifying them.* But I deſire no other evidence in this caſe, than what ſhe gives her ſelf; ſuppoſing the Matters of Fact to be true according to her own Relation; not that I would condemn her, according to Mr. *Creſſy*'s ſoft Language, as a *Hypocritical Viſionaire*; nor as many of her *Friends* did, as *one deluded by the Devil*; but I ſee nothing in her caſe but what might be a natural Effect of an over-heated Imagination, in a Perſon of a very melancholy devout Temper, eſpecially being before-hand poſſeſs'd with the *Notions* of *Myſtical Divinity.* And for the *approbations* given to her *Viſions*, I do not wonder at them, ſince there was a deſign to *Canonize* her for a *Saint*, and ſhe was the *Foundreſs* of a *new Order*; and that there was ſomething relating to this, in the penning of her *Viſions*, ſeems to be not obſcurely intimated in the laſt *Page* of her *Book*, P. 364. where ſhe deſires him to whom ſhe writ it, *to make haſte to ſerve his Majeſty, that he might do her a Favour*; for it ſeems by her own relation, her Order met with great contradiction at *Court.*

P. 312. And for the *approbation of her Books*, I do no more wonder at that, than I do at others that proceed upon the ſame Principles, *viz.* of *Myſtical Theology.* But I do exceedingly admire at thoſe Perſons, who dare to bring the ſingle *inſtance* of St. *Paul*'s *Rapture*, to juſtifie all the Pretences to *Viſions* and *Raptures*, of the Melancholy and diſtempered *Women* of their *Church.* If we had not ſo great reaſon to put ſuch a mighty difference between them, as to the Wiſdom of the Perſons, the reaſonableneſs of their Doctrine, the Miracles wrought to confirm the teſtimony of the *Apoſtles*; it would be, as *Cardinal Beſſarion* ſaid of the *Canonizations of new Saints*, *that it made Men queſtion the old*, ſo theſe new *Raptures* and *Viſions* would expoſe the credit and Authority of undoubtedly *Divine Revelations.* Therefore let Mr. *Creſſy* and O. *N.* have a care, while they are ſo ready to charge me with *blaſpheming God's Saints*, that by making the caſe ſo parallel between the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* and their *new Saints*, they do not lay in the way of all conſidering Men of their Church, one of the greateſt Temptations to *Infidelity.*

O. N. *ſect.* 13. §. 6. But O. *N.* hath not yet done; for he brings *all thoſe Phraſes of Scripture, that relate to the ſanctification of Mens Souls by Divine Grace, and the comfort of God's Spirit, and the extraordinary Revelations which came by the pouring out of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Apoſtles and their Diſciples*, to juſtifie the expreſſions of *Myſtical Divinity*; which are all extreamly impertinent, unleſs he can prove from any of them ſuch an *Union* with the *Divine Eſſence*, *as excludes the uſe of Ratiocination in the Soul*; wherein the *perfection* of *contemplative Prayer* is placed, and all the other Phraſes are to be underſtood with a reſpect to this. And *what though there be two Spirits working within us, and* O. N. *ſect.* 19. 20, 21, 22. 23. *there be degrees of Spiritual Perſons, and the Spirit aſſiſts the Souls of Men with good Motions, which ought not to be reſiſted*; *and what if ſome have a greater meaſure of this Aſſiſtance than others*; *what if excellent Minds may attain to an aſſurance that they are under the conduct of the Divine Spirit, and may have great comfort and ſatisfaction therein*; nay, what if I ſhould grant, *that a State of Perfection were attainable in this Life*; yet all this were nothing to his purpoſe, unleſs he can prove, that the ſuppoſing the *perfection* of a Chriſtian, to be conſiſtent with laying aſide the *Uſe* of all *Ratiocination*, as it is in the *Myſtical Union*, doth not expoſe Men to the greateſt *Enthuſiaſm*, and moſt *Fanatick Deluſions* imaginable. I mean *that State*, which himſelf expreſſes, *by thoſe ſupernatural elevations wherein are communicated to the Soul many times Celeſtial Secrets, and Divine Myſteries, and future Events, by internal Words and Revelations; all which things are received by it with a great tranquillity and attention, and ceſſation of the natural uſe of its Faculties, Senſitive or Intellectual: nor ſeems it in its own diſpoſal while it hath theſe touches.* And this is that, he tells us, *which the Myſtick Divines expreſs by the terms of a ſupernatural, or rather ſupereſſential Life, a Deiformity, or Deification; of a ſenſe or fruition of God's preſence in the fund, depth, or center, or innermoſt part of the Soul, or alſo in the Apex or ſupream Point of it; of Paſſive Unions, wherein is to be underſtood not an excluſion of all Acts whatſoever, but an excluſion of any diſcurſive and laborious Acts, and any primary moving of it ſelf to action.* This explication I accept of; and undertake to make it appear, that in it is contained the greateſt height of *Fanaticiſm*. For what can be imagined greater, than to exempt all pretenders to *Enthuſiaſm* and *Divine Inſpiration* from any Tryal by *Humane Reaſon*? For *if no Perſons are competent Judges of theſe ſupernatural Elevations, but thoſe which have experience of them*; as they aſſert, if *by vertue of theſe Elevations Men come to the knowledge of Divine Myſteries and Future Events, by internal Words and Revelation*; what is to be done with any Perſon who pretends to theſe *Elevations*? Muſt their *Confeſſors* judge of them? But why? For either they have not experienced theſe things, and then they are no *competent Judges*; or they have, and then they are Pretenders to the ſame things, and ought as much to be judged by others: But how? By the *Acts of Reaſon*, and the *Rules* of it? How is that poſſible, when they are ſuppoſed to be above all *Acts of Reaſon and Diſcourſe*? And to do it *without Reaſon*, will be as little Honour to the *Judges*, as it will be Vindication to the Pretenders. But *the Church is to be Judge*: Why ſo? ſince the *Spirit* can no more deceive one than a thouſand; and they have ſatisfaction in themſelves, that it is the *Spirit of God* in them, as much as it is poſſible for any to have that the *Spirit of God directs the Church*; nay, much greater, for the other is only the certainty of *Reaſon* and *Diſcourſe*; but this is an inward *certainty* of *Experience, above all Ratiocination.* But *how* again ſhall the *Church judge* of this? If the *Church* pretend to the ſame thing, ſhe is liable to the ſame Accuſation; if ſhe does not, ſhe can have no pretence to judge of things that are to be known only by *Experience*. So that if Men ſpeak conſequently and agreeably to themſelves, there is no way of Tryal left for Pretenders to theſe things. And what ſhould hinder every *Enthuſiaſt* from this pretence, or ſomething very like it, *viz. Divine Inſpiration*? Why ſhould the pretence to the *Spirit* be more lyable to the tryal of other Mens *Reaſon* or *Authority*, than the pretence to *Myſtical Unions*? Cannot they make uſe of the very ſame places of *Scripture* to juſtifie all the *Fanatick Pretences* to *immediate Impulſes* and *Motions* of the *Divine Spirit*? Cannot they tell Men as eaſily, *that they that are unexperienced are no Judges in this caſe*; and that *the ſenſual Man cannot underſtand the things of the Spirit of God*? Nay, theſe have been the very pleas of all our *Enthuſiaſts*, and there is ſcarce one place of *Scripture*

O. N. *ſect.* 29.

mentioned by *O. N.* which they have not been before-hand with him, in producing to the very ſame purpoſe. I cannot then find out the difference, between the higheſt of our *Enthuſiaſts* and *theirs*; and the very ſame pleas which ſerve for the one, will juſtifie the other alſo. What have they ever pretended to, but to underſtand *celeſtial Secrets, Divine Myſteries, or Future Events by immediate Revelation?* Now all theſe things are owned, defended and juſtified by the *Roman* Church, and yet they not lyable to the charge of *Fanaticiſm?*

§. 7. No, ſaith O. *N. Enthuſiaſm or Fanaticiſm doth not lie in ſpeaking things hard to be underſtood, nor yet the pretending high and myſterious Effects, Viſions, Revelations,* &c. *for all theſe we believe may be, and are often wrought in God's Saints by the Holy Spirit, and his ſpecial preſence in their Souls, and that we ſay in a much higher and more admirable way, than any of Satan's infatuations can imitate or aſcend to; but Fanaticiſm is a falſe pretence of theſe, or the like, when having no juſt ground to be credited, they pretend to them.* So that the main point is yielded up to the *Fanaticks*, viz. *Viſions and immediate Revelations,* and *unaccountable Impulſes from the Spirit of God*; all the Diſpute is, whether the *Popiſh Enthuſiaſts*, or thoſe among us are only Pretenders? If *O. N.* were to convince a *Quaker*, who pretends to ſuch an immediate Impulſe of the *Spirit*, this muſt be his method of proceeding with him. O. N. *ſect.* 13 *p.* 20.

Friend, I perceive thou talkeſt much of the Spirit of God moving thee, and revealing the hidden Myſteries of his Kingdom to thee, but thy pretence is vain, and thou art deceived by thy own Fancy, if not by an evil Spirit.

No, ſaith the *Quaker, I know, I am not, for I have the teſtimony of the Spirit within me, that I am not deceived; but thou art deceived, and lyeſt againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and blaſphemeſt the Spirit of God working in his Saints.*

Not I, ſaith *O. N. I grant that the Holy Ghoſt doth work in his Saints ſuch ſupernatural Elevations, whereby they underſtand divine Myſteries, and have Viſions and Raptures and Revelations more than any of you; but all ours are true, and yours are falſe.*

Thou lying Prophet, replies the *Quaker, God ſpeaks truth by thee, as he did once by* Baalam's Aſs *and* Caiaphas; *but thou, through the wickedneſs of thy Heart, doſt condemn the Generation of his Saints among us, as Hypocrites; and wouldſt have the Spirit of God dwell only among you, that are the Sons of Myſtical* Babylon, *and partake of all her Defilements, that are the Seed of the Beaſt and the falſe Prophet, that commit Adultery with Images, and ſet up the Man of Sin in his Throne, that have covered the Face of the Earth with your abominations, and ſtill go about to deceive the Nations. You have the Spirit of God among you! You pretend to the ſeeing hidden Myſteries, and immediate Revelations and Myſtical Unions with God! No, yours are the Myſteries of Iniquity, the Revelations of Antichriſt, and Unions only with Myſtical* Babylon. *You have the Spirit of God among you! No, yours is the Spirit of Enchantment and Divination, the Spirit of Lying and Deceit, the Spirit of Antichriſt, and not of God.*

I ſay again, ſaith *O. N. that we have the Spirit, and you have not.*

And I ſay by the Spirit, *that you have not,* ſaith the *Quaker.*

And is not this a fair concluſion of this Diſpute? Hath not O. N. extreamly got the better of the *Quaker*? But O. N. pleads yet farther, *That they make uſe of Notes and Rules of diſcerning of the Pretences to Inſpiration*; which I ſhall conſider afterwards: But that which O. N. and Mr. *Creſſy* do moſt inſiſt upon, is this, *That if ſuch Pretenders to Inſpirations do ſpeak or do any thing againſt the Catholick Church* (as they call it) *that their Pretences are to be rejected as Satanical illuſions*. Very good! This is a way to preſerve themſelves, but what is this to the preventing the deluſions of ſuch fanatick Pretenders to Inſpirations, who may be groſly deceived, and yet never ſpeak or do any thing againſt their Church, but it ſeems the leaſt touch that way preſently marrs all. If *Mother Tereſa* had but chanced to let fall a word againſt the Power of *Holy Water in driving away Devils*, or chanced in one of her *Viſions* to have ſeen *Bread upon the Alter after Conſecration*; away with her, a meer Hypocrite and Impoſtor, one deluded by the Devil: And it had been well, if after all her *Viſions* and *Raptures*, ſhe had eſcaped the *Inquiſition*. For can it poſſibly be ſo certain, that ſhe had *Divine Viſions*, as that *Holy Water drives away Devils*; or that *ſhe had Myſtical Unions*, as that *no Bread lay upon the Altar after Conſecration?* No, no. If melancholy Women once offer to meddle in thoſe matters, they muſt then be told of their *weakneſs of Judgment*, and *ſtrength of Imagination*, and *deluſions of the Devil*; but if they admire every ſuperſtitious Foolery, and ſee ſtrange effects of *Holy Water*, and in ſome *Viſions* can diſcern the *very Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*, then *O Heavenly Viſions! O Divine Saint!* Then her *Confeſſor* muſt ſooth and flatter her, and ſuffer her to be deceived by her own imagination at leaſt, if not by ſomething worſe. So that this whole buſineſs of *Viſions and Revelations* among them is managed by *Politick Rules*; if they can ſerve to ſtrengthen their Intereſt, they are encouraged, if not, the Perſons are preſently diſcountenanced, and if they perſiſt in their Pretences, in great hazard of the *Inquiſition*. But may not weak and melancholy Perſons be deceived in judging the effects of a ſtrong *Imagination* to be the *Inſpirations* of the *Spirit of God? What then*, ſay they, *theſe do no hurt to the World*. But is it no injury to their Souls, to ſuffer them to be ſo deluded? Is it no diſhonour to *Chriſtian Religion* to make the Perfection of the *Devotion* of it to conſiſt in ſuch ſtrange unaccountable *Unions* and *Raptures*, which take away the uſe of all *Reaſon* and *Diſcourſe?* Is it nothing to have Perſons *Canonized* for *Saints*, and admired and worſhipped, chiefly for the ſake of theſe things? In which caſe, not only the particular Perſons, while they lived, were ſuffered to be abuſed; but the whole Chriſtian World as much as lies in them, is impoſed upon; and the effects of a ſtrong *Imagination*, and *Myſtical Unions*, are recommended as the *perfection* of the *Chriſtian State*.

O. N. ſect. 14.

§. 8. But whatever *Rules* they go by; I ſhall now ſhew, that ſuch kind of *Ecſtaſies* and *Revelations*, as the *Myſtical Divinity* pretends to, have been condemned by the *Chriſtian Church* in former Ages; which will yet farther diſcover, how far it is from being *a part of the Chriſtian Doctrine*; ſo far is it from being *the perfection of a Chriſtian State*. And the Inſtance I ſhall produce, will be ſuch a one, wherein the judgment of the whole *Chriſtian Church* was ſeen, *viz.* in the

(633.)

mentioned by *O. N.* which they have not been before-hand with him, in producing to the very ſame purpoſe. I cannot then find out the difference, between the higheſt of our *Enthuſiaſts* and *theirs*; and the very ſame pleas which ſerve for the one, will juſtifie the other alſo. What have they ever pretended to, but to underſtand *celeſtial Secrets, Divine Myſteries, or Future Events by immediate Revelation?* Now all theſe things are owned, defended and juſtified by the *Roman* Church, and yet they not lyable to the charge of *Fanaticiſm?*

§. 7. No, ſaith O. *N. Enthuſiaſm or Fanaticiſm doth not lie in ſpeaking things hard to be underſtood, nor yet the pretending high and myſterious Effects, Viſions, Revelations,* &c. *for all theſe we believe may be, and are often wrought in God's Saints by the Holy Spirit, and his ſpecial preſence in their Souls, and that we ſay in a much higher and more admirable way, than any of Satan's infatuations can imitate or aſcend to; but Fanaticiſm is a falſe pretence of theſe, or the like, when having no juſt ground to be credited, they pretend to them.* So that the main point is yielded up to the *Fanaticks,* viz. *Viſions and immediate Revelations,* and *unaccountable Impulſes from the Spirit of God*; all the Diſpute is, whether the *Popiſh Enthuſiaſts,* or thoſe among us are only Pretenders? If *O. N.* were to convince a *Quaker,* who pretends to ſuch an immediate Impulſe of the *Spirit,* this muſt be his method of proceeding with him. O. N. ſect. 13 p. 20.

Friend, I perceive thou talkeſt much of the Spirit of God moving thee, and revealing the hidden Myſteries of his Kingdom to thee, but thy pretence is vain, and thou art deceived by thy own Fancy, if not by an evil Spirit.

No, ſaith the *Quaker, I know, I am not, for I have the teſtimony of the Spirit within me, that I am not deceived; but thou art deceived, and lyeſt againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and blaſphemeſt the Spirit of God working in his Saints.*

Not I, ſaith *O. N. I grant that the Holy Ghoſt doth work in his Saints ſuch ſupernatural Elevations, whereby they underſtand divine Myſteries, and have Viſions and Raptures and Revelations more than any of you; but all ours are true, and yours are falſe.*

Thou lying Prophet, replies the *Quaker, God ſpeaks truth by thee, as he did once by* Baalam's Aſs *and* Caiaphas; *but thou, through the wickedneſs of thy Heart, doſt condemn the Generation of his Saints among us, as Hypocrites; and wouldſt have the Spirit of God dwell only among you, that are the Sons of Myſtical* Babylon, *and partake of all her Defilements, that are the Seed of the Beaſt and the falſe Prophet, that commit Adultery with Images, and ſet up the Man of Sin in his Throne, that have covered the Face of the Earth with your abominations, and ſtill go about to deceive the Nations. You have the Spirit of God among you! You pretend to the ſeeing hidden Myſteries, and immediate Revelations and Myſtical Unions with God! No, yours are the Myſteries of Iniquity, the Revelations of Antichriſt, and Unions only with Myſtical* Babylon. *You have the Spirit of God among you! No, yours is the Spirit of Enchantment and Divination, the Spirit of Lying and Deceit, the Spirit of Antichriſt, and not of God.*

I ſay again, ſaith *O. N. that we have the Spirit, and you have not.*

And I ſay by the Spirit, *that you have not,* ſaith the *Quaker.*

O. N. ſect. 14.

And is not this a fair concluſion of this Diſpute? Hath not O. N. extreamly got the better of the *Quaker*? But O. N. pleads yet farther, *That they make uſe of Notes and Rules of diſcerning of the Pretences to Inſpiration*; which I ſhall conſider afterwards: But that which O. N. and Mr. *Creſſy* do moſt inſiſt upon, is this, *That if ſuch Pretenders to Inſpirations do ſpeak or do any thing againſt the Catholick Church* (as they call it) *then their Pretences are to be rejected as Satanical illuſions*. Very good! This is a way to preſerve themſelves, but what is this to the preventing the deluſions of ſuch fanatick Pretenders to Inſpirations, who may be groſly deceived, and yet never ſpeak or do any thing againſt their Church, but it ſeems the leaſt touch that way preſently marrs all. If *Mother Tereſa* had but chanced to let fall a word againſt the Power of *Holy Water in driving away Devils*, or chanced in one of her *Viſions* to have ſeen *Bread upon the Alter after Conſecration*; away with her, a meer Hypocrite and Impoſtor, one deluded by the Devil: And it had been well, if after all her *Viſions* and *Raptures*, ſhe had eſcaped the *Inquiſition*. For can it poſſibly be ſo certain, that ſhe had *Divine Viſions*, as that *Holy Water drives away Devils*; or that *ſhe had Myſtical Unions*, as that *no Bread lay upon the Altar after Conſecration*? No, no. If melancholy Women once offer to meddle in thoſe matters, they muſt then be told of their *weakneſs of Judgment*, and *ſtrength of Imagination*, and *deluſions of the Devil*; but if they admire every ſuperſtitious Foolery, and ſee ſtrange effects of *Holy Water*, and in ſome *Viſions* can diſcern the *very Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*, then *O Heavenly Viſions! O Divine Saint!* Then her *Confeſſor* muſt ſooth and flatter her, and ſuffer her to be deceived by her own imagination at leaſt, if not by ſomething worſe. So that this whole buſineſs of *Viſions and Revelations* among them is managed by *Politick Rules*; if they can ſerve to ſtrengthen their Intereſt, they are encouraged, if not, the Perſons are preſently diſcountenanced, and if they perſiſt in their Pretences, in great hazard of the *Inquiſition*. But may not weak and melancholy Perſons be deceived in judging the effects of a ſtrong *Imagination* to be the *Inſpirations* of the *Spirit of God? What then*, ſay they, *theſe do no hurt to the World*. But is it no injury to their Souls, to ſuffer them to be ſo deluded? Is it no diſhonour to *Chriſtian Religion* to make the Perfection of the *Devotion* of it to conſiſt in ſuch ſtrange unaccountable *Unions* and *Raptures*, which take away the uſe of all *Reaſon* and *Diſcourſe?* Is it nothing to have Perſons *Canonized* for *Saints*, and admired and worſhipped, chiefly for the ſake of theſe things? In which caſe, not only the particular Perſons, while they lived, were ſuffered to be abuſed; but the whole Chriſtian World as much as lies in them, is impoſed upon; and the effects of a ſtrong *Imagination*, and *Myſtical Unions*, are recommended as the *perfection* of the *Chriſtian State*.

§. 8. But whatever *Rules* they go by; I ſhall now ſhew, that ſuch kind of *Ecſtaſies* and *Revelations*, as the *Myſtical Divinity* pretends to, have been condemned by the *Chriſtian Church* in former Ages; which will yet farther diſcover, how far it is from being *a part of the Chriſtian Doctrine*; ſo far is it from being *the perfection of a Chriſtian State*. And the Inſtance I ſhall produce, will be ſuch a one, wherein the judgment of the whole *Chriſtian Church* was ſeen, *viz.* in the

Ecſtatical *Viſions* and *Raptures* and *Revelations*, which *Montanus* and his Followers pretended to. *Baronius* proves from the Teſtimonies of Baron. A.D. 173. n. 7. 25. *Philaſtrius*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret* and others, that *Montanus* and his Companions were *good Catholicks*, and great Practiſers of Faſting and Mortifications, and were in great eſteem in the *Church* for a more than ordinary degree of Sanctity; when they were in this reputation, they pretended to have extraordinary *Viſions* and *Ecſtaſies*, wherein they ſuffered ſuch violences as *Mother Tereſa* deſcribes; and were under ſuch a *force* upon their Minds as they thought *divine*, which deprived them of the preſent *uſe* of *ratiocination*, in which ſtate, they ſaid, they had many *Revelations from God*. Now here we have the very caſe of *Myſtical Unions*; and we all know that this *Spirit* of *Montanus* was rejected in the Chriſtian Church as a *Fanatick Enthuſiaſtical Spirit*; but, it will it be worth our while, to ſhew that it was upon this very ground, becauſe the *Montaniſts* pretended to ſuch *Ecſtaſies* and *Revelations* from God, which deprived Men of the uſe of their Reaſon. *Claudius Apollinaris Biſhop* of *Hierapolis* apprehending the dangerous Conſequences of theſe Enthuſiaſtical Pretences to Ecſtaſies and Revelations goes to *Ancyra* in *Galatia* to give himſelf full ſatisfaction as to the nature of them; and Euſeb. Eccl. hiſtor. l. 5. c. 16. being returned, he writes this account to his Friend *Marcellus*, *That* Montanus *was wont to fall into ſudden Tranſports and Ecſtaſies in which he became Enthuſiaſtical, and uttered ſtrange things, and propheſie*; *which*, ſaith he, *is a thing contrary to the conſtant tradition and practice of the Chriſtian Church*; the ſame he ſaith of the two Female *Enthuſiaſts*, *Priſca* and *Maximilla*; and all the account he gives of their ſeparation from the Communion of the Church, was becauſe the Chriſtian Church all over the World refuſed to give any Entertainment to their *Enthuſiaſtical Spirit*, and that the Churches of *Aſia* having met together and examined this Spirit, they condemned it *as impious*, whereupon they were caſt out of the Church; upon which *Maxilla* cry'd out, *I am driven away as a Wolf from the Sheep*, but I am no *Wolf* but the *Word*, and the *Spirit*, and the *Power*. *Miltiades*, as appears by *Euſebius*, c. 17. writ a *Book* againſt the *Montaniſts* on this Subject, that *God did not communicate Revelations in Ecſtaſies*; wherein he ſhewed, that *Montanus* was wont to fall into his Ecſtaſies, which ended in an involuntary *Madneſs*; and then proves that none of the *Prophets* either of the Old or New Teſtament ever propheſied in *Ecſtaſies*, or *when they had no uſe of their Reaſon*. But no one ſpeaks more punctually to this Buſineſs than *Epiphanius*, who lays down this as a general Rule, *that whatever Prophets ſpake, they delivered with the clear uſe of their Reaſon and Underſtanding*; and afterwards ſaith, that the *Montaniſts* were very much deceived in pretending to ſuch *Viſions* and *Revelations*, becauſe *God had ſealed up his Church, and put an end to thoſe extraordinary Gifts*. While there was any need of *Prophets*, Holy Men of God were ſent by him with a true Spirit ϗ ἐῤῥωμένῃ διανοίᾳ ϗ παρηκολουθοῦντι νῷ, *with great ſteadineſs of Mind, and a clear Underſtanding*; and afterwards makes this characteriſtical difference of a true and falſe Prophet; that a true *Prophet* ſpeaks μετα καταστάσεως λογισμῶν ϗ παρηκολουθήσεως, *with a great conſiſtency of Ratiocination and Conſequence*. Thus *Moſes*, thus *Iſaiah*, ſaith he, *thus all the Prophets*. *Do not you ſee*, ſaith he, *that theſe are the Words of Men that underſtood themſelves, and not of Men that were ecſtatical; but theſe pretenders to Viſions and Revelations* *ſpeak dark, and perplexed, and obſcure things* (viz. much like to *Myſtical Divinity*) *which neither they underſtood themſelves, nor thoſe that heard them.* As any one may ſee in him by the Fragments he hath preſerved both of *Montanus* and *Maximilla.* But they pleaded Scripture too for their *Ecſtaſies* and *Raptures, viz.* Gen. 2. 21. *God's ſending* Sect. 4. *upon* Adam *a deep ſleep*, which was render'd ἔκστασιν; to which *Epiphanius* anſwers, that that was only a binding of his Senſes by *Natural Reſt*; and not any *force* upon the *Mind*: But they had another place too as impertinent as this, (but as impertinent as it is, it is the very ſame Phraſe that my Adverſaries produce) *Ego dixi in exceſſu meo*; Pſal. 115. 11. which *Epiphanius* proves cannot be underſtood of any ſuch Ecſtaſie as the *Montaniſts* pleaded for; and in Truth he needed not take much pains to do it: But they could not follow the *Montaniſts* exactly, unleſs they abuſed Scripture too to juſtifie their *Viſions* and *Ecſtaſies*: So one *Ferdinandus de Diano* a *Venetian Divine*, writing a Book purpoſely in Vindication of theſe things, on the occaſion of the *Ecſtaſies* and *Viſions* of a *Certain Nun*, which were ſent to *Paul* the Fifth, and which were taken by her *Confeſſor* for fourteen years together, makes uſe of the very ſame Phraſes of *Scripture* as the *Montaniſts* did; but exceeds them in impertinency: For to prove *Raptures*, he produces all the Places where the Word *Raptus* is uſed; *raptus eſt ne malitia mutaret intellectum ejus*, Sap. 4. *Mens illius ad diverſa rapitur*, Job 26. *Rapiemur cum illis in nubibus*, 1 Theſſ. 4. but above all, commend me to *Holofernes* his *Rapture* to prove the *Raptures* of the *Popiſh Saints*; *Holophernis oculi à ſandalibus Judith rapti ſunt, & ejus cor & ſenſus cum illis rapta ſunt*, Jud. 16. Can any Man P. 34. be ſo hard hearted to withſtand ſuch manifeſt proofs as theſe are? But to return to *Epiphanius*; we are not to underſtand, ſaith he, *any* Sect. 7. *Rapture or Ecſtaſie of the Prophets, ſo as to ſuppoſe them to be deprived of the uſe of their reaſon and them*: So he ſhews that St. *Peter* in his *Ecſtaſie* had ſtill the free exerciſe of his *Reaſon*; which he abſolutely affirms Sect. 10. of every *Prophet* both of the *Old and New Teſtament.* What would *Epiphanius* have thought then of the *glorious Frenzies* and *heavenly Follies* of *M. Tereſa*, in which ſhe *ſpake ſhe knew not what?* What of the *Myſtical Unions* wherein the *operations of the underſtanding are ſuſpended?* What of all the holy *Violences* ſhe underwent, wherein *both Underſtanding and Memory were diſtracted?* No doubt, he would have declared them all to be downright *Montaniſm*; and condemned by the whole *Chriſtian Church.* Neither were theſe the only Perſons who delivered the Senſe of the Church in this Matter; but St. *Hierom* ſaith the ſame thing; *The Prophet*, ſaith he, *ſpeaks not in* Hieronym. præfat. in Nahum. *an Ecſtaſie* (as *Montanus*, and *Priſca*, and *Maximilla* fondly imagine) *but what he propheſies in the Book of the Viſion of one who underſtands all he ſays.* So of the Prophet *Habakkuk*, *he underſtands what he ſees* (*con-* Præfat. in Habac. *trary to the perverſe Doctrine of* Montanus) *and ſpeaks not as a Fool, nor gives (as diſtracted Women do) a ſound without any ſignification. Whence it comes that the Apoſtle commands, that if any thing be revealed to another that ſitteth by, the firſt ſhould hold his peace; for*, ſaith he pre- 1 Cor. 14. 30. ſently after, *God is not the Author of confuſion, but of Peace*; *whence* V. 33. *it follows, that he who holds his peace to give way to another to ſpeak, he can either ſpeak or hold his peace at his pleaſure; but that he who ſpeaks in an Ecſtaſie*, i. e. *againſt his will, is not at liberty to ſpeak or to be ſilent.* And to the ſame purpoſe he ſpeaks in other places, *in*

Præfat. in Iſaiah l. 1. c. 1. in Iſaiah 33.
S. Chryſoſt. in Pſal. 45. 1.
In 1 Cor. 12. hom. 29.
S. Baſil in Iſai. ſerm. 1. Præfat.

which, he ſaith, *that all the Viſions and Revelations which came from God were full of Wiſdom and Reaſon; and not like the Extravagancies of* Montanus. Nay St. *Chryſoſtom* goes higher, and imputes all *Fanatick Ecſtaſies* to the *Devil, who breaks in upon the Soul, and blinds the Underſtanding, and darkens the Reaſoning Faculty; but the Spirit of God doth not ſo; but ſuffers the heart to know what it ſays. The Devil as an Enemy fights againſt the Humane Soul, but the holy Spirit as taking care of it, and ready to do it good, communicates his Counſel to thoſe who receive it, and reveals unto them divine things with Underſtanding.* And elſewhere, he makes this the great difference between *Divination* and *divine Revelation*; that *the one was done in Ecſtaſies and Rapture, with violence to the Mind, the other ſedately and compoſedly, and underſtanding whatever they ſpake; for God did not preſs them by violence, nor darkned their underſtandings; but did adviſe and teach them, leaving them ſtill Maſters of themſelves, whence* Jonas *fled, and* Ezekiel *put off, and* Jeremiah *excuſed himſelf.* St. *Baſil* utterly denies *that the Humane Underſtanding was ever ſuſpended by divine Revelation; or that men were by the Spirit of God depriv'd of the uſe of Ratiocination. For how does it ſtand with Reaſon, that thro' the Wiſdom of the Spirit, a Man ſhould become as one beſides himſelf? and that the Spirit of Knowledge ſhould deliver things incoherent? for neither is Light the cauſe of Blindneſs, nor does the Spirit cauſe obſcurity in Men's Minds, but raiſes the Underſtanding to the contemplation of things intelligible, cleanſing it from the ſtains of Sin; nor is it improbable that through the deſign of the evil Spirit, (who lays his Ambuſhes to enſnare human Nature) the Mind is confounded; but to ſay, the ſame is done by the Spirit of God, is impious.* From all which teſtimonies, nothing can be more evident, than that the *Viſions* and *Revelations*, the *Ecſtaſies* and *Raptures*, which *S. C.* and *O. N.* do plead for, were condemned by the whole Chriſtian Church, and the moſt eminent Lights of it, as the very height of *Fanaticiſm*.

O. N. p. 16.
Tertull. de Anima c. 9.
O. N. ſect. 6.
Diano de Diano, p. 84.

But *O. N.* would have Men believe, that the ancient Church did very much favour ſuch *Ecſtaſies* and *Viſions*; to that end he produces the *Teſtimony* of *Tertullian*, concerning the *Siſter that fell into an Ecſtaſie, and had the Viſion of the Corporeity of the Soul:* As though *Tertullian* were not known to have taken the part of *Montanus* in this matter; and in that very place (in the next Words to thoſe cited by *O. N.*) he pleads for the continuance of *Viſions* and *Ecſtaſies* in the *Chriſtian Church*, and in ſeveral other places of the ſame Book. And I deſire *O. N.* and his Brethren, to conſider a little better what they ſay, when they charge me with *making all Antiquity Fanatick, upon the ſame grounds that I charge Fanaticiſm on their Church*; for it is moſt evident by this Diſcourſe, that I have the beſt and pureſt *Antiquity*, and the full conſent of the *Chriſtian Church* in the caſe of *Montanus* clearly on my ſide. And I declare freely, that I value this conſent above all the *Writers* of the *Lives* of the *Saints*, from St. *Antony*'s downwards; and it is the only conſiderable thing which *Diano* ſaith on this ſubject, *if we do not allow of Viſions, and Raptures, and Revelations, What will become*, ſaith he, *of all the Lives of the Saints, and the Legends which are full of them?* As may be ſeen in *Lippoman, Surius, Baronius*, and the *Monaſtick Hiſtories* of the *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans*. What will become of the *Speculum exemplorum*, of the *Promptuaria*, the *Liber Apum*, the *Legends* of the *bleſſed Virgin*, and a *thouſand ſuch excellent Books?* Truly, it is the leaſt part of my concernment what becomes of them; and I think it had been much more for the *Honour* of *Chriſtianity*, if they had never been writ.

And if as O. N. ſaith, *it be now too late to cry ſuch things down*, I am very heartily ſorry for it: and it is a plain diſcovery that the *Spirit* of *Montanus* hath too much poſſeſſed that which they call the *Catholick Church*.

O.N. p.12.

But O. N. beſides *Tertullian* produces ſeveral Paſſages of St. *Auguſtin* to juſtifie *theſe ſupernatural and extraordinary Graces and Careſſes received from God*; (for thoſe of St. *Gregory* and St. *Bernard* are not of ſo great weight in this matter, to deſerve a particular conſideration, where the conſent of the *Chriſtian Church* is ſo fully proved already) St. *Auguſtin* is brought in by him, *as acknowledging his Converſion from Manichaiſm to have been from a divine Revelation concerning God's incorruptibility and immutability*: But what were this to the purpoſe, if the free uſe and exerciſe of his Reaſon were continued therein? Yet no ſuch thing doth appear by any thing ſaid by St. *Auguſtin*. In the Diſpute with *Fortunatus*, he doth ſay, *that he would anſwer that which God would have him to know, that God could ſuffer no neceſſity, nor have any violence put upon him*, (which *Fortunatus* ſaith, *God had revealed to him)* and in the concluſion, making uſe of the force of that Argument, he ſaith, *By that he was divinely admoniſhed to leave the Manichean Doctrine.* And what is all this to *Myſtical Divinity*? What *immediate Revelation*, or *Viſion*, or *Rapture* was this, for a Man to acknowledge there was ſomething *divine* in the force of a particular Argument to convince him? Do I ever call it *Fanaticiſm*, for Men to acknowledge the *Grace of God* in the *illumination* of their Minds, when ſome particular Arguments may perſwade them at ſome times, which at another might not have done it? And to let us ſee that St. *Auguſtin* meant no ſuch thing as any *particular Revelation* in this Caſe, in the ſeventh Book of *Confeſſions* he gives an account by what ſteps and degrees he was brought off from *Manichaiſm*, and as much by the exerciſe of Reaſon and Underſtanding, as we ſhall eaſily meet with in any Perſon. And as to this particular Argument, as though he had a mind to prevent any ſuch Imagination, he ſaith, *he had it from Nebridius at Carthage*. But I cannot but wonder at the bringing in the *Neſciens unde & quomodo*——— and *hoc uno ictu* in the foregoing *Chapter*, where he ſpeaks expreſly of the manner of his forming a Conception of God as a Spiritual *Being*; upon which, he ſaith, *that although he could not tell whence, or how, yet he was certain that a corruptible Being was more imperfect than an incorruptible; and therefore his Heart did riſe againſt his Imaginations, and with this one ſtroke he endeavours to expel all the flock of Phantaſms from his Conception of God*. Was not this O. N. very hard put to it, to bring theſe Paſſages to prove *Myſtical Divinity*? To as little purpoſe doth he produce that Ejaculation, *Age Domine & fac; excita & revoca nos: accende ac rape, &c.* for may not Men pray for the exciting, aſſiſting, and comforting Grace of God, without ſuppoſing *Ecſtaſies* and *Raptures* and *immediate Revelations*? But he was yet farther of, when he brought that place to prove theſe extraordinary Favours from God; *Lux es tu permanens quam de omnibus conſulebam, &c.* which if he had looked on the beginning of the *Chapter*, he would have found to be an Addreſs to *Truth*; *Vbi non mecum ambulaſti veritas, docens quid caveam & quid appetam, &c.* And doth O. N. think

O.N. from *Sect.* 22. to *Sect.* 40.

Aug. c. Fortunat. Tom. 6.

Confeſſ. l. 7. *c.* 2.

C. 12

L. 8. *c.* 4.

L. 10. *c.* 40.

think that there is ſuch a *Myſtical Union* between the *Soul* and *Truth*, as to deprive Men of the uſe of their *Reaſon* and *Underſtanding*? But I am tired with theſe Impertinences; yet we muſt have more of L. 7. c. 10. them. For becauſe St. *Auſtin* in deſcribing the *depth* of his Meditation concerning God and himſelf, doth mention, *that by the Eye of his Mind he ſaw an immutable Light very far above it; and by this Reflection he became as certain of what he only underſtood, as if he had heard it in his Heart*; therefore this place ſerves to prove no leſs than the *fund of the Soul*, and *God's internal Speech to the Soul*, and what not? I expect next, that *Des Cartes* his *Method* and *Metaphyſical Meditations* ſhould be brought to juſtifie *Myſtical Divinity*; for they altogether L. 9. c. 10. ſerve as well for it. And cannot St. *Auſtin* expreſs the *profound Meditation* which he and his Mother *Monica* had concerning the bleſſed State of Souls in Heaven, and the ardent deſire they had of being there, and the *Joy* they found in the Thoughts of it, without falling *into the unintelligible Canting of the Myſtical Divines*? God forbid, that I ſhould ever call the Diſcourſes, or Deſires, or joyful thoughts of the happineſs of Heaven, by the Name of *Canting*: that were indeed to be Impious and Prophane; but what is all this to *a perfect and immediate Union with God in the pure fund of the Spirit in this preſent State*? a *Union* which ſuppoſes *a ceſſation of Reaſon and Diſcourſe*? No ſuch thing was in the leaſt thought of by St. *Auſtin*, who was too great a *Philoſopher* to ſuppoſe *Contemplation* in this De quant. anim. c. 33. Life without any act of *Reaſoning* or *Diſcourſe*. In his Book *de quantitate animæ*, he deſcribes the ſeveral ſteps of the *Soul*, and the higheſt of all he places *in the contemplation of God as the Supream Truth*, and declares that he could not expreſs the *Joys* which did attend the *fruition* of the *true and chief Good. But great and incomparable Minds have expreſſed theſe things as far as they thought them fit to be expreſſed, which we believe to have ſeen, and ſtill to ſee thoſe things.* By which it is plain he ſpeaks of the *Joys* of another World, and not of any *Myſtical* and *paſſive Unions* in this: And afterwards he ſpeaks of the imperfection of this *Contemplation* here, and *that therefore Death will be deſirable, becauſe thoſe things will then be taken away, which now* De Morib. Eccleſ. Cathol. c. 31. *hinder the whole Soul from fixing upon whole Truth.* In his Book *de Moribus Eccleſiæ Catholicæ*, he ſpeaks of the *Egyptian Hermites ſpending their Life in Contemplation*, without mentioning any *Raptures* and *Ecſtaſies* they had; and although he doth plead for their Life ſuppoſing the uſefulneſs of their Prayers to others, yet he doth not diſſemble, that their manner of Living was diſpleaſing to ſome; and c. 32. afterwards ſaith himſelf, that *the Vertue of thoſe who converſed with Mankind, deſerved greater admiration and praiſe, ſuch as the Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons of the Chriſtian Church.* But although St. *Auſtin* doth not, yet *O. N.* ſaith, *that* Caſſian *doth mention the frequent Raptures and Ecſtaſies of theſe Egyptian Hermits*; but of all ſorts of Perſons, thoſe who lead an Eremitical Life, are leaſt fit to be produced; becauſe all thoſe who have written on this Subject in the *Roman* Church do ſay, that the *Illuſions of the Devil* may be ſo like *divine Rapures*, that there is a neceſſity of a great deal of Judgment and Skill, to be able to put a difference between them; and that none ought to be allowed, but ſuch as have been approved by *diſcreet Perſons*; but in the Caſe of theſe *Hermites* we may have juſt Reaſon upon their own Rules, to ſuſpect them, having been never brought under a ſufficient

cient Rule of Tryal, If Perſons may be deceived themſelves in judging natural Diſtempers and Satanical Illuſions for *divine Raptures* and *Viſions*, then we have no reaſon to relie on the ſingle Teſtimonies of ſuch *Eremitical* Perſons, who have no Witneſſes of their Actions. What know we what ſort of Perſons *Abbat John* and *Abbat Iſaac* were in the *Deſarts* of *Ægypt?* We have only their ſingle Teſtimonies in *Caſſian*, and his ſingle Word that they ſaid ſuch things to him.

§. 9. But to take off the force of theſe and ſuch like Inſtances, I ſhall conſider the *Rules* laid down by their own *Writers*, concerning theſe things, and from thence ſhew, what Grounds we have not to relie on the Inſtances produced by them, concerning *Viſions*, and *Raptures*, and *Ecſtaſies*, and *Revelations*.

1. They confeſs that the natural force and power of *Imagination* will in ſome Tempers produce all the ſame Symptoms and Appearances both to themſelves and others, which there are in *ſupernatural Elevations*. So *Cardinal Bona* (who very lately, and with the beſt Judgment, hath collected the *Rules* of their *Writers* upon this Subject) freely acknowledgeth not only that *Ecſtaſies may be cauſed by natural Diſeaſes*; (of which *Galen* gives an inſtance in a *Schoolfellow* of his, and *Fernelius*, and *Sennertus*, and many others) but by the meer *force of Imagination: by which the Animal Spirits flowing in greater quantities to the Brain, do thereby hinder the external operations of the Senſes, ſo that the Perſon under it continues without Senſe or Motion, and in that condition fancies an extraordinay preſence of that Object which the Imagination was fixed upon. And the more intenſe this Imagination is, the greater flux of Spirits is made to the Brain, and ſo the Ecſtaſie continues ſo much the longer, eſpecially where the Spirits are more thick and melancholy, and conſequently not ſo eaſily diſſipated.* So *Paulus Zacchias* ſaith, *that we are not to conclude an Ecſtaſie to be ſupernatural, becauſe it ariſeth from the contemplation of ſupernatural things; for the Imagination being fixed upon divine things, will have the ſame effects, that it would have upon other things. Thence*, ſaith he, *ſuch Perſons do really think (as much as Men do in Dreams) that they are preſent at that time with Angels, or Saints, and have Conferences with them; or that they ſee and enjoy God, or imagine themſelves to be in* Hell, *or in* Purgatory. And Perſons ſeized upon with this *Ecſtaſie* will continue for a long time in the very ſame poſture it took them without any motion; ſo *Plato* reports of *Socrates, that he ſtood a whole day without any alteration in the ſame Poſture, his Mind being abſtracted with pure contemplation, and at Night ſome* Ionian *Soldiers having obſerved him, lay down by him, and they found that he continued without any motion till the next Morning. Favorinus* in *A. Gellius* ſaith, *that* Socrates *did this often*: which *Cajetan* imputes to the *vehement intention of his Mind*; but he ſaith *Ariſtotle lays it upon the diſpoſition of his Body*; for he thought him beſides himſelf, ſaith *Cajetan*; *poſſeſſed*, ſaith *Fortunatus Scacchus*; but neither the one nor the other appears by *Ariſtotle*, who only ſaith, that all extraordinary Men in any way, had a deep tincture of Melancholy; for which among the *Philoſophers* he doth inſtance in *Empedocles*, *Socrates* and *Plato*; *which Temper*, he ſaith, *hath much in it of the nature of Wine, which is more apt to heighten and inflame Mens Spirits, than Hony, or Milk, or Water, it firſt makes Men talkative, then eloquent and bold*;

Joh. Bona de diſcret. Spirituum c. 14. n. 4. Lut. Pariſ. 1673.

Paul. Zacch Quæſt. Medico-legal. l. 4. tit. 1. q. 6. n. 4.

Plato in Conviv. in orat. Alcibiadis, p. 220. ed. Serr.

A. Gell. Noct. Att. 1. c. 1.

Cajet. in 2. 2. q. 175. art. 1.

Problem. ſ. 30.

bold ; then it ſtirs them to action, then it puts them into a rage, and at laſt by cuſtom makes them meer Sots : All theſe ſeveral Qualities ſome Men have by their natural Tempers : Some, ſaith he, *are much given to deep ſilence, as thoſe whom Melancholy makes Ecſtatical ; which Temper although naturally cold, is capable of a greater degree of heat ; as Water being once heated, is hotter than the Flame it ſelf ; and Stones and Iron heated become hotter than the Coals : So,* ſaith he, *it is with Melancholy, if it be overheated, it fills them with joy and ſinging, and makes them Ecſtatical ; and becauſe this heat comes very near the ſeat of the Mind, it is apt to make Men diſtracted or enthuſiaſtical ; thence the* Sybils, *and the* Bacchæ, *and ſuch* Enthuſiaſts *became ſuch, not by a Diſeaſe, but by a natural Temper.* And to that which is ſaid in the *Life* of St. *Tereſa* of one that made *Verſes in an Ecſtaſie, Ariſtotle* hath a very fit parallel of *Maracus* a *Syracuſian Poet, that never made ſo good Verſes, as when he was really Ecſtatical :* And for the great inequality of the Tempers of ſuch *Ecſtatical Perſons, Ariſtotle* ſaith, *that Melancholy, as it produces very odd and irregular Diſtempers, ſo it is very unequal of it ſelf, ſometimes very hot, and at other times very cold ;* which the *Myſtical Divines* call the *State of Deſolation : But this Temper being apt again to be inflamed of a ſudden, it fills them with ſtrange Pleaſures, eſpecially the Imagination being fixed upon an Object of Love ;* which this Temper, *Ariſtotle* obſerves, is *more particularly diſpoſed to :* But becauſe whatever makes Perſons *Ecſtatical,* deprives them of the *uſe* of their Reaſon ; therefore theſe *Myſtical Unions* which have ſo much *Joy* and *Pleaſure,* are ſaid to be with a ſuſpenſion of all the *Diſcourſive Acts* of the *Mind.* Which things are not to be thought extraordinary, eſpecially in Perſons not only of a Melancholy Temper ; but whoſe Temper hath been heightned by the power of Diſeaſes, great Severities, ſolemn Silence and Retirement ; and whoſe Imagination hath been poſſeſſed with ſuch Notions as do highly gratify an *Enthuſiaſtical Diſpoſition, viz.* ſuch as relate to a more immediate *Union* with an infinite *Object* of *Love.* So that there ſeems to be nothing in this *State* of *pure Contemplation,* of which a reaſonable account cannot be given from a natural Temper heightned and improved by the force of *Imagination.* And that this may ſeem the leſs ſtrange, I ſhall produce an Inſtance of this kind, which I believe will not be denyed, to have been either effected meerly by *Imagination,* or at leaſt, by ſomething under a *Divine Power ;* which is lately reported by a very credible and intelligent Perſon, and one who lives in the communion of the *Roman Church.* Monſieur *Bernier,* in his Letter to Monſieur *Chapelain,* dated *October* 4. 1667. concerning the *Gentiles* of *Indoſtan,* gives an account of certain *Orders* of *Religious* among them, who make Vows of *Chaſtity, Poverty and Obedience,* living in *Convents under Superiours,* who are commonly called *Jauguis,* i. e. *united to* God, *who uſed* themſelves to many hardſhips, and were looked on as ſo many *Eremites* by the People ; being accounted true Saints, illuminated and perfect *Jauguis ; Theſe are People that have entirely abandoned the World, and ſequeſtered themſelves into ſome very remote corner, or garden like Eremites without ever coming to the Town. If you carry them any Meat, they receive it ; if they do not, 'tis believed that they can live without it, and ſubſiſt by the ſole Favour of God in perpetual Faſting, Prayer, and profound Meditations ; for they ſink themſelves ſo deep into theſe Raptures, that they ſpend many hours together in being inſenſible, and beholding in that*

Berniers Memoires, part. 2. p. 136.

time, as they give out, God *himſelf, like a very bright and ineffable light, with an unexpreſſible joy and ſatisfaction, attended with an entire contempt and forſaking of the World. For thus much one of them that pretended he could enter into this Rapture when he pleaſed, and had been often in it, told me; and others that are about them affirm the thing with ſo much ſeriouſneſs, that they ſeem to believe in earneſt, that there is no impoſture in it.* Which therefore *Bernier* imputes to an *illuſion of Imagination cauſed by Solitude and Faſting*; and this he calls *the great Myſtery of the Cabala of the* Jauguis; and adds, *that their extremity of Poverty, and Faſtings, and Auſterities contribute much to it*; *wherein* he ſaith, *the* European *Friars or Eremits, are but Novices in compariſon with them.* I leave Mr. *Creſſy* now to conſider, whether theſe *Myſtical Unions* and *Raptures*, be ſuch Privileges of *Saints?* Whether *Solitude, Abſtraction from Worldly Cares, rigorous Abſtinences,* and ſuch like things, which he admires the *Contemplative Life* for, be *ſo peculiar to their Church?* When we find the very ſame things among the *Gentiles* of *Indoſtan.* And the *Author* of the *Book De Sapientia divina ſecundum Ægyptios,* who ſeems to have been an *Arabian Philoſopher,* ſets down theſe words of *Plato* (and not as his own experience, as *Cardinal Bona* relates them) *Being often in the depth of Contemplation, my body being left behind, I ſeemed to enjoy the chief Good with incredible Pleaſure. Wherefore I ſtood as it were aſtoniſhed, finding my ſelf to be a part of the upper World, and to have obtained Immortality, with the cleareſt Light; which cannot be expreſſed with words, nor heard by Ears, nor underſtood by the Thoughts of Men:* And then he deſcribes *the ſadneſs he felt at the decay of that glorious Light*; *and the pleaſure which returned with his former Ecſtaſies.* This *Cardinal Bona* thinks might either come by the *natural force of Contemplation,* or *the illuſion of evil Spirits*; but herein are all the ſame appearances that are pretended to in *Myſtical Unions,* And to ſhew the *Power* of *Imagination* in cauſing *Ecſtaſies*; beſides that of *Socrates, Bona* mentions the like of *Carneades,* related by *Valerius Maximus,* of *Plotinus* by *Porphyrius,* of *Jamblichus* by *Eunapius,* and the common inſtance of *Reſtitutus* in St. *Auſtin,* who fell into an *Ecſtaſie* when he pleaſed. *Thomas Aquinas* reckons up three cauſes of *Raptures, Bodily Diſtempers, Diabolical* and *Divine Power:* but *Cajetan* ſaith, there is a fourth *cauſe acknowledged elſewhere by him,* viz. *a vehement intention of the Mind, which he therefore omitted, becauſe he ſpake of cauſes extrinſical to the Mind it ſelf.*

De ſapientia ſecundum Ægypt l. 1. c. 4.

2.2.q.175 art.1.corp. art.

§. 10. 2. There can be no certainly by the Rules laid down by themſelves, that the *Ecſtaſies* and *Raptures,* or *Viſions* and *Revelations* of Perſons, do come only from Divine and Supernatural Cauſes. For they grant that in all theſe caſes there is reaſon to ſuſpect Ecſtaſies and Raptutes.

1. If the Perſon's natural Temper be very Melancholy. This is the firſt *Rule* in *Cardinal Bona*; for ſaith he, *thoſe who are troubled with this, may eaſily fix their Minds ſo upon one object, as to ſuffer an alienation of their Senſes from any other. Joh. à Jeſu Maria,* a great Myſtical Divine, makes this his fourth *Rule,* to conſider, *Whether the Perſon have a good underſtanding, or be troubled with any Diſtemper in the Head, or with Melancholy, or be ſubject to any vehement Paſſions*; which *Cardinal Bona* likewiſe adds; and therefore *Cardinal Cajetan* well notes, *that the various motion of the Heart, ariſing foom ſome appre-*

Card. Bona de diſcr. Spirit. c. 14. n. 5.

Joh. a Jeſu Maria Theolog. Myſt. c. 8.

Cajet. in 1.2.q.17. *art.* 7.

bold; then it ſtirs them to action, then it puts them into a rage, and at laſt by cuſtom makes them meer Sots: All theſe ſeveral Qualities ſome Men have by their natural Tempers: Some, ſaith he, *are much given to deep ſilence, as thoſe whom Melancholy makes Ecſtatical; which Temper although naturally cold, is capable of a greater degree of heat; as Water being once heated, is hotter than the Flame it ſelf; and Stones and Iron heated become hotter than the Coals: So,* ſaith he, *it is with Melancholy, if it be over-heated, it fills them with joy and ſinging, and makes them Ecſtatical; and becauſe this heat comes very near the ſeat of the Mind, it is apt to make Men diſtracted or enthuſiaſtical; thence the* Sybils, *and the* Bacchæ, *and ſuch* Enthuſiaſts *became ſuch, not by a Diſeaſe, but by a natural Temper.* And to that which is ſaid in the *Life* of St. *Tereſa* of one that made *Verſes in an Ecſtaſie, Ariſtotle* hath a very fit parallel of *Maracus* a *Syracuſian* Poet, *that never made ſo good Verſes, as when he was really Ecſtatical:* And for the great inequality of the Tempers of ſuch *Ecſtatical Perſons, Ariſtotle* ſaith, *that Melancholy, as it produces very odd and irregular Diſtempers, ſo it is very unequal of it ſelf, ſometimes very hot, and at other times very cold;* which the *Myſtical Divines* call the *State of Deſolation: But this Temper being apt again to be inflamed of a ſudden, it fills them with ſtrange Pleaſures, eſpecially the Imagination being fixed upon an Object of Love;* which this Temper, *Ariſtotle* obſerves, is *more particularly diſpoſed to:* But becauſe whatever makes Perſons *Ecſtatical,* deprives them of the *uſe* of their Reaſon; therefore theſe *Myſtical Unions* which have ſo much *Joy* and *Pleaſure,* are ſaid to be with a ſuſpenſion of all the *Diſcourſive Acts* of the *Mind.* Which things are not to be thought extraordinary, eſpecially in Perſons not only of a Melancholy Temper; but whoſe Temper hath been heightned by the power of Diſeaſes, great Severities, ſolemn Silence and Retirement; and whoſe Imagination hath been poſſeſſed with ſuch Notions as do highly gratify an *Enthuſiaſtical Diſpoſition, viz.* ſuch as relate to a more immediate *Union* with an infinite *Object of Love.* So that there ſeems to be nothing in this *State* of *pure Contemplation,* of which a reaſonable account cannot be given from a natural Temper heightned and improved by the force of *Imagination.* And that this may ſeem the leſs ſtrange, I ſhall produce an Inſtance of this kind, which I believe will not be denyed, to have been either effected meerly by *Imagination,* or at leaſt, by ſomething under a *Divine Power;* which is lately reported by a very credible and intelligent Perſon, and one who lives in the communion of the *Roman Church.* Monſieur *Bernier,* in his Letter to Monſieur *Chapelain,* dated *October* 4. 1667. concerning the *Gentiles* of *Indoſtan,* gives an account of certain *Orders* of *Religious* among them, who make Vows of *Chaſtity, Poverty and Obedience,* living in *Convents under Superiours,* who are commonly called *Jauguis,* i. e. *united to God, who uſed* themſelves to many hardſhips, and were looked on as ſo many *Eremites* by the People; being accounted true Saints, illuminated and perfect *Jauguis; Theſe are People that have entirely abandoned the World, and ſequeſtered themſelves into ſome very remote corner, or garden like Eremites without ever coming to the Town. If you carry them any Meat, they receive it; if they do not, 'tis believed that they can live without it, and ſubſiſt by the ſole Favour of God in perpetual Faſting, Prayer, and profound Meditations; for they ſink themſelves ſo deep into theſe Raptures, that they ſpend many hours together in being inſenſible, and beholding in that*

Berniers Memoires, part. 2. p. 136.

time, as they give out, God *himſelf, like a very bright and ineffable light, with an unexpreſſible joy and ſatisfaction, attended with an entire contempt and forſaking of the World. For thus much one of them that pretended he could enter into this Rapture when he pleaſed, and had been often in it, told me; and others that are about them affirm the thing with ſo much ſeriouſneſs, that they ſeem to believe in earneſt, that there is no impoſture in it.* Which therefore *Bernier* imputes to an *illuſion of Imagination cauſed by Solitude and Faſting*; and this he calls *the great Myſtery of the Cabala of the* Jauguis; and adds, *that their extremity of Poverty, and Faſtings, and Auſterities contribute much to it*; *wherein* he ſaith, *the* European *Friars or Eremits, are but Novices in compariſon with them.* I leave Mr. *Creſſy* now to conſider, whether theſe *Myſtical Unions* and *Raptures*, be ſuch Privileges of *Saints?* Whether *Solitude, Abſtraction from Worldly Cares, rigorous Abſtinences*, and ſuch like things, which he admires the *Contemplative Life* for, be *ſo peculiar to their Church?* When we find the very ſame things among the *Gentiles* of *Indoſtan*. And the *Author* of the *Book De Sapientia divina ſecundum Ægyptios*, who ſeems to have been an *Arabian Philoſopher*, ſets down theſe words of *Plato* (and not as his own experience, as *Cardinal* Bona relates them) *Being often in the depth of Contemplation, my body being left behind, I ſeemed to enjoy the chief Good with incredible Pleaſure. Wherefore I ſtood as it were aſtoniſhed, finding my ſelf to be a part of the upper World, and to have obtained Immortality, with the cleareſt Light; which cannot be expreſſed with words, nor heard by Ears, nor underſtood by the Thoughts of Men:* And then he deſcribes *the ſadneſs he felt at the decay of that glorious Light; and the pleaſure which returned with his former Ecſtaſies.* This *Cardinal Bona* thinks might either come by the *natural force of Contemplation*, or *the illuſion of evil Spirits*; but herein are all the ſame appearances that are pretended to in *Myſtical Unions*, And to ſhew the *Power* of *Imagination* in cauſing *Ecſtaſies*; beſides that of *Socrates*, *Bona* mentions the like of *Carneades*, related by *Valerius Maximus*, of *Plotinus* by *Porphyrius*, of *Jamblichus* by *Eunapius*, and the common inſtance of *Reſtitutus* in St. *Auſtin*, who fell into an *Ecſtaſie* when he pleaſed. *Thomas Aquinas* reckons up three cauſes of *Raptures*, *Bodily Diſtempers*, *Diabolical* and *Divine Power:* but Cajetan ſaith, there is a fourth *cauſe acknowledged elſewhere by him*, viz. *a vehement intention of the Mind, which he therefore omitted, becauſe he ſpake of cauſes extrinſical to the Mind it ſelf.*

De ſapientia ſecundum Ægypt. l. 1. c. 4.

2. 2. q. 175 art. 1. corp. art.

§. 10. 2. There can be no certainly by the Rules laid down by themſelves, that the *Ecſtaſies* and *Raptures*, or *Viſions* and *Revelations* of Perſons, do come only from Divine and Supernatural Cauſes. For they grant that in all theſe caſes there is reaſon to ſuſpect Ecſtaſies and Raptutes.

1. If the Perſon's natural Temper be very Melancholy. This is the firſt *Rule* in *Cardinal Bona*; for ſaith he, *thoſe who are troubled with this, may eaſily fix their Minds ſo upon one object, as to ſuffer an alienation of their Senſes from any other. Joh. à Jeſu Maria*, a great Myſtical Divine, makes this his fourth *Rule*, to conſider, *Whether the Perſon have a good underſtanding, or be troubled with any Diſtemper in the Head, or with Melancholy, or be ſubject to any vehement Paſſions*; which *Cardinal Bona* likewiſe adds; and therefore *Cardinal Cajetan* well notes, *that the various motion of the Heart, ariſing foom ſome apprehenſion*

Card. Bona de diſcr. Spirit. c. 14. n. 5.

Joh. a Jeſu Maria Theolog. Myſt. c. 8.

Cajet. in 1. 2. q. 17. art. 7.

henſion or deſire, moves the Body, and alters it according to different qualities; which alteration of the Body doth again affect the imagination and Appetite; from whence we may obſerve, that thoſe accidents which often happen to Perſons under Ecſtaſies, are Originally cauſed from their own apprehenſion, although afterwards, cuſtom being turned into Nature, makes them fall under them whether they will or no. Which is ſeen by this, that if they turn their imaginations with all their force quite another way, thoſe accidents forſake them, as, ſaith he, *I have found by certain Experience:* which is a plain diſcovery that theſe things are produced by natural Cauſes. *F. Baker* himſelf puts that down among his *Rules, Whether the Perſons be not addicted to Melancholy?* From which Rule, there is great reaſon to ſuſpect thoſe who have complained of *being oppreſſed with a moſt profound Melancholy,* as *M. Tereſa* did: And we have reaſon to believe it of all thoſe *lovers* of *Solitude,* that forſake all converſation of Mankind, as the *Ægyptian Eremites* did.

Sanct. Sophia tr. 3. *ſect.* 4. *c.* 3. *n.* 11.

2. If their Proficiency in Vertue be not very great. This is the firſt Rule laid down by *Fortunatus Scacchus, Prefect* of the Pope's *Chapel,* in his *Book* of the *Qualifications* neceſſary to *Canonization,* viz. *That we examine the Life and Actions of the Perſons who pretend to Ecſtaſies and Raptures; if they have been ſuch as have come up to an Heroical degree of Perfection, it may be believed that they come from God; but if not, they come either from a Natural or Diabolical Cauſe; eſpecially,* ſaith he, *if they happen in Women, who may ſeem to aim either at the fame of Sanctity, or ſome advantage by it. Great Caution,* ſaith *Cardinal Bona, is to be uſed in judging the Raptures of young Beginners; for the very Novelty and Sweetneſs of Divine Contemplation is apt to put ſuch into Ecſtaſies; it is like ſtrong Wine, which they cannot bear without intoxication. Beſides,* ſaith he, *it ought to be inquired into, Whether their Souls be capable of ſuch favours, what purity and humility they have attained to; Whether their Lives be as much above the World, as they pretend their Souls are: If not, they are no true Raptures, but illuſions of the Devil:* to the ſame purpoſe the reſt ſpeak. What muſt we then think of thoſe *Raptures* which *M. Tereſa* had, when ſhe ſaid, *ſhe was very backwards, and but in the beginnings of Vertues and Mortifications?*

Fortunat. Scacch. de not & ſign. Sanct. ſect. 8. *c.* 3.

Bona ib.

Sanct. Soph n. 19.

3. If they are not able to give any good account of what they ſpeak in their Ecſtaſies: This *Cardinal Bona* lays down, *That if when they come to themſelves, they know not what they ſaid in their Ecſtaſies, but refer the hearers to what they ſpake then; or if they ſpeak whether they will or no, there is great reaſon to ſuſpect them. For this,* ſaith *Cardinal Cajetan, is a condition of true Inſpiration, that the Spirits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets in this, that they do not ſpeak with any diſturbance of Mind, as though they were acted by another, but from their own ſenſe with a quiet Mind, underſtanding what they ſpeak; therefore,* ſaith he, *they that ſpeak in alienation of Mind, or after it, do not remember what they ſpake in it, have no true Inſpirations. From whence it appears,* ſaith he, *that thoſe who in their Ecſtaſies ſpeak in the Perſon of Chriſt, or of ſome Saint, as though they were acted by them, are either ſeduced, or do ſeduce. And yet the fooliſh World is aſtoniſhed, and admires, and adores theſe Words and Actions.* But this Rule, although as much grounded on Scripture and Reaſon, as any; is, as far as I can find, very carefully omitted by the *Myſtical Writers,* for a very good Reaſon, which they well know.

Bona ib. p. 250.

Cajet. in 2. 2. *q.* 73. *art.* 3.

4. If they have weakned themſelves by very long Faſtings: For ſo *Cardinal Bona* ſaith, *that very great weakneſs may bring them to fainting*

Bona p. 253.

ing Fits and Ecſtaſies; and he tells us from St. *Tereſa*, *That ſhe cured a Nun of her Ecſtaſies by making her leave her Faſting, and bringing her to a good habit of Body.* It is great pity the ſame Experiment had not been tryed upon her ſelf. *Some*, ſaith *Bona*, *have made that an argument that their Ecſtaſies were ſupernatural, becauſe they continued many days in them without eating or drinking; whereas many have undergone long Faſts without a Miracle*; and ſome of the *Indian* Prieſts have faſted twenty days together; but becauſe in thoſe Parts the Heat may take away their Appetite, therefore *Paulus Zacchias* produces many inſtances of very long Faſts in theſe *European parts* without any Miracle; beſides what *Licetus*, *Horſtius*, *Kornmannus*, and *Sennertus* and others, have related to the ſame purpoſe; and ſuch inſtances have been lately known among us in *England*.

Carol. Claſ. not. in Garz. ab Horto c. 3.
Paul. Zacc. quæſt. Medico-log. l. 4. tit. 1. qu. 7.

5. If they be very frequent and ordinary, and happen upon any ſlight occaſion. For ſaith *Paulus Zacchias*, *ſince Divine Raptures have the nature of ſomething miraculous in them, we are not to ſuppoſe them to be very common, and as often as any one pleaſes; therefore* ſaith he, *when we ſee a Perſon fall frequently into Ecſtaſies, we may juſtly preſume that it is ſomething natural, ſince God doth not commonly work Miracles.* *Cardinal Bona* ſaith, that *Sales* thought, *the meer frequency of having Divine Revelations was enough to make them ſuſpected.* And *for Perſons to fall as often as they pleaſe into Ecſtaſies*, is, ſaith *Scacchus*, *an evident ſign of a Diabolical Illuſion*: So the *Maid* of *Saragoza*, and *Magdalena Crucia* were diſcovered. And what ſhall we then think of the almoſt continual Raptures of St. *Tereſa*? What of the *Abbot Siſoi*, mentioned by *Bona*, that fell into a *Rapture* unleſs he let fall his Hands at Prayers? What of *Br. Gyles*, mentioned both by *Bona* and *Scacchus*, that thought it ſo eaſie to fall into *Raptures*, that if any one ſpake the Word *Paradiſe*, he fell into an *Ecſtaſie*; inſomuch that the Boys of *Peruſium*, as *Scacchus* relates it, would come behind him, and cry *Paradiſe*, on purpoſe to make him immediately fall down in a *Trance*: Muſt we acknowledge this to be from God? But what ſhall we ſay to *Br. Roger*, mentioned by *F. Baker* out of *Harphius*, that *had a hundred Raptures in a Mattins*?

Paul. Zacc. l. 4. tit. 1. q. 6. n. 33.
Bona de diſcret. Spirit. c. 20. p. 411.
Scacch. p. 612.
Sancta Sophia Tr. 3. ſect. 3. c. 6. n. 22.

6. If they appear deſirous of them, and are apt to report them to others, and to have them made publick. So *Joh. à Jeſu Maria* would have it obſerved, *whether they are apt to ſpeak of them, without being asked, or upon an eaſie requeſt; whether they pray for them, or come to Prayers in hopes of them.* *Cardinal Bona* would have it obſerved likewiſe, *where they happen, if in publick places where they may be taken notice of?* This Rule may hold as to *Satanical Illuſions*; but where they ariſe from meerly *natural Cauſes*, Perſons may not at all be deſirous of them, nay, may ſtrive againſt them, and endeavour to keep them ſecret, and yet they may not be divine.

Bona ib. & p. 415.

Theſe are ſome of the moſt generally approved *Rules* among the *Perſons* of *Judgment* and *Underſtanding* in the *Roman Church*; and if we could proceed according to theſe, in the examination of the Inſtances produced in *Raptures* and *Ecſtaſies*, not one of a thouſand would paſs by their own *Rules*. But when all is done, theſe Rules are very little obſerved, but they are approved or condemned, according to the *Rules* of *Policy*, and not of *Divinity*.

But beſides theſe, the *Myſtical Divines* have ſome particular *Notes* of their own, which neither themſelves nor any elſe can underſtand; as

Sancta Sophia Tr. 3. ſect. 4. c. 3. n. 10, 14.

Father Baker's firſt *Rule*, *viz.* the *Wills being moved without the ordinary precedent action of the Underſtanding or Imagination* : The fifth Rule, *About the efficacy of internal Words, and the Souls conceiving more by them, than in themſelves they ſignifie* ; and others as unintelligible as theſe, *Joh. à Jeſu Mari, Theol. Myſt. c.* 8. *p.* 89. 90. *viz.* thoſe delivered by *M. Tereſa*, and ſet in order by *Joh. à Jeſu Maria* to diſtinguiſh *divine Viſions* from the effects of *Imagination* ; as, *the not miſſing a Syllable of internal Words*, the *great Secrecy of them, being ſpoken in ſo cloſe a place in the Soul, that the Devil cannot come at them*, (to *eves drop* them) and ſeveral other ſuch ſenſeleſs things. And I do ſuppoſe no Man will believe any thing to be from God, meerly becauſe it cannot be underſtood by Men ; for then the greateſt Nonſenſe and Contradictions might paſs for *Divine Revelations.*

§. 11. And as there can be no certainty by their own Rules as to Raptures and Ecſtaſies, ſo neither can there be as to *Viſions* and *Revelations.* For,

1. They grant, that thoſe that are of no uſe, are not to be allowed ; as, *If the matter of Revelations be vain and curious*, ſaith *Jeſu Maria*, or *that which may be known without Revelation* ; now, ſay I, if there be no Revelation at all to be expected as to matter of Doctrine, all the other things *are vain and curious*, there being no other end ſuitable to divine Revelation beſides this. *De diſcret. Spirit. c.* 19. *n.* 1. And *Cardinal Bona* makes a very ingenious Confeſſion, that there *is a great deal of danger and no profit at all in Viſions* ; *and that by them a way is opened for many Deceits and Illuſions of the Devil.* Can any Man of common Senſe then believe that God ſhould cauſe ſuch extraordinary *Viſions*, which bring no Profit, but abundance of Danger along with them ? *We walk much more ſafely*, ſaith he, *by Faith, whoſe Light far exceeds all Viſions and Revelations of Myſteries.* *De Not. & ſign. Sanct. Sect.* 8. *c.* 4. *And no Argument of Sanctity*, ſaith *Scacchus*, *can be drawn from them* ; *becauſe Chriſtian Perfection doth not conſiſt in them : And Revelations do not make us either more pleaſing to God, or more uſeful to our Neighbour*, and he quotes *Gerſon* with Approbation, for ſaying, *that the Ancient Fathers did fly from the curioſity of Viſions and Miracles, as the moſt deceitful and dangerous* ; *and that St.* Auſtin *gave God thanks that he was delivered from it*, and that *Bonaventure* ſaith, *it is to be abhorred and ſtriven againſt with all our power.* And *Scacchus* himſelf concludes, *that there is uſually a ſecret Pride and Hypocriſie to be thought Saints, which makes Perſons deſire Viſions and Revelations, which are inconſiſtent with true Sanctity* ; *and if it be not Pride, it is a vain Curioſity, wherefore God often ſuffers them to be deceived.*

2. That it is a very hard matter in this caſe to diſtinguiſh the *Illuſions of the Devil*, from *divine Viſions and Revelations.* For they do not pretend to the only certain way which the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* made uſe of, *viz. the working Miracles to confirm the Truth of their Teſtimony* : For among all the numbers of *Miracles* they boaſt of, they pretend to none for the proper *end* of *Miracles*, viz. *to confirm divine Revelation.* *De diſcret. Spirit. c.* 19. *n.* 7. And therefore, it is no wonder *Scacchus* yields up this, *as a very doubtful thing, conſidering how eaſie and common a thing it is for the Devil to deceive Men in this matter.* And *Cardinal Bona* confeſſes, *that the Devil doth often aſſume the Perſon of Chriſt, and of the Bleſſed Virgin, with ſo much Art and Cunning as to deceive very good Men, as is evident from moſt certain Experience, as well as the Teſtimony of the Fathers.* *N.* 4. Nay, *he denies, that ever the Perſon of Chriſt did appear to any*

ſince St. Paul*'s Viſion* ; and he ſaith, *that to aſſert otherwiſe, is againſt the unanimous conſent of the Fathers, and not agreeable to that Article of our Faith, wherein we believe that he ſits at the Right Hand of the Father, and ſhall come again to judge the Quick and the Dead.* Yet what abundance of *Viſions* of *Chriſt's Perſon* do we meet with in the *Legends* of *Saints*, and of his Appearance with *Fleſh and Blood* in the Euchariſt? But if the Perſon of Chriſt do never appear, it cannot be proved from any of thoſe *Viſions*, that the *very Body of Chriſt* is there.

3. That it were far better if a ſtop were put to all private Revelations among them, that are not confirmed by *Miracles* or *Teſtimony of Scripture*. This *Cardinal Bona* wiſhes, *that the Confeſſors among them would at laſt take care of*; which no Man certainly would do, if he believed them to be from God. *Cardinal Cajetan* ſaith, *that we can have no certainty of private Revelations, although the Perſons who pretend to them, ſhould not only proteſt but ſwear to it, that they have them from God*; and in general concludes, *that we are not bound to believe them.* From which it neceſſarily follows, that there are no certain Rules to know when they are from God; for if there were, an Obligation to believe them would lie upon thoſe who had tryed them by thoſe Rules.

C. 20. *n.* 2.

Cajet. in 2. 2. *q.* 174. *art.* 6.

4. If Revelations made to two ſeveral Perſons do contradict each other, that there is great Reaſon to ſuſpect both. *For although*, ſaith *Cardinal Bona, it be poſſible that one may be true and the other falſe, and the Devil may endeavour to take away the Authority of the true by the falſe, yet for the moſt part they are both ſuſpected and doubtful.* And before he ſaith, *that it is reaſonable to believe thoſe Women Saints were deceived, in ſuppoſing their own Fancies to be divine Revelations, who have publiſhed Revelations contradicting each other.* Which it is plain he intended for the famous Caſe of the *Revelations* of St. *Brigitt* and St. *Katharin*, which contradicted each other expreſly about the immaculate Conception; and which I had produced as a plain inſtance of a falſe pretence to *Inſpiration* in the *Roman Church*, it being impoſſible God ſhould contradict himſelf. Mr. *Creſſy*, in anſwer to this, firſt *confeſſes that the publick Office of their Church teſtifies that each of them were favoured with Divine Revelations, and then produces the Teſtimony of St.* Antonin, *that thoſe things may be ſuppoſed by the Perſons themſelves to be divine Revelations, which are but humane Dreams.* Thirdly, He cites *Cardinal Baronius*, who ſeems *to reject the Revelations on both ſides.* And yet he by no means will allow *the Honour of their Church to be concerned herein*, which hath approved them both as Perſons *truly Inſpired*; when Mr. *Creſſy* confeſſes, *they did not teſtifie their Revelations by Miracles*, and that *without it Divine Revelation cannot be known.* I would not deſire a greater advantage from an Adverſary, than Mr. *Creſſy* here gives me againſt himſelf. For by his own Confeſſion then, their Church approves thoſe to have had *divine Revelations*, which never gave the proper evidence of it, *viz. Miracles*, and ſuch whoſe Revelations are queſtioned by the Wiſeſt Men among them. And what is all this but to give Countenance, (for all that the Church can know) to a meer Pretence to *Inſpiration*? which is the higheſt *Fanaticiſm* in the World. And if, as he ſaith, *notwithſtanding the Councils approbation, there is ſcarce a Catholick alive, that thinks he hath an obligation to believe either of them*: This makes as much to my purpoſe as I deſire; for if they have no obligation to believe them, they may without Sin believe them not to be *divine*

De diſcret. Spirit. c. 20. *n.* 4. *p.* 409.

Ib. c. 17. *p.* 299.

Fanaticiſm p. 67, 68.

P. 70.

Revelations; and ſince they are given out to be ſuch, and approved by their *Church*, all ſuch Perſons may without Sin charge them with the higheſt *Fanaticiſm* in a falſe pretence to *Divine Revelation.* And why then ſhould I be ſo much blamed for doing that, which Perſons in their own Church may do without Sin? But I ſee Mr. *Creſſy* is not acquainted with the common Doctrine of their own *Divines*, about the obligation that lies upon Perſons to believe Private Revelations. For they agree,

1. That thoſe Perſons to whom thoſe Revelations are made, are bound to believe them before any *approbation* of the *Church?* For, ſay they, the primary Reaſon of aſſenting to a Divine Revelation, is from the Divine Veracity; to which it is wholly accidental whether it be publick or private, and the Churches propoſition is only the common external condition of applying the Object of Faith to us; but there may be as great an obligation to believe a private Revelation, ſuppoſing only ſufficient motives to the Mind of the Perſon that this Revelation comes from God. This is the Opinion of *Vega*, *Catharinus*, *Suarez*, *Lugo*, *Tſambertus*, and as they tell us, of moſt of their Modern Divines. Indeed they mention *Cajetan*, *Sotus*, *Canus*, and ſome others as of another Opinion; but *Suarez* ſaith, *they ſeem to differ only in Words*, becauſe they will not have that aſſent called *Catholick Faith*; which the other are willing to yield to them, and call it *Theological Faith*, but do make it as certain and infallible as the other. Which they prove, not only from the obligation to Faith in the private Revelations mentioned in Scripture, but from invincible Reaſon, becauſe the ground of the aſſent of Faith is not the publickneſs of the Revelation, but the Divine Authority and Veracity; which being ſuppoſed, muſt equally oblige, whether the Revelation be private or publick. And if there be ſufficient motives to believe a private Revelation; to deny an obligation to believe it, is a contempt of Divine Authority; and to ſuppoſe there cannot be ſufficient motives, is to ſay, that God cannot do as much by himſelf, as he can by the Church. The force of which Reaſon I do not ſee how it is poſſible for thoſe to avoid who aſſert, that God doth ſtill communicate private Revelations to Mens Minds.

Vega in Concil. Tr. l. 9. Catharin. de certit. grat. c. ult. Suarez de Fide diſp. 3. ſect. 10. Lugo de Fide diſp. 1. ſect. 11. Tſambert. de Fide diſp. 12. art. 3.

2. That ſuppoſing theſe Revelations to be propoſed by the Church, all others are bound to believe them to be Divine Revelations. For then they have the ſame reaſon, which they have to believe any Revelation. All the difficulty now is, to underſtand what a ſufficient propoſal by the Church in this Caſe is; *Suarez* ſaith, *That although private Revelations be chiefly intended for the Perſons to whom they are made, yet a ſufficient Propoſal of them being made to others, there doth ariſe from thence an obligation to believe them.* For which, ſaith he, *the general Rule is the approbation of the Church; as appears by the Lateran Council under* Leo 10. *which forbad the preaching private Revelations without the examination and approbation of the Church; and then,* ſaith *Suarez, the believing them becomes a part of Catholick Faith.* Now I deſire to know, how it is poſſible for their *Church* to ſhew greater care in the examination and approbation of any *private Revelations*, than it did in thoſe of St. *Brigitt?* they being frequently examined by the publick *Authority* of their *Church*, and after ſuch examination declared by the *Pope to have come from the Spirit of God*; and at laſt approved

Suarez ib. n. 7.

Concil. Lateran. ſub Leon. 10 ſeſſ. 11.

approved, ſay their own Writers, *at the General Council of Baſil.* How could they poſſibly expreſs greater approbation of any controverted Book in the Bible? But if after all this, theſe *Revelations* may paſs among them for *Dreams* and *Fancies, and no Men are obliged to believe them?* let them clear their Church from *Fanatiſm*, if they can. For either theſe *Revelations* were from God or not? if not, then they were *Fanatical illuſions* approved by their *Church*; if they were, then ſince they were approved by thoſe whom they are bound to believe, with what Face can Mr. *Creſſy* ſay, *That there is ſcarce a Catholick alive that thinks he has an obligation to believe them?* which I do the more wonder at, ſince they believe things as abſurd already, and with as little reaſon as any thing in St. *Brigitt's* Revelations. And therefore the *Perſon* of *Honour* had great reaſon to ſay, "That Mr. *Animad-verſ. p.63.* *Creſſy* hath in truth not anſwer'd the Weight " of my Inſtance from the *Revelations* of St. *Brigitt* and St. *Catherine.*

5. They confeſs that ſome Perſons are very lyable to be deceived in *C. 20. n. 3, 4.* believing themſelves to have Divine Revelations. *Such*, ſaith Cardinal *Bona, are thoſe that have a bad habit of Body, that have a reſtleſs and vehement imagination, that have a great deal of Melancholy, which is apt to corrupt the Imagination, ſo as they are apt to fanſie that they ſee and hear things which they neither ſee nor hear. And likewiſe*, ſaith he, *from long faſting and immoderate watchings, vain Phantaſms may ariſe in the Brain, by which the Mind being deceived, adheres to them as to Divine Revelations.* And what are theſe elſe but the *Fanatick* heats of *Enthuſiaſm? Beſides*, he ſaith, *that regard ought to be had to the Humour, Diſpoſition, Condition, Converſation, and Age of the Perſons; for old Men are apt to doat, and young Men to be hot and credulous; but eſpecially great caution muſt be uſed towards Womon, whoſe Sex is the more to be ſuſpected becauſe of its weakneſs; for by reaſon of the vehemency of their Thoughts and Affections they think they ſee that which they deſire, and that which ariſes from their own violent Paſſions, they believe to be true; and it is an eaſie matter for the Devil, (and no great conqueſt he thinks) through their want of Reaſon and Judgment to deceive them.* Therefore he ſaith peremptorily, *That the Biſhops and Guides of Souls ſhould oppoſe and deſpiſe their Revelation, and ſeverely rebuke them, for pretending to things too high for them*: And he at large diſcovers, *the great Miſchiefs which have come to the Church by Women's pretending to Revelations.* I confeſs after all theſe ſevere things, he doth at laſt approve the *Revelations* of St. *Tereſa*, which I very much queſtion whether he would have done or no, if he had been her Confeſſor; but now ſhe was *Canonized* for a *Saint*, and it would not have been ſo agreeable for a *Roman Cardinal* to have expoſed to the World the *ſelf-deluſions* of a *Roman Saint.* But I deſire no more in her Inſtance, or any other among them than to compare the circumſtances of them with theſe Rules laid down by their own moſt approved Authors. From which it appears, that although Mr. *Creſſy* declares, *That they are very well content with their Fanaticks* *Epiſtle Apologet. p. 30.* *and Fanaticiſm*, yet there are ſome wiſe Men among them, which are not.

§. 12. Having thus far ſhewn, that this way of *Myſtical Divinity* with all its *Raptures* and *Ecſtaſies* and *paſſive Unions*, had no *Foundation* in the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, nor in the conſent of the *Chriſtian Church* of the pureſt Ages, I now come to ſhew whence it came into any *Vogue* and *Reputation* among *Chriſtians.* It is an eaſie matter to diſcover that the Foundation of it was laid by the counterfeit *Dionyſius Areopagita*, to whom Mr. *Creſſy* and *O. N.* do refer me. *Who,* ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, *whatever his true Name was, was queſtionleſs an Author of the ſecond or at leaſt the third Age of the Church, and who deſcribes the moſt ſublime and moſt purely divine Prayer exerciſed by* Hierotheus *a Diſciple of the Apoſtles.* But if he lived *in the ſecond or third Age*, he muſt be a Counterfeit (for *Dionyſius* dyed within the compaſs of the firſt Century, as *Sirmondus* hath fully proved) and if he were a Counterfeit, how came he to know *the divine Prayer of Hierotheus?* However I do acknowledge that this *Author*, whoever he was, was juſtly pitch'd upon by Mr. *Creſſy*. For it is from him, they not only borrow the *Myſtical Notions*, but moſt of the *Phraſes* too: And as ſoon as thoſe Books, written by him, came to be known and admired in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, there were ſome ſo fond of this Myſtical Divinity, as to to cry it up as the moſt perfect way of *Devotion*, being eſpecially accommodated to Perſons of an Enthuſiaſtical Temper; who were withal confined to Solitude and Retirement from the World. It will not be amiſs therefore to give a Taſte of *Myſtical Divinity*, as far as it is poſſible to bring his affected Bombaſt within the compaſs of our Language. Thus he begins,

Fanaticiſm p 59.

O thou ſuper-eſſential Trinity, above all notion of Deity and Goodneſs; O thou Governour of the Divine Wiſdom of Chriſtians, direct us to the moſt unknown, moſt clear, and moſt ſupream height of Myſtical Oracles; in which the ſimple, abſolute, and unchangeable Myſteries of Divinity are hidden, by the over-ſhining darkneſs of a teaching Silence, diſcovering the moſt glorious light in the moſt profound obſcurity, and over-filling the blindeſt Minds with the moſt beautiful Beams, in that which can neither be felt nor ſeen.

Dionyſ. de Myſtica Theol. c. 1.

Let this Prayer be for my ſelf: But Thou O Friend Timothy *by thy diligent exerciſe in theſe Myſtical Speculations, leave thy Senſes and the Operations of thy Mind, and all things ſenſible and intelligible, and all things which are not and which are; and after an unknown manner elevate thy ſelf to that Union, which is above all Eſſence and Knowledge: And when by a pure and perfect Abſtraction of thy ſelf, thou ſhalt be free and looſe from all things, thou ſhalt be raiſed to the ſuper-eſſential Ray of divine Darkneſs.*

Then after he hath given caution to *Timothy*, *That theſe divine Myſteries be not communicated to thoſe that would make uſe of their knowledge in theſe things, any more, than to thoſe, who followed their Imaginations*; becauſe *the ſuper-eſſential Being dwelleth in darkneſs*; *and as to him, Affirmations and Negations are not oppoſite, being above all*; he ſhews, *that the Cauſe of all things, is above all Reaſon and Underſtanding, and is only truly and plainly made known to thoſe who aſcend above all divine Lights, and heavenly Sounds and Words, and are ſwallowed up of Darkneſs*; which he expreſſeth *by the Allegory of* Moſes *going into the Cloud upon the top of the Mount: Then,* ſaith he, *this Myſtical* Moſes *is carried up above all viſible and intellectual Heights, being taken up into the truly Myſtical Cloud of unknowing, in which he puts a ſtop to all knowing Perceptions, and is in that which can neither be ſeen nor felt, being altogether his who is above all, and not of any one elſe, neither of himſelf nor any other; and being under a ceſſation of all knowledge, is in a firmer*

Union to that which cannot be known; and becauſe he underſtands nothing, he underſtands more than his Mind can reach to.

This is certainly the very height of *Myſtical Union* and the *Perfection* of the *Contemplative State*: In the Deſcription of which, I have kept as near as I could to his Words, and as to the Senſe, have followed *Carolus Herſentius*, a late Myſtical Divine, who hath taken the greateſt care and pains to explain the meaning of this obſcure Author upon this Argument. To the ſame purpoſe he ſpeaks elſewhere, where he ſaith, *That the moſt Divine way of knowing God is by not knowing him, by an Union above Underſtanding; when the Mind being abſtracted from all things, and going out of it ſelf, is united to thoſe over-bright Beams, by which he is enlightned in the unſearchable depth of Wiſdom.*

De Divin. Nomin. c. 7. ſ. 3.

Any one that caſts an Eye upon this kind of Diſcourſe, will eaſily find it to proceed upon very different Grounds, in order to the *Perfection* of Mens Minds, from what are delivered in the *Chriſtian Religion*. For there it is ſaid to be *eternal Life, to know God and his Son Jeſus Chriſt*; here we are told, that we cannot come at perfection in the way of *Knowledge*, but of *Ignorance* and *not knowing*: There it is ſaid, that *God is Light and in him is no darkneſs at all*; here, that he is the moſt *profound darkneſs* and *obſcurity*. Here we meet with no difference at all as to the clearneſs of our apprehenſions concerning the *Divine Nature*, from what Men had before the Chriſtian Doctrine; whereas it is one of the excellencies of Chriſtianity that by it we come to know the true *God* much better than Mankind had done before, and are able to form a very true and diſtinct Conception of him in our Minds, as of a Being of infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs and Power. Although we cannot attain to a full comprehenſion of the utmoſt extent of the Perfections of the Divine Nature; yet that doth not hinder our Conceptions from being clear and true, though not adequate and perfect. And if we could have no clearer knowledge and more ſteady conceptions of the Divine Nature by the Doctrine of Chriſt, to what end are we told by it, *that no Man hath ſeen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the Boſom of the Father he hath revealed him*; that now the *veil of Darkneſs* is taken away, *and we all with open Face beholding as in a Glaſs the glory of the Lord, are changed into the ſame Image*; not that our *transformation* is to come by *Darkneſs* and the ceſſation of intellectual Operations, as this *Myſtical Union* implies. But beſides this, this *Myſtical way* pretends to carry Men above all *external Revelation* as well as intellectual Knowledge, for ſo much is implied in the *raiſing the Mind above all divine Lights, and heavenly Sounds and Words*, i. e. ſaith *Herſentius, above all the manifeſtations of God whatſoever which are made to the Mind*. Which Myſtical way of *Perfection*, being ſuppoſed poſſible, I ſee no neceſſity at all of Chriſts coming into the World, nor of any influence his Death, or Sufferings, or Doctrine, could have upon the bringing Men to a *State* of Happineſs. For the whole *Hypotheſis* proceeds only upon theſe principles. 1. The *obſcurity* of the *Divine Nature*, and the impoſſibility of our attaining ſo clear a perception of *God* in our Minds, as for us ever to hope for *a State* of *Perfection* with the exerciſe of our *Reaſon* and *Underſtanding*. 2. That the only poſſible way of attaining it, is by the *abſtraction* of our

St. Joh. 17. 3.

1 Joh. 1. 5.

Joh. 1. 18.

2 Cor. 3. 18.

Comment. in Myſt. Theol. p. 135.

ſelves from all *ſenſible* and *Intellectual Operations*, and thereby bringing our Souls to an *immediate Union* with *the Divine Eſſence.*

§. 13. Having thus endeavoured to bring theſe things out of the Clouds of the ſublime Nonſenſe and ſeeming Contradictions which they were wrapt up in, we may more eaſily diſcern from whence all theſe *Notions* were taken and ſlily conveyed into the Chriſtian Doctrine as the higheſt way of Perfection. For which we are to conſider, that the Chriſtian Religion growing very conſiderable, notwithſtanding all the endeavours uſed by the *Roman* Emperors and Governors of Provinces to ſuppreſs it, and very Learned Men having taken upon them the Profeſſion of it in ſeveral parts of the Empire, but eſpecially at *Alexandria*; the Heathen Philoſophers ſaw there was an abſolute neceſſity of making the beſt they could of the Pagan Theology. To this end they beſtirred themſelves to gather together the moſt conſiderable parts of the *Chaldaick*, *Ægyptian* and *Platonick* Theology, and putting them together to form ſuch a method for the *Perfection* of Mens Souls, as would appear more ſublime than the Chriſtian Inſtitution. For this end *Plotinus*, *Porphyry*, *Jamblichus*, *Proclus*, and the reſt of them, did imploy the utmoſt of their Study and Care: For they ſaw now it was to no purpoſe for them to ſpend their time in idle Curioſities, and the vain Diſputes of the ſeveral Sects of Philoſophers; therefore they endeavour to lay aſide theſe, (*Ammonius* of *Alexandria* having ſhewed them the way) and to bend their Studies chiefly about ſhewing Men ſuch a way of *Purifying* their *Souls* as might bring them to a *State* of *Perfection*, without embracing Chriſtianity. For they ſaw, that the common People were become *Philoſophers* by the help of the Chriſtian Religion, and out-went them in the bearing Torments and all ſorts of Miſeries, only in expectation of that *Bleſſed State* which the Chriſtian Religion did give Men ſo great aſſurance of, and gave ſuch excellent Directions, by the practice of all divine Vertues, for Mens attaining to it. We know there was no greater Enemy in the World to the Chriſtian Religion than *Porphyrius* was, againſt whom *Euſebius*, *Methodius*, and many others, writ in defence of Chriſtianity. Yet it appears by what we have remaining of his Writings, that he had a very mean eſteem of the common Cuſtoms of *Sacrificing*, and of thoſe *Dæmons* which were pleaſed with *the Smoke of Fleſh*; and he looked upon the *Theurgick way*, as liable to Deceit, and not capable of advancing the Soul to higheſt Perfection. Which *Theurgick* way, lay in the initiating of Men in ſome ſacred Myſteries, by partaking of certain Rites and Symbols, by which they were admitted to the preſence of ſome of their Deities; the end whereof, as they pretended, was, reducing the Souls of Men to that State they were in before they came into the Body: So St. *Auguſtin* tells us from *Porphyry*, that they who were purified after this manner, did converſe with *glorious Appearances of Angels*, which they were fitted to ſee; but *Porphyry* himſelf, as he did not utterly reject this *lower* and *ſymbolical* way; ſo he ſaid, that the higheſt perfection of the *Soul* was not attainable by it; but it was uſeful for purifying the *lower part* of the Soul, but not the intellectual. By the *lower part* he underſtood the *irrational*, which by the *Theurgical Rites* might be fitted for *Converſation with Angels*; but the *intellectual part* could not be elevated by

Jamblich. de Myſter. Segm. 5. *c.* 11.

St. Auguſt. de Civit. Dei. l. 10. *c.* 10.

by it to the *Contemplation of God*, and the *Viſion of the Things that are True*: And herein he placed the utmoſt perfection of the *Soul* in its *return to and union with God in this upper part* or fund of the Soul; for the utmoſt the other attained to, was only to live among the *Æthereal Spirits*, but the *Contemplative Souls returned to the Father*, as he ſpeaks; which as many other of his *Notions*, he borrowed from the *Chaldaick Theology*. C. 27. 28. 29. To ſhew, what this *Intellectual* or *Contemplative Life* was, that ſhould bring Mens Souls to this *State of Perfection*, *Porphyry* writ a Book on purpoſe, *Of the return of the Soul*, as St. *Auſtin* tells us, who quotes many Paſſages out of it; and this particular Precept above all the reſt, *That the Soul muſt fly from all body if it would live happy with God*, which is all one *with Abſtraction of Mind and pure contemplative Life*. In that Book he complains that there was no perfect way yet known to the World for this end, not the *Indian*, *Chaldaick* or any other. But what that was which he meant, appears by what he ſaith near the end of the *Life* of *Plotinus*, where he hath theſe Words, τέλος γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ σκοπὸς ἦν τὸ ἑνωθῆναι καὶ πελάσαι τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ. *The ſcope and end of his Life was union and conjunction with God over all: And four times*, ſaith he, *when I was with him he attained to this union, by an unexpreſſible act of the Mind:* which he before ſets forth, *by a Divine Illumination without any Image or Idea, being above the underſtanding and all intelligible things*. And he ſaith of himſelf, *that he was once in this ſtate of Union, when he was* 68 *years of Age*: which *Holſtenius* underſtands of an *Ecſtaſie* he then fell into; and imputes it to the *depth of his Melancholy joyned with his abſtracted and ſevere life, his frequent watchings and almoſt continual exerciſe of Contemplation*. De vita & Script. Porphyr. c. 6. For all theſe things were remarkable in him; and *Eunapius* ſaith of him, *that he was ſo little a lover of the body, that he hated his being a Man, and being in* Sicily, *he was almoſt famiſhed by abſtinence, and ſhunn'd all Converſation with Mankind:* Eunap. vit. Porphyr. As he begins the *Life* of *Plotinus*, *that he was like one aſhamed that his Soul was in a Body*. So that we find the Foundation here laid not only for the *Myſtical Union*, but *the abſtraction of Mind* neceſſary in order to it; and that it doth not lie in any *intellectual operations*, but rather in a *ceſſation of theſe acts*, is likewiſe expreſly affirmed by *Porphyry*. *Many things*, ſaith he, *are ſaid of underſtanding things that are above the Mind; but the Contemplation of thoſe things is better performed* ἀνοησίᾳ κρεῖττον νοήσεως *otio & vacatione intellectûs*, as *Holſtenius* Porphyrii ſentent. n. 26. renders it rather by *the reſt and ceſſation of Operation in the underſtanding than by the exerciſe of it; as many things, while a Man wakes, are ſaid of him that he does when he ſleeps, but the knowledge and perception of them is by ſleep; for things are beſt underſtood by Aſſimilation*. And elſewhere he ſaith, *that our manner of underſtanding all things is different according to their eſſence; thoſe things that are above the Mind are to be known* ἀνεννοήτως τε καὶ ὑπερουσίως *in the way of unknowing, and after a ſuper-eſſential manner*, N. 10. where we ſee the very *Phraſes* of *Dionyſius* uſed by him; and in many places he ſpeaks of *the Minds abſtracting and looſing it ſelf from the Body, and drawing itſelf nearer to the firſt Being*; N. 7, 8, 29, 30. of *the Souls Being in God*; N. 31, 32. of *the pure and clear Light which follows the abſtraction of the Mind*; N. 34. of *the State and Life of Contemplation*, and *the Vertues neceſſary thereto, ſuch as abſtinence from the Actions of the Body and from Affections to it, which*, ſaith he, *raiſe the Mind to the ſuper-eſſential Being*; and he very much diſparages *the active and political Life* in compariſon with this, *the end of one being only Men's living according to nature*; *but*

but of the other Aſſimilation to God; *he that lives according to practical Vertues, is only a good Man*; *but he that lives the life of Contemplation is a God*; from whence we underſtand the *Deiformity* of the *Myſtical Divines* being attainable by the *Life* of *Contemplation*. The way laid down by him for purifying the Soul is this. 1. *The Foundation* of it, is for the *Soul to know it ſelf*, i. e. to conſider, *that it is in a ſtrange place and bound to a thing of another ſubſtance.* 2. *Recollection*, or *gathering it ſelf up from the Body to be free from the affections of it*; in order to which he adviſeth to deny the Body in its Appetites and Pleaſures; and to ſhew as little care of it and concernment for it as may be; by degrees to leſſen *all ſenſe both of pleaſure and pain*; and ſo to come at laſt to a freedom from the paſſions of the Body. Then he deſcribes *the Super-eſſential Being*, and ſaith, N. 36. *that it is neither great nor little, but above both*; *and is neither greateſt nor leaſt but above all*; N. 37. *and that his Preſence is not Topical, but Aſſimilative*; *and that the only way for our Souls to recover themſelves, is to bring them into themſelves,* N. 41. *by which means the true Being is preſent with them, and we become united to God.* Which *union of the Soul with God*, *Holſtenius* thinks it very De ſcript. Porphyr. c. 9. probable, that *Porphyry* underſtood by the Book which he mentions in the Life of *Plotinus*, called ὁ ἱερὸς γάμος, *the Sacred Nuptials*, becauſe both *Plotinus* and he ſuppoſed this *Union* to be wrought by the power of *Divine Love*, as well as the *Myſtical Divines*; and *Porphyry* ſaith, upon the reading of it, *ſome thought him Mad, becauſe there were ſeveral things ſpoken in it after a Myſtical and Enthuſiaſtical manner*; for which he was highly applauded by *Plotinus*. And *Porphyry* was ſo much in his Favour, that he committed the ordering and publiſhing of his Books entirely to his care; which no doubt he was the more willing to do, becauſe by delivering theſe *Myſtical Notions* in ſuch a Philoſophical manner, he might hope to put a ſtop to the ſpreading of Chriſtianity, eſpecially among Men of Contemplative Minds. For it appears by St. *Auguſtin*, that *Porphyry* deſpiſed Chriſtianity Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 10. c. 29. chiefly on the account of the *Incarnation of the Son of God*: Which they thought to be *bringing God down to the Body*, whereas their deſign was to *elevate the Soul from the Body to God.*

Plotin. Ennead. 1. l. 2. c. 3. 4, 5, 6. §. 14. The ſhort account of *Plotinus* his *Hypotheſis* is this, *That the Soul of Man being immerſed in the Body, ſuffers very much by reaſon of its Union with it, by which means it is drawn down to the Affections of the Body, and to a Converſation with ſenſible things, and ſo becomes evil and miſerable: That its good and happy condition lies in being like to* God, *not in regard of underſtanding, but a ſtate of quieſcency*; *that the practice of the vertues of the active Life is inſufficient for aſſimilation to* God; *but in order to it, thoſe which are properly intellectual are moſt neceſſary, whereby the Soul draws it ſelf off from the Body. Thus for the Soul to act by it ſelf, is wiſdom*; *introverſion is Temperance*; *abſtraction from matter, is fortitude*; *to follow reaſon, is juſtice*: That, *by the practice of theſe, the Soul purifies it ſelf,* i. e. *caſts off the things without it ſelf, and ſo recovers its purity, by bringing thoſe things into light again, which lay hid under the rubbiſh of ſenſible things before, ſo that the Soul did not know them to be there*; *but for the diſcovery of them, it was neceſſary for the Soul to come near a greater Light than it ſelf*; *and to bring the Images which are in it to be the true Originals.* The way of *purifying the Soul* he calls by the names of *Abſtraction* and *Recollection*: Which he elſewhere expreſſes, Ennead. 3. l. 6. c. 5. *by awakening the Soul out of ſleep, wherein it was diſturbed by ſenſible I-*

mages; not as though the Soul had need of any other way of *purifying*, but only *reſtoring it to it ſelf, by taking away that load of matter which oppreſſed it, and then it naturally endeavours after the neareſt Union with the firſt Being*, which he calls the *true Being*, and the *ſuper-eſſential Being*. And, he ſaith, *when the Soul endeavours after this Union,* Ennead. 6. l. 9. c. 3. *it muſt lay aſide all ſenſible and intellectual Images of things, and make uſe only of the pureſt and ſupream part of the Mind* (or the fund of the Spirit) *that God then is not to be conſidered under the Notion of Being, but as ſomething above Being; and that we are not either to affirm or deny any thing of him*; that, *our Contemplation of him is not by knowledge or any intellectual operation, but by a Divine Preſence, which far exceeds any knowledge: For knowledge* he ſaith, *hinders Union;* C. 4 *therefore we muſt go beyond knowledge, and be abſtracted from all other Objects; and be united to him only by the Power of Divine Love,* C. 9. *from whence follows a clearer Light in the Soul; and in this ſtate*, ſaith he, *there is not only a ceſſation of Paſſion,* C. 11. *but of reaſon and underſtanding too; neither is the Perſon himſelf*, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἁρπασθεὶς ϗ ἐνθουσιάσας, *like one in a Rapture or an Ecſtaſie he enjoys God in that ſtate of Quieſcency as in a ſilent Wilderneſs*; which he calls *being in God*; and in other places, *ſeeing God in themſelves*; *being the ſame with God*; Ennead. 5. l. 8. c. 10, 11. *being one with God*, and which is the higheſt of all, *being God*; which is the perfect *State* of *Deiformity*. By this we ſee there is not one of the ſublimeſt Notions of *Myſtical Divinity*, Ennead. 1. l. 2. c. 5, 6. which hath not been borrowed from theſe *Philoſophers*, who were the moſt dangerous Enemies to Chriſtianity. For although *Plotinus* doth not ſpeak ſo openly againſt it, as *Porphyry* did, who was his beloved Diſciple and Confident; yet he lets fall many inſinuations againſt it, and particularly againſt the doctrine of the *reſurrection of the Body* upon the account of this *Myſtical Doctrine*; for ſaith he, Ennead. 3. l. 6. c. 6. *the true awakening of the Soul, is an awakening from the Body, and not a Reſurrection with the Body; for that change which is together with the Body, is but paſſing from ſleep to ſleep, as it were from one Bed to another; but the true awakening is from all Bodies, which are contrary to the Soul; becauſe the nature of one is oppoſite to the other.*

§. 15. After theſe ſucceeded *Jamblichus*, who was *Porphyry*'s Diſciple, and a great Friend of *Julian the Apoſtate*, and purſued the ſame Myſtical Notions: For in his Book of the *Ægyptian Myſteries* (which Jamblich. de Myſter. Segm. 3. c. 4, 5, &c he writ in anſwer to an Epiſtle of *Porphyry*'s to an *Ægyptian Prieſt*, and wherein *Proclus* ſaith, *that he writ like a Man inſpired*) he Diſcourſes at large concerning *divine Ecſtaſies*, and *Viſions*, and *Inſpirations*, in which he deſcribes the Perſons juſt after the *Myſtical way*, *as no longer leading a Humane Life*, or *having any operations of their Senſes or Underſtanding, but their Mind and Soul is only in the Divine power, and not their own, being acted and poſſeſſed wholly by it*: Afterwards, he ſets down *ſeveral degrees and kinds of theſe*, in ſome they have only *Participation*, in others *near Communion*, and in the higheſt of all, *Union*; in ſome of theſe, he ſaith, *the Body wholly reſts, and ſometimes breaks out into Singing and all Expreſſions of Joy: Sometimes the Body is raiſed up from the Ground*, (as M. *Tereſa* thought hers) *ſometimes it ſwells into a greater Bulk, and ſometimes the contrary*: Then he lays down *Rules* to know *divine Inſpirations* by, *viz.* by enquiring in *what manner God appears, whether an appearance of Fire come before him, whether he fills up and acts the whole Soul, ſo that there is a ceſſation* of *of all its own acts?* For this he makes the main Character of a *divine Inſpiration*, that *the Perſons are wholly taken up and poſſeſſed by the Deity, from whence follows an Ecſtaſie and Alienation of the Senſes; but if either the Soul acts, or the Body moves, then*, he ſaith, *it may be a falſe Inſpiration.* No Man can expreſs himſelf more emphatically

De Myſter. ſegm. 5. c. 27. concerning the excellency of *Contemplative Prayer*, than *Jamblichus* doth: *This quickens the Mind, enlargeth its Capacity, opens the Secrets of the Divinity, and fits it for Conjunction and Union with God; and never leaves Men till it hath carried them to a State of Perfection; and by degrees doth ſo alter and change Men, that it makes them put off humane Nature, and bring them into ſuch a State of Deiformity that they become Gods. The firſt degree of Prayer*, he ſaith, *brings to a State of Recollection, and hath ſome divine Contact which helps our Knowledge: The ſecond carries the Soul to a nearer Communion with* God, *and excites the divine Bounty to freer Communications to it: But the third, is the Seal of the ineffable Union which makes our Mind and Soul to reſt in*

Segm. 10. c. 6. *God as a Divine Port or Haven.* And he concludes his Book with ſaying, *that this Union with God, is Man's greateſt Perfection, and the end of all Religion among the Ægyptians*, whoſe *Myſteries* his *Deſign was to*

Segm. 1. c. 3. explain and vindicate. Many other Paſſages might be produced out of him, concerning *the knowing God by divine Contact*, and *the inſuf-*

2. c. 11. *ficiency of any act of the Mind for this ineffable Union*; but theſe are enough to ſhew how well acquainted *Jamblichus*, and (if we believe him) the *Ægyptian Idolaters* were, with the profoundeſt *Secrets of Myſtical Divinity.*

Suidas tells us, that after *Porphyry*, there was no one appear'd a

Suid. v. Proclus. more bitter Enemy to Chriſtianity than *Proclus*, yet no one a greater Friend to *Myſtical Divinity* than he. Of whom *Marinus* gives this Character, towards the concluſion of his Life, *That his Soul was ſo*

Marin. de vit. Procli, ant. Procl. Theolog. *recollected and drawn into it ſelf, that it ſeemed to be ſeparated from the Body while it remained in it.* In the beginning of his *Theology*, he diſtinguiſhes between *that intellectual Faculty in us whereby we are capable of underſtanding the Nature and Difference of intelligible Ideas, and that*

Procl. Theolog. Plat. l. 1. c. 3. *which he calls* τὴν ἀκρότητα τοῦ νοῦ καὶ (ὥς φασι) τὸ ἄνθος, *the ſummity*, as the *Myſticks* ſpeak, *and pure fund of the Spirit*, which he ſaith, *is alone capable of the Divine and Myſtical Union*, ſo he calls it, ἀπόκρυφον ἕνωσιν. For, ſaith he, *though there be many intellectual Powers in us, yet it is by this only that we can be united to the Divinity, and be made partakers of it. For we cannot reach the Divine Being either by our Senſes, or by Opinion, or by Apprehenſion; no, nor yet by Ratiocination*, ἔτι νοήσει μετὰ λόγου· *it remains therefore that if the divine Nature can any ways be known by us, it muſt be by the eſſence of the Soul. For the Soul being drawn into its own Unity, and removing from it ſelf the multiplicity of its Powers, it aſcends to the greateſt height of true Contemplation. While the Soul looks about on things below it, it ſees nothing but Shadows and Images of things, when it comes to a ſtate of Introverſion, then it ſees its own Eſſence and Operations of the Underſtanding; but when it ſearches deeper, then it finds the Mind within it ſelf, and the ſeveral Orders of real Beings; when it goes yet farther into the moſt ſecret Cloſet of the Soul, there it contemplates, as it were blindfold, the Divine Beings, and the firſt Ideas or Unities of Beings. And this*, ſaith he, *is the moſt excellent operation of the Soul, in the reſt or quieſcency of its Powers, to ſtretch it ſelf towards the divine Nature, and dance as it were round it, and to raiſe up the whole Soul towards this U-*

nion with it ; and abſtracting it ſelf from all inferiour Beings, to reſt upon and be conjoyned with that ineffable and ſuper-eſſential Being. And by this means the Soul comes to have the trueſt Underſtanding of all things.

§. 16. Many other Paſſages might be produced out of him to the ſame purpoſe; but this comprehends in it ſo much of the very *Marrow* of *Myſtical Divinity*, that *Carolus Herſentius* confeſſeth, *either that* Proclus *borrowed from* Dionyſius, *or* Dionyſius *from* Proclus; but he is willing to believe that *Proclus*, and the reſt of the *Modern Platoniſts*, did borrow thoſe Notions out of *Dionyſius*. *Marſilius Ficinus* indeed is of the ſame Opinion; for being a skilful *Platoniſt*, he ſaw ſuch an Agreement of Notions and Expreſſions in *Dionyſius* and the Writings of *Plotinus*, *Jamblichus* and *Proclus*, that either they muſt have taken from him, or he from them; but for the Honour of the *Platonick Notions*, he believed the former. And *Suidas*, an Author of no great Judgment ſaith, *that ſome of the Philoſophers, and eſpecially* Proclus, *made uſe of his very Expreſſions without any alteration, from whence it might be ſuſpected that the elder Philoſophers at* Athens, *had hidden his Works, that they might ſeem to be the Authors of thoſe ſublime Notions contained in them.* A very likely Story! Why ſhould *Proclus* take thoſe things out of *Dionyſius*, which he might have found as well in the Books of *Plotinus*, *Porphyry*, or *Jamblichus*, whom he had a far greater eſteem of, than of *Dionyſius*, and quotes every one of them very frequently, and with great Veneration, and mentions them together as a ſort of *inſpired Perſons*, in the very beginning of his *Theology?* And *Proclus* hath nothing peculiar in him upon this Subject; the very ſame *Notions* were delivered by *Plotinus*, an *Ægyptian Philoſopher*; and *Proclus* quotes him for the chief of them; viz. *The twofold operations of the Mind, the one of it as the Mind, viz.* Raciocination; *the other of it as drunk with the divine Nectar (*thence comes the *Myſticks Ebrietas Spiritualis*, of which *Rusbrochius* hath ſeveral Chapters, and which ſaith *Harphius*, *makes ſome Sing, and others Cry, and others utter ſtrange Noiſes, as* Fr. Maſſeus *that cryed V. V. V.* and *others tremble and quake, and others run over Mountains and Valleys like* Fr. Bernard, *and others Dance, and laſtly, others ready to burſt, like a Veſſel filled with new Wine)* and *that the Mind becomes Deified by its Union with God*, which being the fundamental Principles of *Myſtical Divinity*, *Proclus* doth acknowledge that he had them from *Plotinus*, and if we believe *Jamblichus*, they came from the Ancient *Myſtical Theology* of the *Ægyptians* and *Chaldeans*.

Carol. Herſent. Apparat. Theolog. Myſtic. p. 43.

Marſ. Fic. de Chriſt. Relig. c. 22.

Suid. in Dionyſ.

Procl. Theol. Plat. c. 12. p. 36.

Rusbroch. de Nupt. ſpirit. l. 2. c. 20, 21, 22.

Harp. Theolog. Myſt. l. 2. p. 3. c. 41.

I expect that thoſe who have not conſidered theſe things ſhould be ſtill ready to believe, that all theſe Notions among theſe Philoſophers were taken from ſome of the Chriſtians at leaſt, if not from this *Dionyſius*: Which *Plotinus* his Education under *Ammonius* at *Alexandria*, ſeems to make probable, where he continued 11 Years; but whatever Doctrine he heard from *Ammonius*, it is certain *Plotinus* his opinion as to theſe Matters, together with his followers, was derived from other *Oracles* than thoſe of the *Sacred Scriptures*: For *Pſellus* in his *Commentary* on the *Chaldaick Oracles*, doth ſay, that *Plotinus*, *Jamblichus*, *Porphyrius* and *Proclus* did wholly approve of the *Chaldaick Theology*; and by what remainders there are ſtill extant of it, we may diſcover the Footſteps of theſe Myſtical Notions in it. If the *Chaldaick Oracles* were ſtill extant, which were frequently quoted by theſe Philoſophers, (and from them

Pſell. in Orac. Chal. p. 120.

them in a great meaſure the *Fragments* were preſerved) we might more fully manifeſt theſe things; yet as they are, they give us ſufficient ground to draw the Fundamentals of this *Myſtical Divinity* from thence. For they ſpeak of *God's being united to the Soul, by the Soul's claſping God to her ſelf*; and that *not by any act of the underſtanding*, but *by the flower of the Mind*, (the very Phraſe uſed by *Proclus*, and the ſame which the *Myſticks* call the *fund of the Spirit*,) of *the Soul's being inebriated from God*, (which *Plotinus* calls, *being drunk with the divine Nectar*,) and *Pſellus* explains of *divine Illuminations and Ecſtaſies*: Of *abſtraction from the Body*, and *extending the Mind upwards, and haſtening to the Divine Light and the Beams of the Father*; with ſeveral other Paſſages to the ſame purpoſe. But leſt any ſhould ſay, that theſe *Chaldaick Oracles* were framed by ſome Chriſtians at firſt in *Greek* (as it is ſuppoſed the *Sibylline* were) *Joh. Picus Mirandula* ſaith, *he had an entire Copy of them in the Chaldee Language, with a Chaldee Paraphraſe upon them, which he valued as a great Treaſure.* But in truth all theſe Notions both among the *Chaldeans* and the *Platonick* Philoſophers are built upon a very ancient *Hypotheſis*, but very different from that of Chriſtianity; which *Hypotheſis* being granted, this *Myſtical Divinity* appears with ſome face of Reaſon, and colour of Probability; which I ſuppoſe will not be conſented to by Mr. *Creſſy*, or any of the *Friends* to *Myſtical Divinity*: Which was this, That the Souls of Men did exiſt in another World long before they came into the Body; that in their Deſcent to the Body they had an Æthereal Vehicle joyned to them; which upon the conjunction of the Soul and Body became the means of Communication between them, and takes up its chief Seat in the Brain, which is the ſame which we call the *Imagination*; that the Soul being in this State, is apt to be much inveigled with kindneſs to the Body, and ſo forget its return home; that the Body is capable of doing the Soul miſchief no other way, being it ſelf under the power of Fate, than as it draws it downwards; that the Mind being the upper part of the Soul, is always acting, but we know not its operations but only by the impreſſions they make upon the Fancy; that the Mind hath the true Ideas of things within it ſelf; but we are deceived by the Repreſentations conveyed by our Imagination; and therefore our Ratiocination is very ſhort and uncertain; that our only way of recovering our Souls, is by drawing them off from the Body, and retiring into themſelves; and that upon this the Mind hath the Divine Being ſo nearly conjoyned to it, that it paſſeth into a Divine Nature, and recovers its former State when it parts from the Body. But becauſe it is not to return alone without the Æthereal Vehicle it brought with it, therefore the *Chaldeans* and *Egyptians* had ſeveral Sacred and Symbolical Rites for the purifying of the *Vehicle*, as they called it; which they made neceſſary for this end: And with them *Jamblichus* joyns, but *Porphyry* thought them not neceſſary, but that *Philoſophy* and *meer Contemplation* would purifie enough without it. This is the true account of their *Hypotheſis*, as may be fully ſeen in *Hierocles* and *Syneſius*, without going farther; and was the firſt Foundation of Myſtical Divinity; which I will not deny to be well enough accommodated to it; but it is as remote from Chriſtianity, as the *Hypotheſis* it ſelf is.

Oracu'. Chaldaic. ed. Obſopæi p. 19, 20.

Pſell. in Orac. Chal. p. 85, 90.

Nicepb. Gregor. in Syneſ. de inſom. p. 383.

Joh. Pic. Mirand. ep. Marſil. Ficin. p. 249.

Hierocl. in Aur. Carm. Pythag. Syneſ. de inſomn. p. 136, &c.

But the counterfeit *Dionyſius* finding the Notions ſublime, and having found out Expreſſions, as he thought, lofty enough to expreſs them; and either being not wholly brought off from the Philoſophy then in requeſt, or hoping by this means to enſnare the Philoſophers, when they found their Sentiments entertained among the Chriſtians, makes it his Buſineſs to patch together the ſublimeſt Notions of the Modern Platoniſts, and to make them paſs for good Chriſtian Doctrine. And I think it may be made appear, that there is not one Notion thought peculiar to this counterfeit *Dionyſius*, which we cannot trace the footſteps of in theſe *Writers*; which few of the Chriſtians ever looked into, becauſe of their known oppoſition to Chriſtianity, and therefore he had no more to do than only to fit them to the Chriſtian Doctrine, and they might eaſily paſs for new and ſublime Diſcoveries of his own. Not only the Principles of *Myſtical Theology*, but the very nine *Orders* of his *Celeſtial Hierarchy* are to be ſeen in *Jamblichus*, and are reckoned up by *Scutellius* in the Margin of his Tranſlation: And *Archangels* are not only mentioned frequently by him, but *Proclus* upon the *Timæus* ſaith, that *Porphyry* reckons them among the *Celeſtial Orders*; which being denyed by *Jamblichus* to have been ever mentioned by *Plato*, and yet reckoned up by himſelf, may be ſuppoſed to be drawn either from the *Chaldean* or *Egyptian Theology*; but that is not my Buſineſs to ſearch into. His Book of the *divine Names*, ſeems to have had its Foundation as well as Title in a Book written by *Porphyry* with the ſame Title, as *Suidas* himſelf confeſſes, who reckons that as *the firſt of his Books*; but that being loſt, we have only that Reaſon for our Conjecture, becauſe we find him ſo apparently guilty in his *Myſtical Theology*; to which he hath added nothing but a more affected Style, and profound Non-ſenſe: For it is not enough for him to joyn *Light* and *Darkneſs* together; but that *Darkneſs* muſt be *overſhining*, and the *Rays* of it muſt be *ſupereſſential*; he is not content, to expreſs nothing almoſt without *Metaphors*, but ſtretches them to *Hyperbole's*, and when he hath by this means ſet two things as far from each other as may be, then he claps them together, as if one ſhould ſay, the *moſt glorious Sun-ſhine of Egyptian Darkneſs*.

Jamblich. de Myſter. Segm. 2. c. 3.
Procl. in Timæum Platon. p. 47.

§. 17. But if this *Dionyſius* were the Perſon he pretends to be, *viz.* the *Areopagite*, then we might have ſome reaſon to think that the *Platonick Philoſophers* had taken their Notions out of him; and yet it would be very improbable that ſuch a Writer ſhould have been ſo well known among the *Platoniſts*, that was utterly unknown among the Chriſtians. Did *Dionyſius* leave his Works to the *Philoſophers* at *Athens*, or to the *Chriſtians*? If they were only among the *Philoſophers*, how came they out of their Hands at laſt? If they had borrowed ſo much out of them, they would have done as they report *Ariſtotle* did with his *Creditors* (I mean the *ancient Philoſophers*) viz. *ſuppreſſed* them, when they had gotten as much from them as they could; And it were an eaſie matter to have done it, ſince they were Writings never mentioned in thoſe firſt Ages by *Chriſtians*. So *Bellarmin* himſelf grants, (after the conſideration of all the Teſtimonies produced by *Baronius*, and many others) *that theſe Books were not known in the five firſt Centuries.* Which Argument, together with other Circumſtances, have made ſome of the moſt learned Perſons of the

Bellarm. de Script. Eccleſ. in Dionyſ.

Petav. in Ind. ad Tom. de dogm. Theol. Sirmond. de 2. Dionyſ. c. 8.
Labbe de ſcript. Eccleſ.
Launoy Diſcuſſ. c. 16.
Godeau hiſt Egliſ. l. 1. A. D. 99. p. 125.
Habert. obſerv. 1. in Rit. Ordin. Græc.
Morinus de Ordin. Sacr. p. 2. c. 2. n 8.
Petav. de Incarn. l. 4. c. 6. n. 6. l. 14. c. 13. n. 9.
Leon. de Sectis act. 8.
Phot. Cod. 230.
Facund. l. 1. p. 40.
Liberat. in Brev. c. 10.
Theodr. hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 10.
Gennad. Catalog. c. 2.
Auguſt. de hæreſ. c. 90.
Auct. frag. c. Severi. apud Caniſ. Antiq. Lect. Tom. 4. p. 236.

the Roman Church that have been of late, to reject this Author as ſuppoſititious; for notwithſtanding all the Pleas that have been made for him by *Baronius*, *Del-Rio*, *Halloix*, *Leſſius*, *De Chaumont*, *Lanſſelius* and others; his Authority is very much ſuſpected by *Petavius*, *Sirmondus* and *Labbe*, all *Jeſuits*; but rejected by *Launoy*, *Godeau*, *Habertus* and *Morinus*, who proves at large that theſe *Books* were never produced till the Conference with *Hypatius*, A. D. 532. and then they were brought forth by the *Severian Hereticks*, and rejected by *Hypatius*, *becauſe no Teſtimony was brought out of them, by former Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, when there was ſufficient occaſion if they had been then extant. And in truth, it ſeems moſt probable, that they came out of the *School* of *Apollinaris*, and ſo might well be produced firſt by the *Severians*; for it is not only obſerved by *Petavius*, that the Hereſie of *Apollinaris* came out of the *Platonick School*; but (if I be not much miſtaken) from that very notion of *Plotinus* of the difference of the *Mind* and *Soul* (for as appears by *Epiphanius*, *Apollinaris* granted, *that Chriſt had the Soul but not the Mind of Man*, and *Nemeſius* expreſly charges *Apollinaris* with following the Doctrine of *Plotinus*) by which it is plain that *Apollinaris* was ſufficiently converſant in theſe Writings, to borrow his Notions from thence; and he was more than ordinarily remarkable for his Converſation with *Philoſophers*; but beſides this, we find his *School* particularly charged with this way of forging Eccleſiaſtical Writers, as ſome *Pieces* of *Athanaſius* and *Greg. Thaumaturgus*, and an Epiſtle of *Pope Julius* and others. To which, another Circumſtance may be added, which ſhews the greater probability of it, *viz.* That among the Diſciples of *Apollinaris*, there were both a *Dionyſius* and *Timotheus*; a *Dionyſius* to whom the counterfeit Epiſtle of *Julius* was directed; and a *Timotheus* mentioned together with *Apollinaris* as his Diſciple by *Damaſus*, by *Gennadius*, and by St. *Auguſtin*, and others; ſo that if *Apollinaris* himſelf were not the *Author* of them, yet his Diſciple *Dionyſius* might write them to his Fellow-diſciple *Timotheus*; and the Names hitting ſo luckily, they might the eaſier paſs under the more venerable Names of the ancient *Dionyſius* and *Timothy*. But this I only propoſe as a Conjecture, it being ſufficient to my purpoſe to have given ſuch plain Evidence, That the *Fundamentals* of *Myſtical Theology* were firſt taken out of thoſe *Philoſophers* who were the greateſt Enemies to *Chriſtianity*, and who ſeemed to ſet up this in oppoſition to it, as a *more ſublime way to perfection*.

It were an eaſie matter after this, to ſhew how this *Myſtical Divinity* by the Authority of theſe Counterfeit Writings came into reputation in the *Weſtern Church*, after the tranſlation of them by *Johannes Erigena* and *Anaſtaſius*; what Authority it gained among ſome of the *Schoolmen* by its agreeableneſs with the Doctrine of ſome *Arabian Philoſophers*, about the *Intellectus Agens*; and other Principles of *Enthuſiaſm* among them; how it came into *Germany* among the *Monks* there, and what Pretences to *Viſions* and *Revelations* came in upon it; what favour it hath received from the *Jeſuitical* Order, (*Maximilian Sandæus* having publiſhed a Diſcourſe on purpoſe to prove, that from the very Foundation of their Order, the *Jeſuits* have been the greateſt Admirers of, and pretenders to *Myſtical Divinity*,) but I muſt ſtop, leſt Mr. *Creſſy* ſhould tell me, that I take *another opportunity to empty my voluminous ſtore of Collections*; whereas

Max. Sand. Jubilum. Societ. Jeſu ob Theolog. Myſtic. Colon. A. D. 1640.

all the pains I have taken in this matter, hath been to give him full ſatisfaction, that I have read and conſidered what the *Author of the Roman Churches Devotions vindicated*, hath ſaid upon this Argument, which he ſo *humbly beſeeches the* Perſon *of* Honour *to peruſe, hoping by that means he would come to a better opinion of* Sancta Sophia, and *Myſtical Divinity*, and Mr. *Creſſy:* And I dare leave any *Perſon* of *Honour* and *Underſtanding*, to judge, whether notwithſtanding what he hath ſaid for it, Mr. *Creſſy* had reaſon to account, this *Myſtical Divinity, the perfection of Chriſtian Prayer and Devotion.*

CHAP. III.

Of the Monaſtick Orders *in the* Roman Church, *and particularly of the* Benedictine.

§. 1. THE ſecond thing to which the charge of *Fanaticiſm* relates, is *the Foundation of their Religious Orders in the* Roman *Church, which* I ſaid *were firſt inſtituted among them by Enthuſiaſtick Perſons, upon the Credit of their Viſions and Revelations.* For which I inſtanced in all their moſt celebrated *Orders*, viz. *the Benedictines, Carthuſians, Dominicans, Franciſcans* and *Jeſuits*; and gave a particular account of this, from the Authentick Hiſtories among themſelves of the ſeveral *Founders* of them; and beſides, I produced the *Teſtimony* of *Bellarmin, that their Religious Orders were inſtituted by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt.* In anſwer to this, Mr. *Creſſy* (declining the Diſpute about the Perſonal Qualities of the *Founders* of *Religious Orders*,) ſaith, *the moſt commodious way to make a true Judgment of them, will be* **Fanatic.** *to examine their Fruits. For by their Fruits, ſaith our Saviour, they will* **p. 21.** *be known. Therefore to determine whether it was by God's Inſpiration, that they inſtituted their reſpective Orders, he propoſes theſe two ways,* 1. *To examine their ſeveral Rules, according to which their Diſciples oblige themſelves to conform their Lives and Actions.* 2. *Whether God hath acknowledged them for his Servants by making uſe of them to the great benefit of his Church and dilation of his honour. By theſe ways he deſires it may be judged whether there were not ſufficient ground for* Bellarmin *to ſay, that ſuch Orders were inſtituted by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*, and ſo do I. Which cannot be done without a particular enquiry into the *Rules* and *Hiſtory* of their *ſeveral Religious Orders*, that by them we may ſee what evidence appears of any Divine Inſpiration.

And according to Mr. *Creſſy*'s particular zeal and concernment for the *Benedictine Order*, I begin with that: The *Perſon* of *Honour* having given that *Character* of St. *Benedict*, "That he believed him to **Animadverſ. p. 38.**
" have been a devout Man in a dark time, according to his Talent
" of Underſtanding; but that he might have been deluded by the
" effects of a diſtempered Fancy, as many well-meaning Men have
" been; and that he could diſcern nothing like divine Inſpiration in **P. 39.**
" his Rule; but preſently met with an impertinent allegation of
" Scripture *ch.* 2. applying that place, *Rom.* 8. *crying, Abba, Father,* **P. 42.**
" to the Perſon of the *Abbot*, as repreſenting Chriſt; he proceeds far-

“ ther, to ſay, that neither the reading of his Rule, nor any of the
“ reſt, will oblige any Man to be of *Bellarmin*'s Opinion, that thoſe
“ *Orders* were inſtituted by the Inſpiration of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and
“ becauſe of Mr. *Creſſy*'s great rage againſt me upon this Subject of
“ *Viſions* and *Revelations*, he deſires to know his Opinion particularly
P. 53, 54. “ concerning the *Revelation* of St. *Francis* on the Mount *Palombo*,
“ concerning the literal Obſervation of his *Rule* without any *Gloſs*;
“ which is printed with his *Rule*, and with the *Pope's Bulls*, and the
“ *Teſtimony* of St. *Bonaventure*. Mr. *Creſſy* in Anſwer to this, takes no manner of notice of St. *Francis* his *Rule*, or *Revelation*; but leaves that to ſhift for it ſelf; but ſomething he muſt ſay for the Honour of St. *Benedict*, and it all amounts to as little as could be wiſhed. For he doth not produce any one thing, to make it appear more probable that St. *Benedict* writ his *Rule* by *divine Inſpiration*, which had been indeed to his purpoſe; but only anſwers to the place of *Scripture* mentioned *Ch*. 2. of his *Rule*; and then brings ſeveral Teſtimonies *of the great Reputation the Benedictine Rule hath been in among Popes, and Saints, and Councils, and Kings and Princes in after Ages.* And what of all this? Muſt this Rule therefore be written by divine Inſpiration? Is it not poſſible for Men to think them good Rules, without believing them to have been inſpired? Suppoſe this were approved, as the beſt *Monaſtick Rule* in theſe Weſtern parts, by Popes, and Princes and Councils, doth it hence follow, that it was immediately endited by the Spirit of God? If it were, it muſt be of equal Authority with the *Bible*; if it were not, the Charge remains good, that it was only an Enthuſiaſtical pretence to Inſpiration.

Epiſt. Apolog. n. 29. to *n.* 35.

§. 2. But to take off the force of all that Mr. *Creſſy* ſaith in behalf of the *Benedictine Rule*, and to make good the firſt Charge; (although Mr. *Creſſy* hath evidently declined the proof of the *Affirmative* which lay upon him) I ſhall give theſe Reaſons to prove that this *Rule* was never written by *divine Inſpiration*. 1. Becauſe the main parts of it were borrowed out of former Rules. 2. Becauſe what is of St. *Benedict*'s own, hath manifeſt ſigns of humane weakneſs; particularly miſapplication of Scripture, mentioned by the *Perſon* of *Honour*. 3. Becauſe it was never received in the *Roman* Church as written by divine Inſpiration.

1. Becauſe the main parts of it were borrowed out of *former Rules*. Where we can with ſo much eaſe and certainty, trace the Footſteps of humane Induſtry in any Writing, it is very unreaſonable to attribute it to divine Inſpiration: And there is not one conſiderable part in the *Benedictine* Rule, which we cannot even at this diſtance of time ſhew from whence it was taken. *Hugo Menardus*, a *French Benedictine*, hath publiſhed the *Concordia Regularum*, written by *Benedict Abbot of Aniane*, (not by the Engliſh *Benedict*, as *Reynerus* would have it) who was appointed by *Ludovicus Pius* to bring all the Monaſteries within his Empire to one uniform Rule, (which it ſeems they had not before) he therefore in purſuit of this deſign made it his Buſineſs to ſearch all former *Rules*, which having done, he publiſhed them together, with this Preface to them, *that ſometimes he met with the very ſame Words, at other times with the ſame Senſe which was in the Benedictine Rule*; and a little after he ſaith expreſly, *that St.* Benedict *took his Rule from thoſe who were before, and gathered it as one*

Hugo Menard. concord. Regular. p. 52. *Apiſtol. Benedict. p.* 190.

P. 70.

one handful out of many: And *Menardus* there confeſſeth, that it was taken out of the *Rules* of *Pachomius*, St. *Baſil*, *Caſſian* and others, who lived before him; which will very eaſily appear to any one who will take the pains to compare them. The *Benedictine Rule* begins with an account of the ſeveral ſorts of *Monks*, viz. *the* Cœnobitæ *who lived together under a Rule or Abbot*; *the* Eremitæ *who lived by themſelves in the Deſart*; *the* Sarabaitæ, *who lived two or three together without any certain Rule or Governour*; *and the* Wandring Monks, *who never remained in any certain place.* To the very ſame purpoſe, *Piammon* the *Egyptian Anchoret* in *Caſſian* ſpeaks, and reckons up the ſeveral kinds of *Monks* with the very ſame Deſcriptions of the three firſt, and *Alardus Gazæus* ſaith, the fourth ſort in *Caſſian*, is the ſame with the fourth in St. *Benedict*. The 12 *degrees* of *Humility*, mentioned in the *Benedictine Rule* are, (except the two laſt, and the pleaſant paſſage of *Jacob's* Ladder, the two Sides whereof he makes to be the Soul and Body) to be found in *Caſſian*, and ſome of them, as *Gazæus* confeſſeth, in the very ſame Words, but there more properly called *Signs*. But there are two things eſpecially Mr. *Creſſy* ſeems to admire the *Benedictine Rule* for, viz. *the ordering the Eccleſiaſtical Office*, and the *decent aſſignation of Duties proper to all Offices both of Superiors and Inferiors*; by theſe two therefore let us judge whether St. *Benedict* deſerves any other admiration than that of a bare *Collector*. The firſt thing remarkable in his *Eccleſiaſtical Office*, is, *that after the nocturnal Office, the Monks ſhould not go to ſleep again, but ſpend that time, between that and Mattins, in reading and getting by heart the Pſalter and Leſſons*; which Paſſage the *Commentators* upon the *Benedictine* Rule are extreamly puzzled with, as may be ſeen in *Caramuel*; but if they would have looked into the old *Egyptian Rules* in *Caſſian*, they might have eaſily underſtood both the meaning and the deſign of it. *Abbot Iſaac*, in *Caſſian*, highly commends the uſe of that *Verſicle* upon every occaſion, *Deus in adjutorium meum intende; Domine ad adjuvandum me feſtina*; from hence St. *Benedict* took it to begin the *divine Office*; *Menardus* thinks, that the application of it to the Office, was the Invention of St. *Benedict*; (ſurely not ſuch a one which could not proceed, but from divine Inſpiration) and yet *Walafridus Strabo* ſaith, *the Egyptians did begin their Canonical Hours with it.* The *Egyptian Monks*, as *Caſſian* relates, had a great Diſpute among them, what *number of Pſalms* was to be uſed in the *daily Office*, ſome were for 50, ſome for 60, and ſome for more, till an Angel appeared in the midſt of them, and repeated twelve Pſalms, upon which the whole Senate of the Fathers, underſtanding this number to be by divine Inſpiration, made a Canon, *that this number ſhould be conſtantly obſerved*, both at *Veſpers* and in the *nocturnal Office*; from hence St. *Benedict*, as both *Menardus* and *Gazæus* confeſs, took the number of 12 *Pſalms* for the *nocturnal Office*; but he allowed a much leſs number, *viz.* four or five, for *Veſpers*. Which I cannot but wonder at, ſince the Angel did appoint both alike: And *Palladius* ſaith expreſly, *that the Angel revealed it to* Pachomius *that* 12 *Pſalms ſhould be uſed at Veſpers.* Had St. *Benedict* a Revelation againſt this? If not, ſurely he was bound to follow the former; if he had, we have great reaſon to queſtion both. It is a poor excuſe the *Benedictines* uſe to bring their Founder off, viz. *that he added the Completorium after Veſpers, and therefore ſhortned the Service*; for, what Authority

Regul. Benedict. c. 1.

Caſſian. Collat. 18. *c.* 4, 7, 8.

Gazæ. not. in Caſſian. coll. 18. *c.* 8.

Caſſian. de inſtitut. renunciant. l. 4. *c.* 39.

Fanaticiſm. p. 23.

Regul. Bened. c. 8.

Caram. Theol. Regulatis n. 1102.

Caſſian. de noct. orat. l. 2. *c.* 13. *l.* 3. *c.* 5.

Caſſian. Collat. 10. *c.* 10.

Menard. not. in Concord. Reg. p. 341.

Strabo de rebus Eccleſ. c. 23.

Caſſian. de noct. orat. l. 2. *c.* 5, 6.

Reg. Bened. c. 10. *c.* 18.

Pallad. hiſt. Lauſ. de Tabenneſiotis.

had he to make new Alterations, when the Order was ſettled by a general conſent of the *Egyptian Fathers*, and that upon the appearance of an *Angel?* But it ſeems the *Council* at *Tours*, rather adhered to the *Egyptian Revelations* than St. *Benedict*'s; for they appoint 12 Synod. Turon. 2. c. 18. *Pſalms at Veſpers, which they ſay was firſt learnt by the appearance of an Angel.* It ſeems very ſtrange to me that St. *Benedict*, who ſo punctually followed the *Egyptian Cuſtoms* in other things, ſhould preſume to alter them in that which they pretended to have more immediately from divine Revelation; as it happened not only in this, but Pallad. ib. in the number of *Canonical Hours*, for *Palladius* ſaith, *that the Tabenneſian Monks had it from an Angel, that they were to obſerve but three Canonical Hours*, viz. *the Nocturnal, Veſpers, and Nones, all the reſt of the time* Caſſian. de diurn. orat. l. 3. c. 2. *to be ſpent in Work and ſecret Prayers.* But *Caſſian* ſaith, *that the Egyptian Monks had but two Canonical Hours wherein they met to celebrate the divine Office*, viz. their *Nocturnal Vigils and Veſpers*; *unleſs it were on the Saturday, or Sunday*; *on both which days they met for the Holy Communion at the third hour of the Day*; (for not only the *Egyptian Monks*, but moſt of the *Eaſtern Chriſtians* kept both thoſe Days Holy for the ſolemn performance of *divine Offices*, which was the reaſon of their difference with the *Weſtern Church* about the *Saturday Faſt*;) but the *Monks* of *Paleſtine* and *Meſopotamia* and of the whole *Orient*, added more C. 3. *Hours* for the *Diurnal Office*: and *Caſſian* adds, that in his time, in the *Monaſtery* of *Bethlehem*, they added another Hour after *Mattins*, ſince C. 4. called the *Prime*, *to keep the Monks from Lazineſs*; *and withall, by this means they might ſay with* David, *Seven times a day will I praiſe thee*; *which he ſaith may be accommodated to this, although it might have a myſtical*, i. e. ſaith *Gazæus*, a *figurative meaning*, for, *often*; *but the other*, *Caſſian* ſaith, *was the true reaſon of appointing it*; *and he grants, that the moſt ancient Eaſtern Monaſteries would not admit of that alteration.* Regul. Bened. c. 16. But St. *Benedict* makes no doubt, that was the *Pſalmiſt*'s meaning, and therefore appoints the ſeven Canonical Hours agreeable to the *Monks* of *Bethlehem*, and becauſe it is ſaid *Septies in die*, he will have them all to be parts of the *Diurnal Office*; for he had another place for the Nocturnal, *media nocte ſurgebam*: But was it by Revelation that he knew the former place was not underſtood of a Natural Day? By theſe two inſtances we ſee, that St. *Benedict* did moſt unhappily differ from the *Egyptian Monks* in thoſe things, which they pretended the moſt to have from divine Revelation; but in other things he followed their Regul. Bened. c. 20. Example, as *Menardus*, ſaith he, did in the ſhort *Ejaculatory Prayers* at the end of every *Pſalm* inſtead of the *Gloria Patri*; but he adds, Menard. in Concord. Regul. p. 404. *that Place in the Rule is thought more difficult, becauſe the practice of them is diſuſed, either through lazineſs, or the multiplicity and length of their Offices*; but he ſaith, *St.* Benedict *obſerved this cuſtom in the making of his Rule, that thoſe things which were more ſhort in the former Writers, eſpecially in* Caſſian, *he inlarged, as about the Abbot, the Præpoſitus, the Decani,* &c. *but what were more diffuſe in them he contracted, as about theſe ſhort Prayers at the end of the Pſalms.* For *Caſſian* expreſly ſaith, that the *Gloria* Caſſian. de noct. orat. l. 2. c. 7, 8. c. 10, 11. *Patri* was uſed in the *Eaſt* at the end of the *Antiphona*, and not at the end of every *Pſalm*; but then both there, and in *Egypt*, they had very ſhort Prayers; of which *Menardus* underſtands that Clauſe of the *Benedictine Rule* about *ſhort Prayers*; but I rather think it is to be underſtood of the *concluding Prayer*. For *Caſſian* mentions only two ſorts of common Prayers uſed by the *Egyptian Monks* in their *divine*

Offices, viz. The *ſhort mental Prayers* made at the end of every Pſalm; and at every ſolemn ſtop in the reading of them, of which it was uſual to make two or three on purpoſe in a long Pſalm; and the *Collect* at the end (ſo called, becauſe then they did *orationem Colligere,* as *Caſſian* ſpeaks) which being pronounced either by Prieſt, or Abbot, or Prior, he giving the Sign, they all did immediately ariſe from Prayers together; and ſo the *Benedictine Rule* expreſſes it, *& facto ſigno à Priore omnes pariter ſurgant*; by which it ſeems moſt probable that the Rule is to be underſtood of the ſhort concluding *Collect.* And it is obſervable, that the *Benedictine Office* conſiſts almoſt wholly of *Pſalms, Antiphona's, Hymns,* and a few *Leſſons*; very little care being taken about *Prayers,* for the *Litania* mentioned *c.* 13. 17. was only the *Kyrie eleeſon*; only St. *Benedict* appoints the *Prior* to ſay at *Mattins* and *Veſpers* the *Lord's Prayer* aloud, for which he gives this very good reaſon, *becauſe the Monks were ſo apt to quarrel (propter ſcandalorum ſpinas quæ oriri ſolent in Monaſterio) that it was fit they ſhould all ſay together,* dimitte nobis ſicut & nos dimittimus; *but at other hours it was ſufficient to ſay it to themſelves, only the Prior was to lift up his Voice,* & ne nos inducas, *&c.* and all the reſt to anſwer, *ſed libera nos a malo.* And what is there now in the *Benedictine Office* which looks like Divine Inſpiration? What is there, that a Man who had never pretended to Viſions and Revelations, could not have done, by the help of *Caſſian,* and a very little *Mother-wit?* Nay, what is there that was his own? Was it the adding the *Completorium?* So ſome ſay, but others ſhew plainly he had that from the *Rule* of St. *Baſil*: Was it the firſt adding *Te Deum* to the *Mattins,* or the placing the *Antiphona's* between the *Pſalms,* whereas the *Egyptians* had them before them? Theſe are things inſiſted on, and gloried in, as the proper inventions of St. *Benedict*; great things I confeſs, but ſuch as I hope meer human Wit may reach to without divine Inſpiration. But beyond all theſe the *Benedictines* ſay, *the order of Reading the Pſalter was his own*: Very well: And was this it which came to him by Inſpiration? when himſelf ſaith, *that if his diſpoſition of the Pſalms doth not pleaſe, they may make uſe of another,* ſo they hold to the main point, viz. *going through the Pſalter once a Week*; which I perceive he laid great weight upon, but yet he never pretends to have had it by divine Inſpiration. For he ſeems by his *Rule* to have been more humble and modeſt, and I am thereby enclined to believe thoſe ſtories of his *Viſions* and *Revelations* to have been made by ſome idle Monks after his death, who hoped by this means to recommend their *Order* more effectually to the World; eſpecially after they had impoſed upon the credulity of a well-meaning Pope, and made him their inſtrument to publiſh them to the World.

Reg. Benedi c. 13.

S. Baſil. inter. 37.

Gabr. Bucelin. Menolog. Bened. l. 3. *Hugo Menard. Concord. Reg. p.* 355. c. 18.

§. 3. But if the pretence of *Divine Inſpiration* muſt be ſubmitted to in theſe Directors of *Religious Orders,* why might not one ſerve for them all? Why not that which was more ancient than any of theſe Pretences in the Roman Church, *viz.* that of St. *Pachomius?* For, not only *Palladius* and *Sozomen,* and *Nicephorus* and others among the *Greeks* do affirm, *That he received the Monaſtick Rules in a Table of Braſs from an Angel,* but *Gennadius, Vincentius,* and others among the *Latins,* and which is far more, the *Roman Martyrology* confeſſes it, and *Roſweyd* from thence calls him a *ſecond Moſes.* Who could

Pallad. hiſt Lauſ. de Tabennenſ. Sozom. l. 3. *c.* 14. *Niceph. l.* 9. *c.* 14. *Gennad. de Script. Eccl ſ. in Pachom. Vincent. Spec. l.* 18. *c.* 82. *Martyrolog Rom. Maii* 14. *Roſweyd. not. in vit. Pat. p.* 141.

could imagine otherwiſe, after ſuch acknowledgments as theſe, than to have ſeen *Pachomius* his Table in as much veneration among the *Monks*, as thoſe of *Moſes* were among the *People of Iſrael?* But no ſuch matter; although the latter *Monks* love to practiſe by ſome of his Rules, yet it would not cover their *Hypocriſie* enough to pretend to live by them. For the firſt of them is, *to give the Monks free liberty to eat or drink, or work or faſt as they pleaſed; only they that eat moſt were to do moſt work, and they that faſt, to have leſs impoſed upon them.* It is to no purpoſe to mention the reſt of his *Rules*, ſince no ſort of *Monks* except the *Tabenneſians*, who increaſed to ſeveral thouſands, thought themſelves obliged to obſerve them; and yet all Authors that I have met with of the Roman Church that mention this *Rule* of *Pachomius*, do allow it to have been received from an *Angel*. What do they mean by theſe things? Can they have better Rules than what an *Angel* from *Heaven* hath given, or do they think the *Angel* only intended them for the *Monks* of *Tabenneſus?* The *Angel*, as *Sozomen* ſaith, *appeared on purpoſe to* Pachomius *in his Cave, to draw him out from his Retirement, and commanded him to gather Monks and to take that braſs Table for their Rule?* Could any thing be more ſolemn than this? But, if after ſuch Confeſſions, they think it lawful not to believe the truth of this Story; I hope we have much more reaſon to queſtion the pretence to Inſpiration, either in St. *Benedict*, St. *Francis*, or *Ignatius Loyola.* For this is averred by much more credible Authors, and received by the conſent of both *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Hiſtorians, and the Roman Church allows it in her *Martyrology:* And yet, after all this, if there be no Reaſon to believe it, what becomes of the credit of all the *Viſions* and *Revelations* of the *Egyptian Monks*, which are not near ſo well atteſted as this is? And if there be any reaſon to believe it, how comes that Rule not to be univerſally embraced? Do they think St. *Benedict*, or St. *Francis*, or *Ignatius* wiſer than an *Angel* from *Heaven?* Nay, how came ſo many other Rules to be received in *Egypt* after this Rule of *Pachomius* was known? As the Rule tranſlated by St. *Hierome*, compoſed by *Pachomius*, *Theodorus* and *Orſieſius*; which is ſaid likewiſe *to be received from an Angel*; which *Gazæus* would have to be only *an enlargement of the former*; but they were bold Men that durſt mend the defects of an *Angel*; another *Rule* of *Orſieſius*, out of which *Benedictus* of *Anian* hath taken ſeveral Paſſages; the *Rules* of the two *Macarii* both famous *Egyptian Monks*, and of *Serapion* and *Paphnutius*; the fragments of which are extant in the *Concordia Regularum.* What do all theſe things mean? But it ſeems the pretence of Inſpiration among theſe *Founders* of *Religious Orders*, is juſt contrary to what the *Apoſtle* ſaith of *Miracles*, for this is not for thoſe *that believe not*, but for *thoſe that believe.*

Caſſian. l. 4. c. 1. Hieron. ad Euſtoch. v. Baron. in Martyrol. Rom. 14. Maii. & To. 5. An. 404. Gazæ. in Hier. Præf. ad Reg. Pach. Menard. Præf. p. 54.

Gazæ. in Regul. Pachom.

§. 4. But to return to the Rule of St. *Benedict*; the other thing Mr. *Creſſy* magnifies it for, is, *the Rules of Government and Diſcipline; which*, he ſaith, *are ſo excellent that* Coſmo de Medicis *collected inſtructions from thence for the Government of his People.* Great Men love to be ſingular; and take a Pride in ſeeming to find that which no Body elſe can. I dare ſay, if it be true, he was the only Prince in the World ever learnt to Govern his People by *Monaſtick Rules.* This is ſo great a diſcovery, that it is pity we have no more of it; for

Epiſtle Apologet. n. 35.

for who can tell what *maxims* of *Policy* might be drawn from thence
by a ſubtle Head? What uſe the *Chapter* of the *choice* of the *Abbot*
might be of in chooſing *Miniſters* of *State*, or it may be the *Officers* of
an *Army?* And what influence it might have upon a Prince to do
nothing without the advice of his wiſe Council, becauſe *the Abbot was* Reg. Bened. c. 1.
to call the Monks together in all matters of importance? The *Monks* c. 2.
lying in their Cloaths all Night girt up, and the meaſure of their Wine, and
the Pound of Bread a day, and the two Meſſes for all the Monks, are ſea- c. 22.
ſonable *Items* for *Soldiers: The burning of the Candle all Night in the* c. 39.
Dortor, a good *Memento* for *Centinels: The Monks laying aſide their* c. 40.
Knives when they ſleep, a Caveat againſt Self-murder: *Every Monk's be-* c. 22.
ing obliged to be Cook in his turn, affords that uſeful inſtruction, that *no*
Man is born only for himſelf; but that every Man ought to ſerve his c. 35.
Countrey: The Abbot's care in looking to the Utenſils and Habits, to take an c. 32.
account of them and to truſt them in ſafe Hands, will eaſily put a Prince
in mind of looking after his Revenues. But I am afraid ſo ſubtle
a Prince as *Coſmo de Medicis*, would like no Chapter ſo well, as that
which ſaith, *the Monks are to have no propriety in any thing; no, not ſo* c. 33.
much as in their own Wills. And I confeſs that would be the very
height of *Policy*, for a Prince to get away the very *Wills* of his Sub-
jects from them. I am a little to ſeek what inſtructions he could
gather from the *Monks Cowles*, and *Scapular*, and *Boots*, and *Breeches*
when they travel, which are to be ſafely delivered back at their return; c. 55.
with ſeveral other uſeful *Rules* for the choice of the *Cellerar Porter*,
and ſuch *Officers of State*; but although theſe things are above my
reach; yet who knows what uſe ſo wiſe a Prince as *Coſmo de Me-
dicis* might make of them? nay, who can tell whether *Machiavil*
himſelf did not take his *Politicks* out of the *Benedictine Rules?* I ſee
Mr. *Creſſy* himſelf is grown a *Politician* by being a *Benedictine*; for
if he could perſwade Men to believe the *Benedictine Rule to be ſo uſe-
ful for governing of People*, it were the only way to make *Perſons* of
Honour to love their *Rules*, and to brings *Monks* to the *Council
Table.*

But to leave this pleaſant Paſſage, and to return to what is more
grave and ſerious: there is not any thing of Moment in the *Bene-
dictine Rule* about the *Government* or *Diſcipline* of the *Monaſtery*,
which is not likewiſe taken out of former *Rules*: As will appear a- Reg. Bened. c. 65.
bout the *Præpoſitus* or *Prior*, if we compare it with what the *Oriental*
Rule, and the *Rules* of *Pachomius*, and *Orſieſus* do ſay upon the ſame
ſubject: The choice of the *Decani* out of *Caſſian*, and the *Regula O-* c. 21.
rientalis; about *excommunication* of the *Refractary*, from the *Rules* of c. 23.
Pachomius, St. *Baſil*, and the *Oriental*, and *Caſſian*, and *Macarius*:
About the *Cellerar* from St. *Baſil*, and the *Oriental Rule*: About the c. 31.
Utenſils, out of the *Regula Patrum*, *Pachomius*, and St. *Baſil*: About c. 32.
having *all things in common*, out of *Orſieſus*, *Pachomius*, St. *Baſil*, and c. 33.
others: About *ſerving their turns for a Week in the Kitchin*, out of c. 35.
Caſſian: About the *Infirmary*, out of *Pachomius* and St. *Baſil*: About c. 36.
the *Weekly Reader while they ſit at Table*, out of *Caſſian*; and the *ſilence* c. 38.
to be uſed at Meals, out of *him* and the *Oriental Rule* and *Pachomius*.
It would be too tedious to inſiſt upon the reſt, about *their Work*,
Hoſpitality, *Gifts*, *Artificers*, *Travellers*, *Novices*, *Garments*, nay, the
very *Porters*; but whoſoever will take the Pains to compare the
Benedictine Rule with the former, as to all theſe, will eaſily be con-

vinced, that there needed no *divine Inſpiration* for the writing of his Rule; unleſs the *Apoſtles* wanted as much the aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt* to *gather up the Fragments and put them into a Baſket*, as when they were to preach on the day of *Pentecoſt*.

§. 5. *But although this takes off from the Divinity of their Rule, doth it not add as much to it another way, by ſhewing the greater antiquity of it; in that it was taken out of the Eaſtern and Egyptian Rules?* I do not deny, that the *Monaſtick State* came into the *Weſtern Parts* out of the *Eaſt*, and began much later, and was entertained much colder a long time here, than it was there. For after that *Antony* the *Eremite* had gained a mighty reputation by the ſeverity and ſolitarineſs of his Life, not only with the *Emperor Conſtantine*, but with the *Governors of Provinces*, it is hardly conceivable what numbers from all Parts, the *Novelty* and *Fame* of this way, drew to be his Diſciples; and how many were encouraged by his Example to ſet up this new way of *Chriſtian Philoſophy*, as the *Greeks* call it; which although it were advanced with a contempt of Humane Learning, yet the pretence of greater ſeverity of Life, and a more eaſie way of ſubduing the Paſſions of Humane Nature by withdrawing the occaſions of them, made many underſtanding Men, at firſt, to cry it up as a *moſt divine and perfect ſtate of Life*. From hence in *Egypt*, *Ammon* began the ſame way in the *deſert* of *Scetis* and upon *Mount Nitria*; which in a little time were fill'd with the multitudes of his Diſciples, among whom the moſt famous were *Didymus*, *Arſenius*, *Pior*, *Iſidorus*, *Pambos*, and others. Then *Pachomius* went a way by himſelf into *Tabenneſus*, and had in a little time ſeven Thouſand Diſciples, which ſpread themſelves over *Thebais* and *Egypt*: Beſides theſe, there were *Apollonius*, *Pitherus*, *Anuphi*; and after them, many others mentioned by *Caſſian*, *Palladius*, *Ruffinus*, *Sozomen*, and others. The fame of theſe Perſons was ſpread ſo far in the Roman Empire, that multitudes flocked to them to ſee their way of living, and to hear their Diſcourſes; thence we read of *Melania* and *Ruffinus* going on purpoſe into *Egypt*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *Evagrius*, *Caſſian* and *Germanus*; and the ſame curioſity in others made the Deſarts become no great Places of retirement to them. From hence *Hilarion* one of *Antony*'s Diſciples, impatient of ſo much Company as flock'd continually to him, withdraws into *Paleſtine*, carrying ſome *Monks* with him, and ſettles himſelf in a Deſart not far from *Gaza*, where he in time gathered great numbers of *Diſciples*: And St. *Hierom* expreſly ſaith, *That before the time of* Hilarion *there was neither Monk nor Monaſtery known in* Syria; by which it is plain he doth not ſpeak of the *Eremitical Life* only, but of the *Cœnobitical* too: Whatever ſome pretend of *the conſtant ſucceſſion of the Cœnobitical ſtate from the Apoſtles times*, which it ſeems St. *Hierome* was utterly unacquainted with; and he was not ſo little a Friend to the Monaſtick State, to have concealed it, if he had thought otherwiſe. In the further parts of *Syria*, *Aones* brought the ſame way of living into requeſt, which was unknown there before; and *Julianus* at *Edeſſa*; and *Eutychianus* upon Mount *Olympus*; and *Euſtathius Sebaſtenus* in *Armenia*, *Pontus* and *Paphlagonia*. So far was this *Monaſtick Life* ſpread in the *Eaſt*, while the ſame Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians tell us, *it was not known in Thracia, Illyricum*, or the *Parts of* Europe; *although they were not wholly deſtitute of Men that did affect that*

Sozom. l. 1. c. 13.

C. 12.

C. 14. *Socr. l. 4. c. 23.*

Soz. l. 3. c. 14. Caſſian. collat. Pallad. hiſt. Lauſ. Ruffin. l. 2. c. 8. Soz. l. 6. c. 28, 29, 30, 31. v. Roſweyd vit. Patr. Hieron. vit. Hilar.

Soz. l. 6. c. 33, 34.

L. 3. c. 14.

way, for which *Sozomen* only inſtances in *Martin* and *Hilary.* It ſeems by St. *Hierome* that when the firſt notice of this way of living was brought to *Rome*, it met with no kind acception there, becauſe of the *novelty* of it; but when the *Biſhops* of *Alexandria*, *Athanaſius*, and *Peter*, fled thither upon their baniſhment, they recommended it ſo effectually to ſome of the devout Women; that firſt *Marcella*, then *Paula*, then *Sophronia*, then *Euſtochium*, were all for embracing this kind of Life; and by degrees brought it into reputation at *Rome*: After this, *Ruffinus* tranſlates St. *Baſil's Rule* for the direction of the Weſtern Chriſtians, who had a Mind to embrace the *Monaſtick State*, with ſuch additions and alterations as he thought fit; and the *Egyptian Rules* were brought (if not by *Euſebius* of *Vercelles*, as ſome think) yet it was certainly by *Caſſian*, and *Monaſteries* ſettled both in *Italy*, and *Gaul*, and *Britain*, before St. *Benedict* went into his Cave.

Hieron. ad Principium.

§. 6. But the *Monaſtick State* had loſt very much of its firſt Reputation in the *Eaſtern* parts, before it began to ſpread conſiderably in theſe *Weſtern*. That which firſt brought it into ſo great an eſteem, was the mighty Opinion of the extraordinary Sanctity of the beginners of it, the ſeverity of their Lives, the ſtrictneſs of their Diſcipline, the frequency of their Devotions, the diligence of their Labours, and a Retirement in good earneſt from the World. But this heat was too great to continue long; St. *Hierom* in his time, complains very much of the *declenſion of the Monks*; *of thoſe who made it only an Art of Living and a Holy Cheat*; *of their Faſting for Wagers and Victory*; *and their living without Order and Diſcipline*; theſe were thoſe who were called *Sarabaitæ*, and by St. *Hierom*, *Remoboth*; and although they are commonly thought to be only a few *degenerate Monks*, yet the *Abbot Piammon* in *Caſſian*, hath this ſevere Paſſage, *that ſcarce any others were to be found out of* Egypt, *as*, he ſaith, *he found by Experience, when he was baniſhed with his Brethren, in the time of the Emperor* Valens. St. *Baſil* did his endeavour to bring them into better Order by the making of his *Rule*; for his deſign was, not to found any *new Order of Monks*, but to bring thoſe who were ſcatter'd up and down without *Rule* and *Government*, under ſome kind of *Diſcipline*, which was well deſigned by him, but was far from being effectual for the end he aimed at. For by bringing them nearer to Cities, they ſoon grew ſo troubleſome in them, that the Emperor *Theodoſius* was forced to publiſh an Edict, *commanding all that had taken upon them the Profeſſion of Monks to retire from the Cities into Deſart Places, and to inhabit there* (which *Baronius*, without any reaſon in the World, would have to be underſtood only of the *Manichees*, and *Jovinian*, and *Apoſtate Monks*) but by the Favour they obtained in the Emperors Court, this Edict was repealed within two Years after; but his Son *Arcadius* found them ſo buſie, that he publiſhed another *Edict againſt their reſcuing Perſons from the Tribunals of Juſtice*; which it ſeems was a common Practice with them: And St. *Chryſoſtom* mentions their coming down in *Troops* to *Antioch*, to *reſcue thoſe who were ſeized upon for pulling down the Empreſſes Statue*: For which, although he highly applauds them, yet he found the ill effect of their *buſie* and *factious Humour* in his own Caſe at *Conſtantinople*: For by reproving them *for gadding up and down the Streets*, as

Hieron. ad Euſtoch.

Caſſian. Collat. 18. c. 7.

Greg. Nazianz. in Monod.

Cod. Theod. 16. tit. 6.

Baron. A. D. 390. n. 48.

Cod. Theod. 9. tit. 40. 16.

Chryſ. or. 17. ad pop. Antioch.

Sozom. l. 8. c. 9. *as unſuitable to their Profeſſion*, he made moſt of the *Monks* his implacable Enemies, who thereupon endeavoured to bring him into Diſgrace among the People: And when *Chryſoſtom* fell into Diſgrace with the Emperor, they kept poſſeſſion of the Church, and would Zoſim. l. 5. p. 800. not ſuffer the People to come in to Prayers, upon which they were ſo enraged, that they killed all the *Monks* they could meet with.

For now the firſt heat of their zeal was over, they began to intereſt themſelves in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, and to make Parties, and Factions in the Church. And he that had a mind to ſet up for a new Opinion, and to make a Party, went a great way in his Buſineſs, if he could get the Monks of his ſide: Upon this occaſion they were firſt brought to *Conſtantinople*, by the intereſt of *Macedonius*, who with the help of *Marathonius*, a great Friend of his, erected *Monaſteries* for them there, and by the aſſiſtance of the *Monks* Sozom. l. 4. c. 2. c. 27. he very much ſtrengthned his Party. The *Eutychian* Hereſie, as well as the *Pelagian* and *Macedonian*, had its beginning and ſupport from the Faction of the *Monks*; for *Eutyches* himſelf was the *Abbot* at *Conſtantinople*, and with him joyned *Barſumas* a famous *Syrian Abbot*, who was the occaſion of the Death of *Flavianus*, as *Diogenes Cyzicenus* charges him in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*; and upon his return Concil. Chalced. act. 4. p. 524. home, he and his *Monks* of *Syria*, perſecuted the *Biſhops* of the other Party, having a *thouſand* Monks with him, and *almoſt ruined the Syrian Churches*. *Leo* I. charges the *Monks* of *Paleſtine* (upon their great zeal, ſome for *Neſtorius*, and others for *Eutyches*) *that they cauſed many Seditions in Cities, and great Diſturbances in Churches, and had been the Murderers of many Biſhops and Prieſts; and through their Rage and* Leo ep. 83. *Cruelty had quite forgot their Profeſſion.* Theſe were the Men that had renounced the World, and had mortified their Paſſions, by the rigours and ſeverities of a Monaſtick Life. But here the Reader muſt take notice, that in the late Edition of *Leo* by *Theophilus Raynaudus* the *Jeſuit*, the Title of this Epiſtle is, *ad Palæſtinos Epiſcopos*, inſtead of *Monachos*: So much more are the *Jeſuits* concerned for the Honour of *Monks* than of the *Biſhops*; and care not what Reproaches are caſt upon them, ſo the other eſcape: But it falls out Baron. ad A. 453. n. 10. ad 15. happily that *Baronius* hath fully proved, that all thoſe Diſturbances were made by the *Monks*, and that this *Epiſtle* was written to them: By which we ſee what Truſt is to be given to their correct Editions of Fathers. And notwithſtanding the great Strictneſs and Diſcipline of the *Egyptian Monks* we do not find them, after the firſt fervour was ſpent, much freer from *Faction* and *Diſturbance* of the Epiph. hær. 68. ſ. 3. *Churches* Peace; for they very early joyned with *Meletius* againſt the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria*, as *Epiphanius* confeſſeth; they complotted the buſineſs of *Arſenius* againſt *Athanaſius*, and gave out he was *killed* by *Athanaſius* when they had concealed him; and one *John*, a *Monk*, was employed to accuſe *Athanaſius* for killing *Arſenius*, who lay hid with *Prines*, a *Monk* of *Thebais*. In the time of *Theophilus*, *Biſhop* of Socr. l. 6. c. 7. Soz. l. 8. c. 11. *Alexandria*, the illiterate *Monks* of *Egypt* were ſuch zealous *Anthropomorphites*, that upon *Theophilus* his oppoſing their Opinion in his *Paſchal Epiſtle*, they forſook their *Monaſteries*, and came in *Troops* to *Alexandria*, *with a reſolution to deſtroy him*; but *Theophilus* knowing their Simplicity, avoided their Fury by a ſubtle Anſwer, telling them *he beheld their Face as the Face of God*; with which they were very well ſatisfied, only deſiring him to condemn *Origen*'s Books;

which he told them he was ready to do. Upon this occaſion, a mighty Quarrel happened among the *Monks* themſelves, the more Learned among them oppoſed the *Anthropomorphites*, but the more ignorant and zealous were furious Defenders of their Doctrine, and charged all that oppoſed them with being *Origeniſts*; *Theophilus* finding out this, and having a particular pique at four learned *Monks*, *Dioſcorus*, *Ammonius*, *Euſebius* and *Euthymius*, who were called the *Long Brothers*, he ſends Letters to the *Monks*, to bid them have a care of them, for they believed God to be incorporeal, and therein were *Origeniſts*; *for they did not believe that God had either Eyes, or Ears, or Hands, or Feet*: Notwithſtanding this, a very few, who had more Learning, diſcerning the Malice and Craft of this Suggeſtion, adhered ſtill to them; but the far greater number, who were very ſimple and furious, moſt vehemently oppoſed them, by which means an irreconcilable War brake forth among them; and things, by *Theophilus* his means, were inflamed to that height, that *Dioſcorus* and his Brethren had much ado to eſcape with their Lives, and fled to *Conſtantinople*, where being received by St. *Chryſoſtom*, this widened the Breach between *Theophilus* and him, and proved one occaſion of his following Troubles.

The *Monks* of *Egypt* having been thus heated, it was a hard matter to keep them quiet afterwards, for in the time of *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, who was *Theophilus* his Siſters Son, and immediate Succeſſor, the *Monks* of *Nitria*, hearing of the difference between *Cyril* and *Oreſtes* the *Governour*, came to *Alexandria* 500 in a Body, with a reſolution to *kill the Governour*, and one of them called *Ammonius*, wounded him in the Head with a Stone, ſo that he hardly eſcaped with his Life. After this, *Timotheus Ælurus*, who had been one of the *Egyptian Monks*, was the occaſion of the Death of *Proterius Biſhop* of *Alexandria*, and cauſed himſelf to be choſen in his Place. *Theodorus Lector* ſaith, *that he diſguiſed himſelf in the Night, and went about the ſeveral Cells of the Monks, and called every one by his Name, and when they asked who called them, he told them he was an Angel ſent to them to tell them they ought not to communicate with* Proterius, *but they ſhould chooſe* Timotheus *for their Biſhop*. By which Story we have a true account of ſome of the *Monkiſh Revelations*: And ſome Hiſtorians report another as good as this at *Rome*, viz. of *Boniface* ſuborning one to ſpeak under the appearance of an Angel to that *Monkiſh* Pope *Celeſtine* V. *that he ought to leave the Papacy, and retire again to the Wilderneſs*; which ſucceeded ſo well with the credulous Pope, that he ſoon made way for *Boniface* to ſucceed him; who afterwards ſecured him from giving any further diſturbance to his Popedom.

Socr. l. 7. c. 14.

Soz. l. 2. c. 23.

Evagr. l. 2. c. 28.

Theod. Lect. l. 1.

v. Platin. in Bonif. 8.

§. 7. By this we may ſee what mighty Advantage the *Chriſtian Church* received in the Infancy of the *Monaſtick State*, in thoſe very Places where it began, by the greateſt pretence of Piety and Retirement from the World in thoſe that embraced it. I do not wonder ſo many great Men of the *Church* ſhould magnifie it ſo highly, before they had ſeen the tryal and experience of it; for extraordinary things in the way of Piety and Abſtraction of the World, are very apt to move Men of devout Minds at the firſt appearance; but the beſt Judgment of things is to be made by their Continuance. And therefore it is obſervable, that although the *Apoſtles* began at firſt with *a community of Goods*, while the *Chriſtians* were few; yet this did not laſt among them; nor was it required in the *Churches* planted by them; becauſe it could not be convenient for all; and for ſome to do it and others not, would be apt to beget Breaches and 1 Cor.16. 2. mutual Suſpicions among them. And I do not find but that the *Church* of *Corinth*, where every one was to lay aſide of his own for relief of the *Church* of *Hieruſalem*, was in that reſpect as pleaſing to Chriſt, as that State of the Church of *Hieruſalem*, wherein they had all things in common. And in matters of this nature, where the firſt appearance is very fair and plauſible, (as it was in the pretended Devotion and Retirement from the World in the *Egyptian Monks*) we are not ſo much to regard the Judgment of thoſe Perſons concerning it, who lived in the firſt heat and beginnings of it, which was the Caſe of St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Hierome*, St. *Baſil*, and others; as of thoſe who lived to ſee the effects of it, after it came into a Settlement. For they found after the firſt Running, ſo much of the Lees ſtill remaining, as put them into frequent and vehement Fermentations, which plainly diſcovered, notwithſtanding all the Pretences they made, they were far from being clearly drawn off from the World.

Syneſius was a Man of excellent Learning, and great Judgment, and Biſhop of *Ptolemais* in *Egypt* (who lived between the *Monks* of Syneſ. Dion p. 45, &c. *Scetis* and *Nitria*, and thoſe of *Thebais* and *Tabenneſus*, and in a time when they flouriſhed moſt as to number and zeal) in his *Dion* he gives an account of their way of Living, of *their Hymns and Prayers*, and *ſeparate Cells*, and *Abſtinence*, and *force they offer to Nature*, and the *very kinds of their Works*, which cannot be underſtood of any other than the *Egyptian Monks*; and ſo *Petavius* and *Holſtenius* confeſs. Petav. not. in Syn. Holſten. diſſert. 3. de Syneſ. And after he hath thus deſcribed them, he gives this Character of their Way, *that it was barbarous and contrary to humane Nature*; for, ſaith he, *we are not pure and unmixed Minds, but joyned together with Bodies, ſo that we cannot be wholly employed in Contemplation of divine things, but our Minds muſt divert themſelves to other matters; and this*, ſaith he, *they confeſs themſelves, by the great neceſſity of Working, which they lay upon all: I could wiſh that we were ſo framed that we could live wholly in Contemplation; but ſince that is impoſſible, I wiſh then*, ſaith he, *ſometimes to be taken up with the beſt things, and at other times to partake ſomething of the delight and pleaſure of Life. For I know my ſelf to be a Man; and not a God to be wholly above theſe pleaſures, nor a Beaſt to be under the power of them; and therefore that State of Life which is between theſe, is moſt agreeable to Humane Nature.* And then falls upon them, *for preferring manual Labour, before the exerciſe and improvement of the Mind in Knowledge and uſeful Learning, which is both an imployment and pleaſure to the Mind. But in their adamantine way*, as he calls it, *there is no Order, no gradual Improvement, but all depends upon Motions and Impulſes, and ſtrange Heats and Tranſports, whereby they hope for the end without the means, and aim at things above Reaſon without the exerciſe of it. How do theſe things agree, to be now above the Heavens, and preſently to be twiſting Reeds and making Baskets? But Mans excellency lies in his Reaſon, which they take the leaſt care about; and thoſe will attain Mans end the ſooneſt, that acts moſt agreeably to his Nature.* He doth not deny that there have been *ſome extraordinary Minds, which without Arts or Improvements, can do as much as others* *with them; but theſe are as rare as the* Phœnix *in* Egypt; *but the common ſort of Mankind are uncapable of this; and all their Labour and Pains is to no purpoſe that think to attain to the perfection of the Mind by any other way than by improvement of the Mind it ſelf. And it is not ſafe or lawful for us to think, that God ſhould dwell in any other part of us, than in our Mind, which is his proper Seat. They mightily cry up Temperance and Continence, and admire themſelves for thoſe things which in themſelves are the leaſt, any further than they ſerve to higher ends:* And afterwards he takes notice of *their confident Pretences to the knowledge of divine things*; *they,* ſaith he, *are Divines,* like *Cadmus* his *Soldiers, ſprung out of the Earth*; and in good earneſt, condemns them at laſt not only for their *barbarous way of Living,* but for a ſtrange mixture of *Pride* and *Ignorance*; *having very abſurd Opinions, and yet very arrogantly aſſuming to themſelves a greater meaſure of divine Knowledge than others had*; *for they had a particular way of improving their Minds by Ignorance*; which was a ſort of *Myſtical Divinity* among them too. By this, and his Epiſtle to *Hypatia* (wherein he deſcribes them again by thoſe peculiar Vertues of their *Ignorance* and *Confidence*) we may ſee what Opinion this great Man had of the *Monaſtick way,* when it was in its greateſt height, and it was not a meer *matter* of *Hypocriſie,* as it hath been for the greateſt part in the *Weſtern Church*; but Men did truly and honeſtly live in Poverty, and real Abſtinence, and continual Labour, with Pſalms and Prayers, hoping by thoſe means to come to the greateſt perfection of our *Souls*; but he ſaw thro' all this, and found, that when they labour'd only, or chiefly, to keep down the inclinations of the Body, *Spiritual-Pride* and *Self-Opinion* were like to get the better of their *Souls.* And St. *Hierome* who had ſome experience of this way, deſcribes the Temptation of *Spiritual Pride,* as the moſt common and dangerous ſnare, which the moſt ſevere and mortified Men were apt to fall into; nay, he ſaith, that *Antony himſelf fell into this, by reflecting on the Perfection of his Life, and that he was cured by an Angel, which revealed to him the greater perfection of* Paul *the* Eremite. One would wonder to meet with ſo many Combats with Devils as we find in the Hiſtory of the old *Monks*; either it was as St. *Hierome* intimates concerning ſome, *that they feigned them for greater Reputation among the People,* or that ſtate could not be ſo much perfecter than others, wherein the Devils were allowed to converſe ſo much more freely with Men than in other places. And if any one will read but St. *Jerom*'s deſcription of his own *Temptations* in the Deſarts, or his *Life* of *Hilarion,* he will eaſily find, it is not running away from the World will make Men more perfect, unleſs they could leave their Paſſions behind them; and that a conſtant care of our Mind and Actions in the midſt of our Employments, is not only more pleaſing to God, but a more likely way to ſubdue all diſorderly Paſſions, than the ſevereſt Life of a *Monk* or an *Eremite.* We have no reaſon then to believe, that either the *Monaſtick State* at firſt, or the *Benedictine Rule* did come from any Divine Inſpiration; but as this was borrowed from the former *Rules,* ſo the former was taken up out of an unreaſonable Opinion, that God is better pleaſed by our *running* from the World, than by *ſerving* him in it.

Syneſ. p. 153.

Hier. ad Ruſtic. p. 45.

Vit. Paul. Erem. p. 238.

Hieron. ad Ruſtic. p. 45.

Hieron. ad Euſtoch.

§. 8. 2. That the *Benedictine Rule* hath manifeſt Signs of Human Weakneſs in it, and therefore cannot be ſuppoſed to come from Divine Inſpiration. Of which the firſt is, *miſapplication of Scripture.* Animadverſ p.42. Reg. S. Bened. c. 2. To this purpoſe the *Perſon* of *Honour* mentions *the bringing of that Place,* We have not received the Spirit of Bondage again to fear; but the Spirit of Adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father, *to prove that the Abbot doth ſupply the room of Chriſt in the Monaſtery, Chriſt* Epiſt. Apologet.n.30. *himſelf being the ſupream Abbot.* To which Mr. *Creſſy* anſwers, by *expreſſing his wonder how he could find the leaſt defect, incongruity, or want of Prudence in that Paſſage:* And he ſpends very needleſs pains to prove, *That Abbots being lawful Superiours for the direction of Souls, the moſt proper Title that can be given them is that of Father,* and *that* Abba *ſignifies Father.* Very well! but what is this to the producing that Place for it? Methinks *Our Father which art in Heaven* had been altogether as proper; for that would have ſhewed the Title of the *Abbot* as well; and withal, that the *Abbot* was *God's Vicar* upon Earth, *God* himſelf being their *Abbot* in Heaven. And if St. *Benedict* had thought upon this Place, all that Mr. *Creſſy* ſaith, would have held as well to prove there was not the *leaſt incongruity* in producing it; and *it would have afforded altogether as uſeful an admonition to the Abbots to govern as Fathers, and not to Tyrannize as Lords.* But there is yet farther incongruity in it; for as the *Perſon* of *Honour* obſerves, St. *Benedict* brings this in, *to prove that the Abbot ſupplies the room of Chriſt in the Monaſtery* (*Chriſti enim egere vices in Monaſterio creditur, quando ipſius vocatur prænomine*) whereas there is no ſuch thing in the Text, Chriſt is not called there by the Name *Abba,* but *God the Father,* for after they are ſaid, *by the Spirit of Adoption to cry Abba Father;* Rom. 8. 15, 17. it is ſaid, *And if Children, then Heirs; Heirs of God, and joynt-heirs with Chriſt.* So that *Chriſt* here is not repreſented under the notion of *Abba,* but rather as a *Son* and *Heir* to him that is called *Abba:* Therefore he that ſuſtains the *Perſon* of Chriſt, can only be the eldeſt *Son, i. e.* the *Prior,* and not the *Abbot;* ſo that it is impoſſible to clear St. *Bennet* from an impertinent Allegation of this Place of *Scripture.* But this is far from being the only place ſo impertinently produced by him; for in the Preface of his *Rule* we have a whole Cluſter of them, wherein he puts together many Places of *Scripture* expreſſing the *earneſtneſs* and *ſincerity* of *God's calling Men to Repentance* and *ſincere Obedience, to the Monaſtick Life, and obſerving the Rules of it.* As though it were impoſſible for Men to repent and to do God's Will, unleſs they did preſently renounce their *Eſtates,* and ſubmit to the *Monaſtick Rules.* This, if he ſpeaks to the purpoſe, he muſt account, *awakening out of Sleep; not hardening our Hearts at God's call; hearing what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches; running while we have light, entering into God's Tabernacle;* and what not? As though all Religion were confined within the Walls of *Monaſteries;* and the *ſtrait Gate* were no other, than that which gives Men admiſſion into them. This indeed was the great and fundamental Cheat of the *Monaſtick Orders* in the Roman Church; they would be called the *Religious Orders,* and would have Men believe, that all *Piety* and *Devotion* was kept warm only under a *Monk's Cowle;* and that, if there were any ſuch *in the World* (as they called all out of their own *Precincts*) it grew very cold, by taking too much Air Abroad. But although they durſt not openly defend this, for fear of giving too great offence to *Clergy* and *Laity*; yet their inſinuations tended this way; for they only were the *Religious*, and the reſt were but the *World*. Which was a horrible abuſe of Mankind, as well as of the Chriſtian Religion; which doth never ſuppoſe Men to be a jot nearer to Heaven for their *naſtineſs, and lying in their Cloaths*, for *abſtaining certain days from Fleſh*, for *eating and drinking upon a common ſtock*, for *having their Garments of ſuch a ſhape and colour*, or whatever other obſervances were peculiar to the *Monaſtick State*. The Chriſtian Religion requires ſincere Humility, and not a *Monkiſh* Affectation of it; inward purity, and a chaſtity within the Bounds which God hath ſet us, and not binding our ſelves by perpetual Vows to abſtain from what he hath allowed us; Heavenly Mindedneſs, and a mighty regard to the Rewards of another Life, and not a needleſs renouncing what the Bounty of Heaven, and the care of our Anceſtors have provided for us, as to the conveniencies of this Life. The *Obedience* neceſſary to Salvation is that to the commands of Chriſt, and not of an *Abbot*. But this they would fain make People believe, that doing only what their *Superiours* commanded them, is the *ſelf-denyal* and *renouncing their own wills*, which the Goſpel makes ſo neceſſary to Salvation; which is a notorious miſapplication of our Saviour's Commands; but theſe things are common to other *Monaſtick Rules*; St. *Benedict* hath Reg. S. Bened. c. 7. other faults of this kind peculiar to his own *Rule*: As when he brings theſe Places for the Monks confeſſing their Sins to the *Abbot*, *Revela Domino viam tuam, & ſpera in illo*: It is great pity the Word *Abba* was not there for *Dominus*; for then it had been a plain caſe: But as it ſtands, it is ſomewhat hard to conceive how the Abbot comes to be concerned in *our making known* (if that were the meaning) *of our ways to the Lord*; and to as little purpoſe are the other Places that follow, *confitemini Domino*, and ſeveral others that ſpeak of *confeſſing our Sins to God*, but not one Word of the *Abbot*, no nor of *Prieſt* in them: Yet this is not all; for in the ſame *Chapter* he brings ſomething for *Scripture*, which was never there; as when he makes the *Publican* to ſay, *Domine, non ſum dignus ego peccator levare oculos meos ad Cælum*; which makes *Menardus* cry out, *Miror ſane, quia nunquam in toto Evangelio repereris hæc verba dicta à publicano*: He juſtly wondered at this Quotation, there being no ſuch Words to be found in the whole Goſpel as ſpoken by the Publican; but the faireſt excuſe he hath to bring him off, is by ſaying, *That he quoted the Words without Book, by the help of his Memory*; which if it be allowed will be certainly an argument to them, that he was not infallibly aſſiſted by the *Holy Ghoſt*. But beſides theſe, we have other Arguments ſufficient of *Humane Weakneſs* in this Rule, if I ſhould undertake to rifle and examine the ſeveral Conſtitutions of this *Rule*, particularly that, *when the Abbot requires Impoſſibilities*, not meerly *moral* as they would now ſoften it; but things *utterly impoſſible*, or *unlawful to be done*; as when the *Senior* in *Caſſian* required *John* the *Egyptian Monk to remove a ſtone, which multitudes of Men could not ſtir*, and another commanded *Mucius* to take his *Son and throw him into the River*; which they thought themſelves obliged by virtue of *Monaſtick Obedience* to perform; and in the Caſe of ſuch impoſſibilities, St. *Bennet* bids them, *if the Abbot perſiſt in them, to truſt to Gods help and obey*. But the reaſon given for this, is, *that they muſt look on the Com-*

Menard. in conc. Regul. p. 312.

Reg. S. Benedict, c. 68.

Caſſ. l. 4. c. 26, 27.

C. 5.

§. 8. 2. That the *Benedictine Rule* hath manifeſt Signs of Human Weakneſs in it, and therefore cannot be ſuppoſed to come from Divine Inſpiration. Of which the firſt is, *miſapplication of Scripture.* To this purpoſe the *Perſon* of *Honour* mentions *the bringing of that Place,* We have not received the Spirit of Bondage again to fear; but the Spirit of Adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father, *to prove that the Abbot doth ſupply the room of Chriſt in the Monaſtery, Chriſt himſelf being the ſupream Abbot.* To which Mr. *Creſſy* anſwers, by *expreſſing his wonder how he could find the leaſt defect, incongruity, or want of Prudence in that Paſſage:* And he ſpends very needleſs pains to prove, *That Abbots being lawful Superiours for the direction of Souls, the moſt proper Title that can be given them is that of Father,* and *that* Abba *ſignifies Father.* Very well! but what is this to the producing that Place for it? Methinks *Our Father which art in Heaven* had been altogether as proper; for that would have ſhewed the Title of the *Abbot* as well; and withal, that the *Abbot* was *God's Vicar* upon Earth, *God* himſelf being their *Abbot* in Heaven. And if St. *Benedict* had thought upon this Place, all that Mr. *Creſſy* ſaith, would have held as well to prove there was not the *leaſt incongruity* in producing it; and *it would have afforded altogether as uſeful an admonition to the Abbots to govern as Fathers, and not to Tyrannize as Lords.* But there is yet farther incongruity in it; for as the *Perſon* of *Honour* obſerves, St. *Benedict* brings this in, *to prove that the Abbot ſupplies the room of Chriſt in the Monaſtery* (*Chriſti enim egere vices in Monaſterio creditur, quando ipſius vocatur prænomine*) whereas there is no ſuch thing in the Text, Chriſt is not called there by the Name *Abba*, but *God the Father*, for after they are ſaid, *by the Spirit of Adoption to cry Abba Father*; it is ſaid, *And if Children, then Heirs; Heirs of God, and joynt-heirs with Chriſt.* So that *Chriſt* here is not repreſented under the notion of *Abba*, but rather as a *Son* and *Heir* to him that is called *Abba*: Therefore he that ſuſtains the *Perſon* of Chriſt, can only be the eldeſt *Son*, *i. e.* the *Prior*, and not the *Abbot*; ſo that it is impoſſible to clear St. *Bennet* from an impertinent Allegation of this Place of *Scripture.* But this is far from being the only place ſo impertinently produced by him; for in the Preface of his *Rule* we have a whole Cluſter of them, wherein he puts together many Places of *Scripture* expreſſing the *earneſtneſs* and *ſincerity* of *God's calling Men to Repentance* and *ſincere Obedience, to the Monaſtick Life, and obſerving the Rules of it.* As though it were impoſſible for Men to repent and to do God's Will, unleſs they did preſently renounce their *Eſtates*, and ſubmit to the *Monaſtick Rules.* This, if he ſpeaks to the purpoſe, he muſt account, *awakening out of Sleep*; *not hardening our Hearts at God's call*; *hearing what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches*; *running while we have light, entering into God's Tabernacle*; and what not? As though all Religion were confined within the Walls of *Monaſteries*; and the *ſtrait Gate* were no other, than that which gives Men admiſſion into them. This indeed was the great and fundamental Cheat of the *Monaſtick Orders* in the Roman Church; they would be called the *Religious Orders*, and would have Men believe, that all *Piety* and *Devotion* was kept warm only under a *Monk's Cowle*; and that, if there were any ſuch *in the World* (as they called all out of their own *Precincts*) it grew very cold, by taking too much Air Abroad. But although they

Animadverſ p.42.
Reg. S. Bened. c. 2.
Epiſt. Apolog. t.n.30.
Rom. 8. 15, 17.

they durſt not openly defend this, for fear of giving too great offence to *Clergy* and *Laity*; yet their inſinuations tended this way; for they only were the *Religious*, and the reſt were but the *World*. Which was a horrible abuſe of Mankind, as well as of the Chriſtian Religion; which doth never ſuppoſe Men to be a jot nearer to Heaven for their *naſtineſs, and lying in their Cloaths*, for *abſtaining certain days from Fleſh*, for *eating and drinking upon a common ſtock*, for *having their Garments of ſuch a ſhape and colour*, or whatever other obſervances were peculiar to the *Monaſtick State*. The Chriſtian Religion requires ſincere Humility, and not a *Monkiſh* Affectation of it; inward purity, and a chaſtity within the Bounds which God hath ſet us, and not binding our ſelves by perpetual Vows to abſtain from what he hath allowed us; Heavenly Mindedneſs, and a mighty regard to the Rewards of another Life, and not a needleſs renouncing what the Bounty of Heaven, and the care of our Anceſtors have provided for us, as to the conveniencies of this Life: The *Obedience* neceſſary to Salvation is that to the commands of Chriſt, and not of an *Abbot*. But this they would fain make People believe, that doing only what their *Superiours* commanded them, is the *ſelf-denyal* and *renouncing their own wills*, which the Goſpel makes ſo neceſſary to Salvation; which is a notorious miſapplication of our Saviour's Commands; but theſe things are common to other *Monaſtick Rules*; St. *Benedict* hath other faults of this kind peculiar to his own *Rule*: As when he brings theſe Places for the Monks confeſſing their Sins to the *Abbot*, *Revela Domino viam tuam, & ſpera in illo*: It is great pity the Word *Abba* was not there for *Dominus*; for then it had been a plain caſe: But as it ſtands, it is ſomewhat hard to conceive how the Abbot comes to be concerned in *our making known* (if that were the meaning) *of our ways to the Lord*; and to as little purpoſe are the other Places that follow, *confitemini Domino*, and ſeveral others that ſpeak of *confeſſing our Sins to God*, but not one Word of the *Abbot*, no nor of *Prieſt* in them: Yet this is not all; for in the ſame Chapter he brings ſomething for *Scripture*, which was never there; as when he makes the *Publican* to ſay, *Domine, non ſum dignus ego peccator levare oculos meos ad Cœlum*; which makes *Menardus* cry out, *Miror ſane, quia nunquam in toto Evangelio repereris hæc verba dicta à publicano*: He juſtly wondered at this Quotation, there being no ſuch Words to be found in the whole Goſpel as ſpoken by the Publican; but the faireſt excuſe he hath to bring him off, is by ſaying, *That he quoted the Words without Book, by the help of his Memory*; which if it be allowed will be certainly an argument to them, that he was not infallibly aſſiſted by the *Holy Ghoſt*. But beſides theſe, we have other Arguments ſufficient of *Humane Weakneſs* in this Rule, if I ſhould undertake to rifle and examine the ſeveral Conſtitutions of this *Rule*, particularly that, *when the Abbot requires Impoſſibilities*, not meerly *moral* as they would now ſoften it; but things *utterly impoſſible*, or *unlawful to be done*; as when the *Senior* in *Caſſian* required *John* the *Egyptian Monk to remove a ſtone, which multitudes of Men could not ſtir*, and another commanded *Mucius* to take his *Son and throw him into the River*; which they thought themſelves obliged by virtue of *Monaſtick Obedience* to perform; and in the Caſe of ſuch impoſſibilities, St. *Bennet* bids them, *if the Abbot perſiſt in them, to truſt to Gods help and obey*. But the reaſon given for this, is, *that they muſt look on the Commands*

Reg. S. Bened. c. 7.

Menard. in conc. Regul. p. 312.

Reg. S. Benedict. c. 68.

Caſſ. l. 4. c. 26, 27.

C. 5.

mands of their Superiors, as if they were the Commands of God himſelf; which is a moſt ſenſeleſs and unreaſonable thing: But it ſeems by this, they give the *Abbot* the *Title* belonging to *God*, not meerly for *Nameſake*; but in caſe a Man were required, as *Mucius* was, *to deſtroy his own Child*, they muſt ſay, they are bound as much to obey as *Abraham* was, upon God's Command to ſacrifice his Son. Nay, we read in *Caſſian*, *that God revealed to the Abbot that* Mucius *had performed the Obedience of* Abraham; and ſo they ſay of another, *who threw his Child into a Fiery Furnace upon the Abbots Command*, *in imitation of* Abraham. But to juſtifie this *blind Obedience*, to the Commands of Superiors, St. *Benedict* brings other very impertinent Places of Scripture; ſuch as *obauditu auris*, *obedivit mihi*; *non veni facere voluntatem meam*, *ſed ejus qui miſit me*, &c. But I am ſick of ſuch idle and impertinent Stuff, which yet muſt be cryed up, as the effects of *divine Inſpiration*. And although Mr. *Creſſy* and his *Brethren*, may admire and cry up the perfection of their Rule, it is plain by the concluſion, their Founder himſelf had no ſuch Opinion of it, for he calls it *minimam inchoationis Regulam*; *a Rule for meer beginners*; and *Menardus* confeſſeth, there are much more *perfect Rules* to be found in *Palladius*, *Caſſian*, *Severus Sulpitius*, St. *Pachomius* and others: But St. *Benedict* thought theſe high enough for the *lazy Monks* of his time, as he expreſſes it: So that it is plain, he followed no *Inſpiration* in the dictating of his *Rule*, but the old Rule of Humane Prudence, when he gave them, not *the beſt Rules he could give them*, *but the beſt which they could bear*. Which, I ſuppoſe, was St. *Gregory's* meaning when he commended it, not for the *Perfection*, or *Divinity*, but *the Diſcretion* of it. Yet as gentle, and eaſie, and *diſcreet* as this *Rule* was, it was hardly ever obſerved in the *Benedictine Order*, according to the *Letter* of it; but they have found ſo many Evaſions, and Diſtinctions, and Diſpenſations, that we are not to judge of this, or any other *Order* among them, by their *Rules*, but by their *Practices*. For they have ſo many diſtinctions of the *eſſentials* and *accidentals of their Rules*; of *being ſworn to obſerve their Rules*, *and to obey the Abbot according to the Rule*; about *Rules that have cuſtom going along with them*, and *thoſe which have not*; about *ſimple Rules of Obedience*, and purely *penal and mixt*; about the *ways of interpreting Rules* and *their Obligation*, from *the intrinſick Natures of the things*, from the *extrinſick probability of Opinions*, and the *Power of the Pope to diſpenſe*, and their *Superiors* to *interpret*; that it is a very hard caſe if by vertue of one, or other of theſe, they cannot find ſome excuſe for the neglect or violation of any of their common Rules. And notwithſtanding the great *diſcretion* of this *Rule*, ſo little hath it been obſerved by the *Monks* of this *Order*, that *Caramuel* cites this remarkable Expreſſion of *Cardinal Turrecremata*, that *if St.* Benedict *intended to oblige the Conſciences of the Monks by all his Rules, as ſo many Moral Precepts*; *he would not have given them directions to Heaven, but have laid ſo many Snares for them to ſend them to Hell.*

C. 28. *Gazæ. in Caſſ. ib.*

Menard. in Concord. Reg. p. 81.

Caram. Comment. Reg. S. Bened. diſp. 7. *art.* 1.

§. 9. 3. If this *Rule* had been received in the *Roman Church*, as *of Divine Inſpiration*; how comes it to paſs, that ſo many other *Rules* did come up after this, and receive *approbation* and *allowance* in the *ſame Church*, and upon as great and as high Pretences, as ever this was received? If this were believed to have come from God, ſurely it would have been univerſally received as ſuch, and embraced, as ſoon as it was made known to them? How came this very Rule to be altered and improved ſo many times? How came very different Rules from this to receive as publick Approbation? And it may be eaſily made out.

1. That this *Rule* was not generally received where it was known. In the confirmation of the *Abbot* of *Caſſino* we read, *That the Pope delivering St.* Benedict's *Rule to him*, uſes theſe Words, *Accipe Regulam Spiritu Sancto inſpirante dictatam. Receive the Rule which was dictated by the Holy Ghoſt*; what could have been ſaid more, if he had delivered the *Bible* to him? Who could imagine any thing leſs by this, than that the *Roman Church* did univerſally believe, that God had raiſed up St. *Benedict* as a *Prophet* in his Age, and had ſent him on purpoſe to ſettle a new ſort of Life under certain Rules to be delivered by him? So that as *Moſes* gave *Laws* by Divine appointment to the *People* of *Iſrael*, and *Chriſt* to all Perſons that *live* in the *World*, ſo S. *Benedict* was to give *Laws* to ſuch as did *retire* from the *World*, for whom *Chriſt* had left no *Rules* at all; and taken no manner of notice of any ſuch Perſons, although there were ſuch among the *Jews* then. But if this were St. *Benedict*'s Commiſſion, where did he open it, what way did he take to ſatisfie the World about it? How came all the Perſons of that Time and Age, who were for the *Monaſtick* way, not immediately to yield themſelves up to his Government? But we find nothing like this, in the Hiſtory of that *Age* wherein he lived; no great notice was taken of him or his Rule then; there was one *Benedict* of *Nurſia*, an obſcure Perſon (for even the wiſer ſort of the *Roman Church* laugh at *Arnoldus Wion*, who hath taken great pains to prove the *Auſtrian Family*, and St. *Benedict* to be deſcended from the ſame ſtock of the *Anician Family*) who after ſome Retirement from the Converſation of the World, gathered ſome Diſciples to him, who lived together after a *Monaſtick* way. And what was there extraordinary in all this? Had not many others done the ſame before him? And even in that Age more conſiderable Perſons than himſelf: Amongſt the reſt was *Caſſiodore*, who had been *Conſul* and *Miniſter of State* to *Theodorick*; in his declining Age he founded a *Monaſtery*, wherein he lived himſelf, and gave directions to thoſe under his Care, and lived Twenty Years after St. *Benedict*, but he takes not the leaſt notice either of him or his Rule, which ſurely he would have done, if they had been either of them thought of any conſideration in his time. In the ſame time St. *Equitius* in St. *Gregory*, is called *the Father of many Monaſteries in the Province* Valeria, without any notice of St. *Benedict's Commiſſion* or *Rule*; and St. *Honoratus* had Two Hundred *Monks* under him, and was ſo far from being St. *Benedict*'s Diſciple, that *Gregory* affirms, that he had no Maſter at all but *God*. *Adeodatus* had *Monks* under his Government, when *Benedict* went into his *Cave*, for his good Friend St. *Romanus* was one of them. Many others we find mentioned in *Gregory*'s Dialogues; it being a common thing in thoſe diſtracted Times for Perſons weary of the World to withdraw into ſome Solitary Place with ſome few Companions, and there to live hardly, rather than be continually expoſed to the mercileſs fury of their Enemies; which firſt brought the *Monaſtick Life* into any great Reputation among the more conſiderable Perſons of theſe

Append. ad Chronic. Caſſin. p. 15

Arnold. Wion de antiq. Familia Anicia Ven. 1595.

Caſſiod. de inſtitut. divin. lect.

Greg. dial. l. 1. *c.* 4.

L. 1. *c.* 3.

L. 2. *c.* 1.

mands of their Superiors, as if they were the Commands of God himſelf ; which is a moſt ſenſeleſs and unreaſonable thing : But it ſeems by this, they give the *Abbot* the *Title* belonging to *God*, not meerly for *Nameſake* ; but in caſe a Man were required, as *Mucius* was, *to deſtroy his own Child*, they muſt ſay, they are bound as much to obey as *Abraham* was, upon God's Command to ſacrifice his Son. Nay, we read in *Caſſian, that God revealed to the Abbot that* Mucius *had performed the Obedience of* Abraham ; and ſo they ſay of another, *who threw his Child into a Fiery Furnace upon the Abbots Command, in imitation of* Abraham. But to juſtifie this *blind Obedience*, to the Commands of Superiors, St. *Benedict* brings other very impertinent Places of Scripture ; ſuch as *obaudita auris, obedivit mihi* ; *non veni facere voluntatem meam, ſed ejus qui miſit me*, &c. But I am ſick of ſuch idle and impertinent Stuff, which yet muſt be cryed up, as the effects of *divine Inſpiration*. And although Mr. *Creſſy* and his *Brethren*, may admire and cry up the perfection of their Rule, it is plain by the concluſion, their Founder himſelf had no ſuch Opinion of it, for he calls it *minimam inchoationis Regulam* ; *a Rule for meer beginners* ; and *Menardus* confeſſeth, there are much more *perfect Rules* to be found in *Palladius, Caſſian, Severus Sulpitius*, St. *Pachomius* and others : But St. *Benedict* thought theſe high enough for the *lazy Monks* of his time, as he expreſſes it : So that it is plain, he followed no *Inſpiration* in the dictating of his *Rule*, but the old Rule of Humane Prudence, when he gave them, not *the beſt Rules he could give them, but the beſt which they could bear*. Which, I ſuppoſe, was St. *Gregory's* meaning when he commended it, not for the *Perfection*, or *Divinity*, but *the Diſcretion* of it. Yet as gentle, and eaſie, and *diſcreet* as this *Rule* was, it was hardly ever obſerved in the *Benedictine Order*, according to the *Letter* of it ; but they have found ſo many Evaſions, and Diſtinctions, and Diſpenſations, that we are not to judge of this, or any other *Order* among them, by their *Rules*, but by their *Practices*. For they have ſo many diſtinctions of the *eſſentials* and *accidentals of their Rules* ; of *being ſworn to obſerve their Rules, and to obey the Abbot according to the Rule* ; about *Rules that have cuſtom going along with them*, and *thoſe which have not* ; about *ſimple Rules of Obedience*, and purely *penal and mixt* ; about the *ways of interpreting Rules* and *their Obligation*, from *the intrinſick Natures of the things*, from the *extrinſick probability of Opinions*, and the *Power of the Pope to diſpenſe*, and their *Superiors* to *interpret* ; that it is a very hard caſe if by vertue of one, or other of theſe, they cannot find ſome excuſe for the neglect or violation of any of their common Rules. And notwithſtanding the great *diſcretion* of this *Rule*, ſo little hath it been obſerved by the *Monks* of this *Order*, that *Caramuel* cites this remarkable Expreſſion of *Cardinal Turrecremata*, that *if St.* Benedict *intended to oblige the Conſciences of the Monks by all his Rules, as ſo many Moral Precepts ; he would not have given them directions to Heaven, but have laid ſo many Snares for them to ſend them to Hell.*

C. 28. *Gazæ. in Caſſ. ib.*

Menard. in Concord. Reg. p. 81.

Caram. Comment. Reg. S. Bened. diſp. 7. *art.* 1.

§. 9. 3. If this *Rule* had been received in the *Roman Church*, as *of Divine Inſpiration* ; how comes it to paſs, that ſo many other *Rules* did come up after this, and receive *approbation* and *allowance* in the *ſame Church*, and upon as great and as high Pretences, as ever this was received ? If this were believed to have come from God, ſurely it would have been univerſally received as ſuch, and embraced, as ſoon as it was made known to them? How came this very Rule to be altered and improved ſo many times? How came very different Rules from this to receive as publick Approbation? And it may be eaſily made out.

1. That this *Rule* was not generally received where it was known. In the confirmation of the *Abbot* of *Caſſino* we read, *That the Pope delivering St.* Benedict'*s Rule to him*, uſes theſe Words, *Accipe Regulam Spiritu Sancto inſpirante dictatam. Receive the Rule which was dictated by the Holy Ghoſt*; what could have been ſaid more, if he had delivered the *Bible* to him? Who could imagine any thing leſs by this, than that the *Roman Church* did univerſally believe, that God had raiſed up St. *Benedict* as a *Prophet* in his Age, and had ſent him on purpoſe to ſettle a new ſort of Life under certain Rules to be delivered by him? So that as *Moſes* gave *Laws* by Divine appointment to the *People* of *Iſrael*, and *Chriſt* to all Perſons that *live* in the *World*, ſo S. *Benedict* was to give *Laws* to ſuch as did *retire* from the *World*; for whom *Chriſt* had left no *Rules* at all; and taken no manner of notice of any ſuch Perſons, although there were ſuch among the *Jews* then. But if this were St. *Benedict*'s Commiſſion, where did he open it, what way did he take to ſatisfie the World about it? How came all the Perſons of that Time and Age, who were for the *Monaſtick* way, not immediately to yield themſelves up to his Government? But we find nothing like this, in the Hiſtory of that *Age* wherein he lived; no great notice was taken of him or his Rule then; there was one *Benedict* of *Nurſia*, an obſcure Perſon (for even the wiſer ſort of the *Roman Church* laugh at *Arnoldus Wion*, who hath taken great pains to prove the *Auſtrian Family*, and St. *Benedict* to be deſcended from the ſame ſtock of the *Anician Family*) who after ſome Retirement from the Converſation of the World, gathered ſome Diſciples to him, who lived together after a *Monaſtick* way. And what was there extraordinary in all this? Had not many others done the ſame before him? And even in that Age more conſiderable Perſons than himſelf: Amongſt the reſt was *Caſſiodore*, who had been *Conſul* and *Miniſter of State* to *Theodorick*; in his declining Age he founded a *Monaſtery*, wherein he lived himſelf, and gave directions to thoſe under his Care, and lived Twenty Years after St. *Benedict*, but he takes not the leaſt notice either of him or his Rule, which ſurely he would have done, if they had been either of them thought of any conſideration in his time. In the ſame time St. *Equitius* in St. *Gregory*, is called *the Father of many Monaſteries in the Province* Valeria, without any notice of St. *Benedict*'*s Commiſſion* or *Rule*; and St. *Honoratus* had Two Hundred *Monks* under him, and was ſo far from being St. *Benedict*'s Diſciple, that *Gregory* affirms, that he had no Maſter at all but *God*. *Adeodatus* had *Monks* under his Government, when *Benedict* went into his *Cave*, for his good Friend St. *Romanus* was one of them. Many others we find mentioned in *Gregory*'s Dialogues; it being a common thing in thoſe diſtracted Times for Perſons weary of the World to withdraw into ſome Solitary Place with ſome few Companions, and there to live hardly, rather than be continually expoſed to the mercileſs fury of their Enemies; which firſt brought the *Monaſtick Life* into any great Reputation among the more conſiderable Perſons of theſe

Append. ad Chronic. Caſſin. p. 15

Arnold. Wion de antiq. Familia Anicia Ven. 1595.

Caſſiod. de inſtitut. divin. lect.

Greg. dial. l. 1. c. 4.

L. 1. c. 3.

L. 2. c. 1.

Weſtern Parts. *Baronius* confeſſeth, *That at that time the Monaſtick Profeſſion had loſt its Reputation in the Eaſt, through the Hereſie and Licentiouſneſs of the Monks, when it began to ſpread it ſelf in* Italy *and the adjacent Parts:* But there was no certain *Rule* among them; every one who was the Chief governed the reſt according to his own *diſcretion*, and in general made uſe of St. *Baſil's Rule* tranſlated by *Ruffinus*, or the *Egyptian Rules* tranſlated by St. *Hierom*, or the *Conferences* of the *Fathers* by *Caſſian* as they thought fit themſelves. And after the ſame way *Benedict* himſelf governed thoſe that were under him, diſpoſing them into Twelve Cells, and placing in every one of them Twelve Monks with a *Superiour* over them; which *Gregory* mentions long before he takes notice of any *Rule* made by him; and *Angelus de Nuce* the preſent, or late *Abbot* of *Caſſino*, confeſſes, *That he did not make his Rule till a little before his Death; and that at the beginning he had not the leaſt thought of making any Rules for the Order of Monks; but being grown old by long experience and obſervation, and comparing of former Rules, he drew up thoſe which go under his Name; which received no Authority from him that made them, but depended upon the free conſent of thoſe who ſubmitted themſelves unto them:* And therefore he compares them to the *Laws of* Solon *or the Decemviri*; than which nothing can be ſaid more deſtructive to the pretence of Divine Inſpiration; for ſuppoſing theſe *Rules* were *dictated by the Holy Ghoſt*, their obligatory Power would not depend upon the conſent of Perſons, but the Divine Authority of him that delivered them. *Holſtenius* thinks that St. *Benedict* made his *Rule* only *for his own Monaſtery* at *Caſſino*, never intending it for any univerſal Rule; but whether he did or no, it was very little known for ſome time after his death: For in an ancient Copy of it in the *Vatican Library*, there is a ſhort Preface before it, wherein we find that it is called, *Latens Opus, a Work that lay hid*, and that it was firſt brought to light by *Simplicius*; which is ſaid likewiſe by *Sigebert*: *Simplicius diſcipulus ejus latens Magiſtri opus publicavit:* If this Rule came by *Divine Inſpiration* as the *Pope* and Mr. *Creſſy* ſay (what they believe I know not) how came it to be concealed by *Benedict* himſelf? Was that a thing befitting an Inſpired Perſon to wrap up ſuch a Divine Talent in a Napkin, and to hide it under Ground? *Angelus de Nuce*, a Man much concerned to find out the truth in theſe things, ſaith, *That St.* Benedict *delivered his Rule but a few Months before his death to St.* Maurus *then going into* France, *and that before this, there is not a Word ſaid of it; and that there were no Copies then extant at all of it, that being the Original given to St.* Maurus *written with his own Hand.* This *Simplicius* accompanied *Maurus* into *France*, and there ſtayed till his Death, and two Years after, (which was in all Forty three Years) and then he together with *Fauſtus* returned to their *Brethren* in *Italy*; and then he made known the *Benedictine Rule*, which had been hitherto concealed. So that in the ſpace of Forty three Years after *Benedict*'s Death, there was nothing like an acknowledgment made even in the Parts of *Italy*, of any ſuch *Rule* at all as the *Benedictine*, much leſs that it came by *Divine Inſpiration*.

Ann. tom. 7. A. D. 519.

Chronic. Caſſinenſ. l. 1. c. 1. Angelus de Nuce ad Chron. Caſſin. l. 3. c. 29. n. 1384.

Holſten. præfat. Cod. omn. Regul. c. 3.

Gallon. Apolo. ed. Bellot. p. 50. Sigeb. de illuſtr. ſcript. c. 31.

§. 10. But *to ſhew the univerſal reception of this Rule*, Mr. Creſſy *produces the confirmation of it extant in the* Monaſtery *of* Sublac *by* Gregory, *wherein he mentions not only his reading, but confirming it in a*

Epiſt. Apol. n. 31.

holy Synod, and commands the obſervation of it through ſeveral parts of Italy, *and wherſoever the Latin Tongue is ſpoken; and that whoſoever ſhall come to the Grace of Converſion ſhould moſt diligently obſerve it even to the end of the World.* This I confeſs is to the purpoſe, and ſo much that I think all that are not of the *Benedictine Order* in the *Roman Church*, are concerned to anſwer it. But we need not take much pains to diſcover the fraud of this, for *Gallonius*, in his *Vindication* of *Baronius* againſt the *Benedictines*, hath given ſeveral proofs of the Forgery of it; not only by the *falſeneſs of the Date* by comparing it with *Gregory*'s *Epiſtles*, but becauſe therein *Johannes Albanenſis Epiſcopus* ſubſcribes, whereas in the true Copies of the *Roman Synod* at that time, it is *Homobonus Albanenſis*; and becauſe the Cuſtom of *publiſhing Decrees by the Biſhop* who was the *Bibliothecarius*, was much later than that time; for *Gregory* made *Uſe* only of his *Notary* for that purpoſe. And this is ſo much more probable to be a meer Forgery of the *Monks*, ſince that hath been always their particular knack in what concerns the Honour of their *Order*, as the ſame *Author* hath ſhewed in many Examples relating to our preſent purpoſe. For he hath fully proved ſeveral of the pretended privileges of the *Benedictines* to be *groſs Forgeries*, as likewiſe the ample *Donations* of *Gordianus* and *Tertullus*, and the *confirmation* of the Letter by *Juſtinian*; the *Bull* of *Pope Zachary*, and his Epiſtle to *Petronax*; the *Epiſtle* of *Gregory* to *Bonitus*; and that they had raſed ſeveral Words out of a *Bull* of *Boniface* IV. on purpoſe that *Gregory the Great* might appear to have been of the *Benedictine Order*, as he makes it evident, by comparing ſeveral Copies of the ſaid *Bull*. Have we not then great reaſon to truſt theſe Men in what concerns the *Honour* of their *Order*, who make no Conſcience of forging Donations, or Privileges, or Decrees that make for them, or of raſing out what makes againſt them? And this confeſſed by Men of their own Church, and the Facts ſo notorious, that *Gallonius* ſaith, *Cardinal* Baronius *was aſhamed of them, they were ſuch groſs Impoſtures*; and he adds himſelf, *that had it not been for their vehement Provocations, he would not have expoſed ſuch things to the World.* The like *Impoſtures* to theſe have been diſcovered by others of the *Roman Church*, who were Men of more Integrity, than either to defend or diſſemble the ſhameleſs Forgeries of the *Monks*; as any one may eaſily ſatisfie himſelf by the very many Diſcourſes publiſhed by *Joh. Launoy* to that purpoſe. But I need not go from my preſent buſineſs, the ſame *Gallonius* hath proved the *Epiſtle* of the *Abbot* of St. *Honoratus* to *Simplicius*, *Abbot* of *Caſſinum*, to be of the ſame ſtamp; wherein it is ſaid, *that all the Monaſteries of* Italy *had then embraced the Benedictine Rule*; of which whoſoever was the Author, *Gallonius* ſaith, *he deſerved to be puniſhed as one* Ciccarellus *at* Rome *was, who was hanged, and his Body burned, for forging old Writings*; it is pity that all who have been equally guilty there, have not ſuffered in the ſame kind. We do not find then any Evidence great enough to ſhew that the *Benedictine Rule* was either delivered at firſt as from *divine Inſpiration*, or believed to be ſo, in thoſe Parts of *Italy* where it was firſt known, or that thoſe of the *Monaſtick Order* did think themſelves obliged to embrace it.

*Gallonii Reſpo*ſ*. ad Monach. Bened. p.* 103.

Gallon. Apolog. & *Reſp. p.* 54. 57, 91, 94, 99, 100, 110.

P. 64.

P. 32.

St. *Benedict* a little before his Death ſent *Maurus* and his *Companions* into *France* to propagate his Rule there: And becauſe Mr. *Creſſy* quotes a *Synod about* A. D. 874. *acknowledging St.* Benedict *to be inſpired*

Epiſt. Apol. n. 32. *Synod. Douz.* 2. *c.* 7.

ſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, I ſhall briefly give an Account of the Entertainment the *Benedictine Rule* met with in thoſe Parts. Before the coming of *Maurus* into *France*, there were ſeveral *Monaſtick Rules* well known there; the *Rule* of St. *Baſil* and the *Egyptian Rules* are mentioned by their eldeſt Hiſtorians. The *Monks* under *Honoratus* at *Lerins*, as appears by *Caſſian*, followed the *Egyptian Rule*; and *Eucherius* Brother to *Honoratus*, ſaith, *that thoſe Monks brought the Egyptian Fathers among them*. Thoſe about *Marſeilles* followed *Caſſian*, the *Monaſtery* of *Reomaus* was under the *Rule* of *Macarius*, as appears by *Clodoveus* his Precept. Beſides theſe, there was the *Regula Tarnatenſis* mentioned in the *Concordia Regularum*, which was obſerved at *Agaunum* or St. *Maurice*, built *A. D.* 515. and of St. *Cæſarius*, which was obſerved in ſeveral Parts of *France*; and all theſe before the *Benedictines* were heard of there. And *A. D.* 570. the Biſhops of *France* in a *Council* at *Tours* commended the *Rule* of St. *Cæſarius* to *Radegundus*; which they would hardly have done, if the *Benedictine* had been in ſuch eſteem there, as Mr. *Creſſy* ſuggeſts. Nay, a good while after the *Benedictines* coming into *France*, other *Rules* were embraced and followed much more than that, as the Rule of St. *Columbanus*, which was not received there till *A. D.* 590. yet though the other had ſo much the ſtart, this gained Ground very much of it, in the eſteem of the People and numbers of Proſelytes. For as the late *French Annaliſt* obſerves, moſt of the *Monaſteries* in *France* followed the Rule of *Columbanus*, and very few the *Benedictine*; which the *Benedictines* finding to take much off from the Antiquity and Reputation of their Order in *France*, when they could not fairly expunge the Name of *Columbanus*, they have added the Rule of *Benedict* to it; and ſo would incorporate both theſe Rules into one, without any Pretence from Reaſon or Antiquity. For the *French Benedictines* themſelves cannot but confeſs, *That the Rule of* Columbanus *was at firſt very different from that of St.* Benedict (although before they ſay, that thoſe of their Order had always believed them to be the ſame) *for in the Rule of* Columbanus *they cannot find any footſteps almoſt of the Benedictine*, and withal they grant, that *Columbanus* came from the *Monaſtery of Banchor* into *France*, before the *Benedictine* Rule was brought into *Britain*; but they ſay that afterwards theſe two Rules were united together: (although in the Preface to the firſt Tome they had ſaid, *they were united from the beginning.*) But they had as little Reaſon for the latter aſſertion, as they had for the former. For not only the *Jeſuits Henſchenius* and *Papebrochius* have plainly aſſerted and proved the continuance of the difference between theſe two Rules; but the *French Annaliſt Le Cointe* hath fully anſwered all the *Benedictine's* Pretences, and charges thoſe of their Order with frequent *Interpolations* of ancient Records on purpoſe to advance the credit of their Order, and that no ill will to their Order, but meer love to Truth made him diſcover this to the World, and at large ſhews that other Rules continued to be obſerved to the eighth Century; in all which time the *Benedictine* Rule was in ſmall Reputation, till *Boniface*'s going into *Germany*: After which it began to be ſettled by ſome Synods there; and ſo by degrees it was brought into thoſe *Monaſteries*, which before had been under other Rules, and thoſe ſuch as had not only been embraced before the coming of *Maurus*; but ſeveral that were made after it, as thoſe of *Aurelianus*, *Ferreolus*,

Greg. Turon l. 10. *c.* 29.

Caſſian. præf. ad Collat. 11.

Eucher. de laud. Eremi.

Annal. Ecc. Franc. A. 496. *n.* 111.

Greg. Turon. l. 9. *c.* 39.

Annal. Eccl. Franc. A. D. 667. *n.* 20.

Præf. ad Sec. ſecundum Benedict. n. 14.

Præfat. ad Sec. 1. *Benedict. n.* 67.

Acta Sanctorum. Mart. 21. *vit. att. al. rob. ſect.* 1. *n.* 2.

Comment. præv. ad vit. ſ. Bened. ſect. 1. *n.* 2.

Annal. Eccl. Franc. A. D. 734. *n.* 32, *&c.* 751. *n.* 107, *&c.* 667. *n.* 20.

olus, and *Donatus*; which are all mentioned in the *Concordia Regularum*. I now leave the Reader to judge, whether there be the leaſt probability, that either in *Italy* or *France*, the *Benedictine Rule* was look'd upon as a Rule coming from *Divine Inſpiration*; which met with ſo little acceptance in thoſe Ages, when they might the beſt judge concerning it, and in thoſe Places where the Monaſtick State was in great eſteem.

§. 11. 2. After it did come to be generally received if it were really thought to come from God, how came ſo many alterations and improvements of it, to be made, and new Rules to be ſet forth by the conſent and approbation of the *Roman* Church? They could not certainly think that the *Holy Ghoſt* would raiſe up a Perſon on purpoſe, and yet deliver by him an imperfect Rule; if it were perfect, with what Face or Conſcience could they think to amend it, or ſet up others beſides it? Yet both theſe are manifeſtly done, by the multitude of additional or different Rules which came up afterwards. The only pretence for it, is the degeneracy of the Order by length of Time and bad Cuſtoms; But what then? Muſt the Rule be amended, or the lives of Men? Muſt we have a new Bible, becauſe this is not obſerved? Or can we hope that Men will be reformed by another, if not by this? But this was ſo frequently practiſed in the *Roman* Church as to the *Monaſtick Rules*, that the moſt charitable opinion we can have of them, is that they looked on all of them only as Humane Conſtitutions, which might be alter'd or amended at pleaſure.

The firſt Amendment and alteration of the *Benedictine Rule* was in the *Monaſtery* of *Clugny* in *Burgundy*; the beginning of which is imputed to *Odo* the ſecond Abbot, who dyed *A. D.* 943. ſaith *Arnoldus Wion*; 944. ſaith the *Chronicon Cluniacenſe*; *Flodoardus* and *Ademarus* call him *the reſtorer of the Rule*, and ſo do moſt other Hiſtorians, who all agree in the univerſal decay of the Monaſtick Diſcipline in that Age; ſaying, that all the fervor was quite ſpent, and nothing but the meer dregs of Idleneſs and Luxury were to be found among the *Monks*; that *Odo* was ſingular in his endeavours to reſtore Diſcipline among them, and therefore was cryed up as a Man of extraordinary Sanctity. *Petrus Cluniacenſis* who ſucceeded him in the Government of *Clugny* A. D. 1157, ſaith, *That in almoſt all the parts of* Europe *there was nothing of a Monk left, beſides the Tonſure and the Habit*; which was little enough of all Conſcience: *That* Odo *undertook the Reformation of it almoſt alone, and he calls him not only the Reformer of the Order, but of the Rule too*: But I find no great Alterations that he made in it, but only adding ſome Hymns of St. *Martin*, to whom he had a particular Devotion: But the greateſt *Reformer* of the *Rule* was this *Petrus Cluniacenſis*, who firſt compoſed the *Statutes* of the *Congregation* of *Clugny*, publiſhed out of MS. by *Marrier* and *Du Cheſne*, in ſeventy ſix Chapters: And it ſeems by a *Bull* of *Innocent* II. bearing date *A. D.* 1136. (extant among their Records) *that the Pope gave him power to correct and alter things for the Good of the Order*: And in his Preface he gives this Reaſon of the Alterations he made, *becauſe it is one thing what God hath appointed by an eternal Law, and another what is appointed by Men for the benefit of others; the firſt can never be changed, but the latter may*: *And among*

Arnold. Wion. Lig. Vita, l. 5. c. 3.
Bibliotheca Cluniac. p. 1633.
V. Biblioth. Cluniac. p. 57, 58, *&c.*
Petr. Cluniac. Epiſt. l. 6. ep. 17.
Biblioth. Cluniac. p. 1354. *&c.*
Privileg. Rom. Pont. chart. 85.

ſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, I ſhall briefly give an Account of the Entertainment the *Benedictine Rule* met with in thoſe Parts. Before the coming of *Maurus* into *France*, there were ſeveral *Monaſtick Rules* well known there; the *Rule* of St. *Baſil* and the *Egyptian Rules* are mentioned by their eldeſt Hiſtorians. The *Monks* under *Honoratus* at *Lerins*, as appears by *Caſſian*, followed the *Egyptian Rule*; and *Eucherius* Brother to *Honoratus*, ſaith, *that thoſe Monks brought the* Egyptian *Fathers among them.* Thoſe about *Marſeilles* followed *Caſſian*, the *Monaſtery* of *Reomaus* was under the *Rule* of *Macarius*, as appears by *Clodoveus* his Precept. Beſides theſe, there was the *Regula Tarnatenſis* mentioned in the *Concordia Regularum*, which was obſerved at *Agaunum* or St. *Maurice*, built *A. D.* 515. and of St. *Cæſarius*, which was obſerved in ſeveral Parts of *France*; and all theſe before the *Benedictines* were heard of there. And *A. D.* 570. the Biſhops of *France* in a *Council* at *Tours* commended the *Rule* of St. *Cæſarius* to *Radegundus*; which they would hardly have done, if the *Benedictine* had been in ſuch eſteem there, as Mr. *Creſſy* ſuggeſts. Nay, a good while after the *Benedictines* coming into *France*, other *Rules* were embraced and followed much more than that, as the Rule of St. *Columbanus*, which was not received there till *A. D.* 590. yet though the other had ſo much the ſtart, this gained Ground very much of it, in the eſteem of the People and numbers of Proſelytes. For as the late *French Annaliſt* obſerves, moſt of the *Monaſteries* in *France* followed the Rule of *Columbanus*, and very few the *Benedictine*; which the *Benedictines* finding to take much off from the Antiquity and Reputation of their Order in *France*, when they could not fairly expunge the Name of *Columbanus*, they have added the Rule of *Benedict* to it; and ſo would incorporate both theſe Rules into one, without any Pretence from Reaſon or Antiquity. For the *French Benedictines* themſelves cannot but confeſs, *That the Rule of* Columbanus *was at firſt very different from that of St.* Benedict (although before they ſay, that thoſe of their Order had always believed them to be the ſame) *for in the Rule of* Columbanus *they cannot find any footſteps almoſt of the Benedictine*, and withal they grant, that *Columbanus* came from the *Monaſtery of Banchor* into *France*, before the *Benedictine* Rule was brought into *Britain*; but they ſay that afterwards theſe two Rules were united together: (although in the Preface to the firſt Tome they had ſaid, *they were united from the beginning.*) But they had as little Reaſon for the latter aſſertion, as they had for the former. For not only the *Jeſuits Henſchenius* and *Papebrochius* have plainly aſſerted and proved the continuance of the difference between theſe two Rules; but the *French Annaliſt Le Cointe* hath fully anſwered all the *Benedictine's* Pretences, and charges thoſe of their Order with frequent *Interpolations* of ancient Records on purpoſe to advance the credit of their Order, and that no ill will to their Order, but meer love to Truth made him diſcover this to the World, and at large ſhews that other Rules continued to be obſerved to the eighth Century; in all which time the *Benedictine* Rule was in ſmall Reputation, till *Boniface*'s going into *Germany*: After which it began to be ſettled by ſome Synods there; and ſo by degrees it was brought into thoſe *Monaſteries*, which before had been under other Rules, and thoſe ſuch as had not only been embraced before the coming of *Maurus*; but ſeveral that were made after it, as thoſe of *Aurelianus*, *Ferreolus*,

Greg. Turon. l. 10. *c.* 29.

Caſſian. præf. ad Collat. 11.

Eucher. de laud. Eremi.

Annal. Ecc. Franc. A. 496. *n.* 111.

Greg. Turon. l. 9. *c.* 39.

Annal. Eccl. Franc. A.D. 667. *n.* 20.

Præf. ad Sec. ſecundum Benedict. n. 14.

Præfat. ad Sec. 1. *Benedict. n.* 67.

Acta Sanctorum. Mart. 21. *vit. att. al. rob. ſect.* 1. *n.* 2.

Comment. præv. ad vit. ſ. Bened. ſect. 1. *n.* 2.

Annal. Eccl. Franc. A.D. 734. *n.* 32, *&c.* 751. *n.* 107, *&c.* 667. *n.* 20.

olus, and *Donatus*; which are all mentioned in the *Concordia Regularum*. I now leave the Reader to judge, whether there be the leaſt probability, that either in *Italy* or *France*, the *Benedictine Rule* was look'd upon as a Rule coming from *Divine Inſpiration*; which met with ſo little acceptance in thoſe Ages, when they might the beſt judge concerning it, and in thoſe Places where the Monaſtick State was in great eſteem.

§. 11. 2. After it did come to be generally received if it were really thought to come from God, how came ſo many alterations and improvements of it to be made, and new Rules to be ſet forth by the conſent and approbation of the *Roman* Church? They could not certainly think that the *Holy Ghoſt* would raiſe up a Perſon on purpoſe, and yet deliver by him an imperfect Rule; if it were perfect, with what Face or Conſcience could they think to amend it, or ſet up others beſides it? Yet both theſe are manifeſtly done, by the multitude of additional or different Rules which came up afterwards. The only pretence for it, is the degeneracy of the Order by length of Time and bad Cuſtoms; But what then? Muſt the Rule be amended, or the lives of Men? Muſt we have a new Bible, becauſe this is not obſerved? Or can we hope that Men will be reformed by another, if not by this? But this was ſo frequently practiſed in the *Roman* Church as to the *Monaſtick Rules*, that the moſt charitable opinion we can have of them, is that they looked on all of them only as Humane Conſtitutions, which might be alter'd or amended at pleaſure.

The firſt Amendment and alteration of the *Benedictine Rule* was in the *Monaſtery* of *Clugny* in *Burgundy*; the beginning of which is imputed to *Odo* the ſecond Abbot, who dyed *A. D.* 943. ſaith *Arnoldus Wion*; 944. ſaith the *Chronicon Cluniacenſe*; *Flodoardus* and *Ademarus* call him *the reſtorer of the Rule*, and ſo do moſt other Hiſtorians, who all agree in the univerſal decay of the Monaſtick Diſcipline in that Age; ſaying, that all the fervor was quite ſpent, and nothing but the meer dregs of Idleneſs and Luxury were to be found among the *Monks*; that *Odo* was ſingular in his endeavours to reſtore Diſcipline among them, and therefore was cryed up as a Man of extraordinary Sanctity. *Petrus Cluniacenſis* who ſucceeded him in the Government of *Clugny* A. D. 1157, ſaith, *That in almoſt all the parts of* Europe *there was nothing of a Monk left, beſides the Tonſure and the Habit*; which was little enough of all Conſcience: *That* Odo *undertook the Reformation of it almoſt alone, and he calls him not only the Reformer of the Order, but of the Rule too*: But I find no great Alterations that he made in it, but only adding ſome Hymns of St. *Martin*, to whom he had a particular Devotion: But the greateſt *Reformer* of the *Rule* was this *Petrus Cluniacenſis*, who firſt compoſed the *Statutes* of the *Congregation* of *Clugny*, publiſhed out of MS. by *Marrier* and *Du Cheſne*, in ſeventy ſix Chapters: And it ſeems by a *Bull* of *Innocent* II. bearing date *A. D.* 1136. (extant among their Records) *that the Pope gave him power to correct and alter things for the Good of the Order*: And in his Preface he gives this Reaſon of the Alterations he made, *becauſe it is one thing what God hath appointed by an eternal Law, and another what is appointed by Men for the benefit of others; the firſt can never be changed, but the latter may*: *And* among

Arnold. Wion. Lign. Vitæ, l. 5. *c.* 3. *Bibliotheca Cluniac. p.* 1633.

V. Biblioth. Cluniac. p. 57, 58, *&c.*

*Petr. Cluniac. Epiſt. l.*6.*ep.*17.

Biblioth. Cluniac. p. 1354. *&c.*

Privileg. Rom. Pont. chart. 85.

among thoſe things which may be changed, he reckons Faſtings, Vigils, bodily Exerciſe and Labour, about which ſo many Chapters of the *Benedictine Rule* are ſpent: And in the *Eccleſiaſtical Office* which Mr. *Creſſy* admires the *Benedictine Rule* for, he makes ſeveral conſiderable Amendments and Alterations; and the Reaſon he gives, why he would have the Abſtinence from Fleſh obſerved, is, *becauſe there was no reaſonable Cauſe of changing it, as there was in other parts of the Rule,* which is a manifeſt proof, that he did not at all look on the Rule as coming from God, but ſuch as might be alter'd or amended, as they thought fit. After him *Henry* the 29*th Abbot* of *Clugny,* made a large Collection of all the Alterations that had been made either by the *Popes,* or their own *Superiours* in the *Statutes* of their *Order*; which are ſo many as are certainly enough to convince any Man, they looked not on the *Benedictine Rule,* as coming at firſt from any divine Inſpiration. And among the conſiderable Alterations made by this *Henry* himſelf, the *Chronicon Cluniacenſe* takes notice of one very remarkable, *viz.* that he firſt appointed *that Monks ſhould be ſhaved by Secular Barbers*; for which this very good Reaſon is given, *that when they ſhaved each other, it was not raſure but excoriation*; for which kindneſs, among many other good things which he did, the Author of the *Chronicon* ſaith of him, *Anima ejus requieſcat in pace.* Amen.

Statut. Cluniac. c. 12.

Biblioth. Cluniac. p. 1542, *&c.*

Chron. Cluniac. p. 1670.

Theſe Reformations of the *Benedictine Rule* by the *Monks* of *Clugny,* were by no means pleaſing to thoſe who began the *Ciſtertian* Order; for as appears by an *Epiſtle* of *Petrus Cluniacenſis* to St. *Bernard,* the *Ciſtertians* objected to them, *that they had made new Rules of their own, and rejected the ancient Rules for their own Cuſtoms, notwithſtanding in their Vow they had promiſed to obſerve the Benedictine Rule; and they had made ſo great* Alterations and Corruptions in the Monaſtick State that they had little beſides the *Name of Monks left:* To this the *Cluniacenſes* replied, by calling the *Ciſtertians a new Race of Phariſees, that cry Touch me not, I am holier than thou: And how could they call themſelves ſuch ſtrict obſervers of the Rule* (for the *Ciſtertian Order* was begun upon this pretence of reſtoring the genuine *Benedictine Rule* by keeping to the Letter of it) *when the Rule commanded them to think better of others than of themſelves; and You,* ſay they, *are the Saints; You are the rare Men; You are the only Monks in the World; You muſt have a new Colour of your own; You muſt be the White Boys, when all the reſt muſt paſs for Black Sheep. And no Colour,* ſay they, *could have been worſe choſen for ſuch whining Companions, ſince White is the Colour of Joy and Feaſting, and Black of Mourning and Sadneſs.* Thus the jolly *Monks* of *Clugny* replyed to the new and ſevere *Order* of *Ciſtertians.* And for the Alterations of the *Rule, Petrus Cluniacenſis* anſwers, they had done nothing amiſs in it; for he Appeals to a higher Rule, *viz.* that of *Scripture*; and *do you think,* ſaith he, *that when we promiſed to obſerve the Benedictine Rule, we renounced the Rule of Scripture?* And from the practice of it in former Ages, he pleads for the *change* of *former Rules.* The *Ciſtertians* charged the *Cluniacks* with breaking their *Rule* in wearing of *Furrs*; the *Cluniacks* brought not only the Example of *Adam* for it, but which was more to their purpoſe of St. *Benedict* too; For, ſay they very ſubtilly, *if he did not wear the Skins of Beaſts, how came the Shepherds to take him for a Beaſt when they found him in the Cave? And do you think,* ſay they, *that your number of Coats, is not as bad as our Furrs?* But the *Ciſtertians* were as angry

Petr. Cluniacenſ. ep. l. 1. *ep.* 28.

Exord. Ordin. Ciſterc. c. 5. *in Biblioth. Ciſtercienſ. Sigeb. Chron. ad A.D.* 1098.

gry with the *Cluniacks*, for *their wearing Breeches* ; but they pleaded a *jus Divinum* of Breeches from *Aaron's Veſtments, for although*, they ſay, *Ceremonials do not oblige, yet the Apoſtle ſaith, thoſe things happened to them in a figure* ; but they are ſomewhat troubled *that* Aaron's *were Linen Drawers, and repreſented the Chaſtity of the Prieſts* ; yet at laſt they beſt reſolve the point *into the Apoſtles Precept about Decency and Modeſty.* For the matter of their *Bedſtraw and Matts*, which the *Ciſtertians* objected, *Petrus Cluniacenſis* tells St. *Bernard*, they had plainly the *Rule* of their ſide, *which left thoſe things to the care of the Abbot.* But they were ſomewhat more troubled about *the pound of Bread a Day*, which the *Benedictine Rule* is ſo exact in, *that a third part of it is preſcribed to be reſerved for Supper* ; but ſuppoſe ſay they, *it ſhould be a little over or under the third part of a Pound which was left at Noon* ; *muſt we preſently go to Hell for it? Muſt Men weigh their Bread when they Travel* ; *and carry the* Cellerar *with them? For the Rule ſaith, it muſt be delivered into his Hands. You indeed*, ſay they, *are the Men that ſtrain at Gnats and ſwallow Camels* ; *and make our Rule to lay Traps and Snares for us* : And withall they call them *the weighers of Syllables, the hunters of Butterflies, that prefer the Letter of the Rule before Diſcretion* ; *and ſet up the Authority of that againſt the conveniency of Alterations*, which *Petrus Cluniacenſis* at large pleads for towards the end of that Epiſtle. Notwithſtanding all this, St. *Bernard* laments the going of his *Nephew Robert* from the *Ciſtertian* Order to the *Cluniack, as if he had turned out of the way to Heaven into that which leads directly to Hell* ; and that, not barely, for the not performing his Vow ; but he calls the *Cluniacks, Wolves in Sheeps Cloathing* ; *ſuch as laughed at voluntary Poverty, and Faſting, and Vigils, and Silence, and Labour, and accounted them Madneſs* ; *and called Idleneſs, Contemplation* ; *and Eating, and Talking, and all manner of Jollity, Diſcretion. How*, ſay they, *can God be delighted by our tormenting our ſelves? Where doth the Scripture command Men to kill themſelves? What Religion is it for Men to dig the Earth, to cut Wood, to carry Dung? Wherefore hath God made ſuch Proviſion, if we may not taſte it? Wherefore hath he given us Bodies, if we may not preſerve them? What wiſe Man ever hated his own Fleſh? By theſe Arguments*, ſaith he, *was the poor ſilly Sheep drawn to* Clugny, *and there he was waſhed and ſhorn* ; *and had rich Veſtments put on him inſtead of his former Rags.* By this we ſee, that theſe ſeveral Orders charge Hypocriſie upon each other as freely, and as truly as we can do upon them all.

S. Bernard. ep. 1. ad Rob. Nept.

§. 12. In *Italy* there was nothing of *Poverty* left, to which they ſo much pretended who began the Monaſtick way, ſave only the bare Name of the *Vow* of *Poverty.* And what is this but great Hypocriſie, to pretend their Perfection to lie in *Poverty*, while they abound in Wealth? As though it were only poſſible for Men to be rich by themſelves ; but in caſe they lived upon a common Stock without any particular Property, they muſt be poor and could not be otherwiſe: Although they had above the third part of the Lands in the Kingdom in their Hands, as it was the caſe here in *England.* Call you this *Poverty*? Is this the keeping a *Vow* of *Poverty*, ſolemnly made to God? or rather is it not a plain mocking of God, and a horrible abuſe of the Chriſtian World? If ſuch Men did mean honeſtly, they would ſpeak as others do ; and declare that the Monaſtick State after *among thoſe things which may be changed, he reckons Faſtings, Vigils, bodily Exerciſe and Labour,* about which ſo many Chapters of the *Benedictine Rule* are ſpent: And in the *Eccleſiaſtical Office* which Mr. *Creſſy* admires the *Benedictine Rule* for, he makes ſeveral conſiderable Amendments and Alterations; and the Reaſon he gives, why he would have the Abſtinence from Fleſh obſerved, is, *becauſe there was no reaſonable Cauſe of changing it, as there was in other parts of the Rule,* which is a manifeſt proof, that he did not at all look on the Rule as coming from God, but ſuch as might be alter'd or amended, as they thought fit. After him *Henry* the *29th Abbot* of *Clugny*, made a large Collection of all the Alterations that had been made either by the *Popes*, or their own *Superiours* in the *Statutes* of their *Order*; which are ſo many as are certainly enough to convince any Man, they looked not on the *Benedictine Rule*, as coming at firſt from any divine Inſpiration. And among the conſiderable Alterations made by this *Henry* himſelf, the *Chronicon Cluniacenſe* takes notice of one very remarkable, *viz.* that he firſt appointed *that Monks ſhould be ſhaved by Secular Barbers*; for which this very good Reaſon is given, *that when they ſhaved each other, it was not raſure but excoriation*; for which kindneſs, among many other good things which he did, the Author of the *Chronicon* ſaith of him, *Anima ejus requieſcat in pace.* Amen.

Statut. Cluniac. c. 12.

Biblioth. Cluniac. p. 1542, &c.

Chron. Cluniac. p. 1670.

Theſe Reformations of the *Benedictine Rule* by the *Monks* of *Clugny*, were by no means pleaſing to thoſe who began the *Ciſtertian* Order; for as appears by an *Epiſtle* of *Petrus Cluniacenſis* to St. *Bernard*, the *Ciſtertians* objected to them, *that they had made new Rules of their own, and rejected the ancient Rules for their own Cuſtoms, notwithſtanding in their Vow they had promiſed to obſerve the* Benedictine *Rule; and they had made ſo great* Alterations and Corruptions in the Monaſtick State that they had little beſides the *Name of Monks left*: To this the *Cluniacenſes* replied, by calling the *Ciſtertians* a *new Race of Phariſees, that cry Touch me not, I am holier than thou: And how could they call themſelves ſuch ſtrict obſervers of the Rule* (for the *Ciſtertian Order* was begun upon this pretence of reſtoring the genuine *Benedictine Rule* by keeping to the Letter of it) *when the Rule commanded them to think better of others than of themſelves; and You,* ſay they, *are the Saints; You are the rare Men; You are the only Monks in the World; You muſt have a new Colour of your own; You muſt be the White Boys, when all the reſt muſt paſs for Black Sheep. And no Colour,* ſay they, *could have been worſe choſen for ſuch whining Companions, ſince White is the Colour of Joy and Feaſting, and Black of Mourning and Sadneſs.* Thus the jolly *Monks* of *Clugny* replyed to the new and ſevere *Order* of *Ciſtertians*. And for the Alterations of the *Rule*, *Petrus Cluniacenſis* anſwers, they had done nothing amiſs in it; for he Appeals to a higher Rule, *viz.* that of *Scripture*; and *do you think,* ſaith he, *that when we promiſed to obſerve the Benedictine Rule, we renounced the Rule of Scripture?* And from the practice of it in former Ages, he pleads for the *change* of *former Rules*. The *Ciſtertians* charged the *Cluniacks* with breaking their *Rule* in wearing of *Furrs*; the *Cluniacks* brought not only the Example of *Adam* for it, but which was more to their purpoſe of St. *Benedict* too; For, ſay they very ſubtilly, *if he did not wear the Skins of Beaſts, how came the Shepherds to take him for a Beaſt when they found him in the Cave? And do you think,* ſay they, *that your number of Coats, is not as bad as our Furrs?* But the *Ciſtertians* were as angry

Petr. Cluniacenſ. ep. l. 1. ep. 28.

Exord. Ordin. Ciſterc. c. 5. in Biblioth. Ciſtercienſ. Sigeb. Chron. ad A.D. 1098.

gry with the *Cluniacks*; for *their wearing Breeches*; but they pleaded a *jus Divinum* of Breeches from *Aaron's Veſtments, for although*, they ſay, *Ceremonials do not oblige, yet the Apoſtle ſaith, thoſe things happened to them in a figure*; but they are ſomewhat troubled *that* Aaron's *were Linen Drawers, and repreſented the Chaſtity of the Prieſts*; yet at laſt they beſt reſolve the point *into the Apoſtles Precept about Decency and Modeſty.* For the matter of their *Bedſtraw and Matts*, which the *Ciſtertians* objected, *Petrus Cluniacenſis* tells St. *Bernard*, they had plainly the *Rule* of their ſide, *which left thoſe things to the care of the Abbot.* But they were ſomewhat more troubled about *the pound of Bread a Day*, which the *Benedictine Rule* is ſo exact in, *that a third part of it is preſcribed to be reſerved for Supper*; but ſuppoſe ſay they, *it ſhould be a little over or under the third part of a Pound which was left at Noon*; *muſt we preſently go to Hell for it? Muſt Men weigh their Bread when they Travel; and carry the* Cellerar *with them? For the Rule ſaith, it muſt be delivered into his Hands. You indeed*, ſay they, *are the Men that ſtrain at Gnats and ſwallow Camels; and make our Rule to lay Traps and Snares for us:* And withall they call them *the weighers of Syllables, the hunters of Butterflies, that prefer the Letter of the Rule before Diſcretion; and ſet up the Authority of that againſt the conveniency of Alterations*, which *Petrus Cluniacenſis* at large pleads for towards the end of that Epiſtle. Notwithſtanding all this, St. *Bernard* laments the going of his *Nephew Robert* from the *Ciſtertian* Order to the *Cluniack, as if he had turned out of the way to Heaven into that which leads directly to Hell*; and that, not barely, for the not performing his Vow; but he calls the *Cluniacks, Wolves in Sheeps Cloathing; ſuch as laughed at voluntary Poverty, and Faſting, and Vigils, and Silence, and Labour, and accounted them Madneſs; and called Idleneſs, Contemplation; and Eating, and Talking, and all manner of Jollity, Diſcretion. How*, ſay they, *can God be delighted by our tormenting our ſelves? Where doth the Scripture command Men to kill themſelves? What Religion is it for Men to dig the Earth, to cut Wood, to carry Dung? Wherefore hath God made ſuch Proviſion, if we may not taſte it? Wherefore hath he given us Bodies, if we may not preſerve them? What wiſe Man ever hated his own Fleſh? By theſe Arguments*, ſaith he, *was the poor ſilly Sheep drawn to* Clugny, *and there he was waſhed and ſhorn; and had rich Veſtments put on him inſtead of his former Rags.* By this we ſee, that theſe ſeveral Orders charge Hypocriſie upon each other as freely, and as truly as we can do upon them all.

S. Bernard. ep. 1. ad Rob. Nept.

§. 12. In *Italy* there was nothing of *Poverty* left, to which they ſo much pretended who began the Monaſtick way, ſave only the bare Name of the *Vow* of *Poverty*. And what is this but great Hypocriſie, to pretend their Perfection to lie in *Poverty*, while they abound in Wealth? As though it were only poſſible for Men to be rich by themſelves; but in caſe they lived upon a common Stock without any particular Property, they muſt be poor and could not be otherwiſe: Although they had above the third part of the Lands in the Kingdom in their Hands, as it was the caſe here in *England*. Call you this *Poverty*? Is this the keeping a *Vow* of *Poverty*, ſolemnly made to God? or rather is it not a plain mocking of God, and a horrible abuſe of the Chriſtian World? If ſuch Men did mean honeſtly, they would ſpeak as others do; and declare that the Monaſtick State after the acceſſion of ſo great Riches, was quite another thing from what it was firſt deſigned; that it now became a more eaſie and pleaſant way of living (only ſome kind of Severities muſt be undergone to keep the World from ſeeing through their Pretences) becauſe that in it Men were freed from all manner of cares of Families or Eſtates, and they lived together, without any fear of the want of ſuitable Company; and every one in hopes of having their condition bettered by the remove or death of their Superiours, and no one in fear of having it worſe, as long as the Riches of their Community continue. If ſome Philoſophers had been to ſet down the way of Life with the greateſt conveniency and freedom from Trouble, they would have pitched upon a rich Monaſtery; where they were all rich in common, and yet no Man had particular property; but I think they would have had more honeſty than to call this a *ſtate of Poverty.* But if ever any Perſons practiſed *Plato*'s Commonwealth, they were the Wealthy Monks, who had plenty of all things in common; but ſurely never any Philoſopher thought *Plato* meant to bring all Men to Poverty by it; or that Men could ſwear to be always poor, and yet enjoy an equal ſhare with others of all conveniencies of Life. *Epicurus* himſelf would have been for a temperate Diet, and ſome healthful Severities, and would have born a Confinement within pleaſant Walks and Gardens, with good Company. I know nothing would have troubled him ſo much as to have been choſen *Abbot*; for the neceſſity of giving Entertainments and treating Strangers, and looking after great Revenues, might have robbed him ſomething of his beloved Tranquility. But to call theſe things the keeping a *Vow of Poverty*, *Epicurus* himſelf would have abhorred; yet this was the way or none, which they had to obſerve it, as ſoon as the kindneſs of Princes and others to the Monaſtick Life had brought ſuch mighty poſſeſſions to Monaſteries. If we believe *Arnoldus Wion*, who was himſelf of the Monaſtery of *Caſſino*, that had under it two Principalities, Two Dutchies, Twenty Earldoms, Thirty-ſix Cities, Two hundred and fifty Caſtles, Four hundred and Forty Towns, Three hundred and Thirty-ſix Mannors, Thirty-three Sea-Ports, Thirty-three Iſlands, Two hundred Mills, Three hundred Territories, One thouſand ſix hundred and ſixty two Churches; and were not the Monks here in a good condition to keep the Vow of Poverty? *Volaterran* might well ſay, that S. *Benedict* left *rather Kingdoms than Monaſteries to his Diſciples*; and inſtead of *receptacles for Men really poor, places of Idleneſs and Luxury*; the ſame *Arnoldus Wion* uſeth *Volaterran*'s Expreſſion concerning the ancient *Benedictine Monaſteries* in *France*, that *they were rather Kingdoms than Monaſteries*; and that *Charles* IX. ſaid, that St. *Maurus had gotten more Riches by his Breviary, than his Predeceſſors had done by their Swords.* So that it is no wonder to hear Men complain ſo early of the general decay of the *Monaſtick ſtate*; as *Jacobus de Vitriaco*, and *Petrus Damiani* and others do, and ſay plainly that there was a neceſſity of a Reformation. And ſince the Monaſtick ſtate is accounted one of the moſt perfect in their Church, why may not the reſt need a Reformation too? *Petrus Damiani* confeſſeth, *that there was nothing of a Monaſtick ſtate left, beſides the meer Habit*; *that their Rules were forgotten, and their Diſcipline loſt*, and under the ſhew of *Religion they liv'd like other Men.* From hence Men that were in

Arnold. Wion. Lign. vit. l. 1. c. 2.

Volat. Anthropolog. l. 21. p. 477.

Lign. Vitæ l. 5. c. 1.

Jac. de Vitriaco hiſt. Occident. c. 13, &c.

Petr. Damian. opuſc. 13. de perfect. Monach. c. 1.

good earneſt, forſook the *Monaſteries*, and betook themſelves to the *Deſarts*; and began to inſtitute *Orders* upon new *Foundations*.

So S. *Romualdus*, having been three Years in the *Monaſtery* of *Claſſe* near *Ravenna*, was forced to withdraw from thence; for, taking upon him to correct his Brethren for breaking their Rule, they endeavoured to break his Neck, when he was riſen earlier than the reſt to his Prayers; but having diſcovered their deſign, away he goes into the Deſart, where he led a very ſevere Life, and endeavoured to bring up others under him, in the old *Egyptian Diſcipline*, keeping them to *faſting* and *hard lodging, and work, ſome making Spoons, others Spinning, others making Nets and Sackcloth; ſo that the Mountain* Sytria, *was*, ſaith *Damianus, become another* Nitria. The ſame Author deſcribing the *Eremitical* Life which he and his Companions (about twenty in all) led in the place called *Fons Avellani*, laments the *degeneracy* of the *Monaſtick Order*, and ſets down the *Rules* they were reſolved to live by; which preſcribed a far ſtricter courſe than the *Benedictine Rule* doth, both as to the *Pſalter*, and *Faſting*, and *Penance*, and *Silence*. They who have a mind to read the *perfection* of their *Diſcipline*, may ſee it in the Life of *Dominicus Loricatus*, one of his Diſciples; who did for many Years wear Armour next his Skin; (from whence he had his name of *Loricatus*) he laſhed himſelf with both Hands every day, while he ſaid over the *Pſalter* twice, and thrice a Day in *Lent*; in ſix Days he performed the Penance of a Hundred years; which was thus reckon'd, 3000 Laſhes went for a Year's Penance; after which proportion every Pſalter made up five Year's Penance, 1000 Laſhes being accounted for every ten Pſalms; and ſo 20 Pſalters diſciplin'd and *ſet home* with both Hands would make up the Penance of 100 Years; *one Lent*, he ſaith, *he went through a thouſand years penance in this way*. We muſt not expect to meet with many ſuch Examples; one ſuch Man by his Works of *Supererogation* might be enough to expiate for all the *Monks* in *Italy*. And I do not queſtion they were glad to hear of ſuch a Stock coming in to the *Churches Treaſury*, out of which they hoped for a plentiful ſhare.

Pet. Damian. de vit. S. Romualdi. c. 3. Antonin. tit. 15. *c.* 15. *ſ.* 1. *Pet. an. c,* 26. *c.* 64. *Pet. Dam. de Ord. Eremit. Fontis Avellani. De vit. Dominici c.* 5. &c.

But there was one of *Romualdus* his Diſciples, who endeavoured to reſtore the *Cœnobitical* Life, viz. *Joh. Gualbertus* of *Florence*, to whom the *Image* bowed with ſo much kindneſs after the ſparing the Life of his Brother's Murderer, that upon it he embraced the Profeſſion of a *Monk* near the Church where it was done: after which he went into the Deſart of *Camaldoli* to *Romualdus*; but not liking the *Eremitical* way ſo well, he betakes himſelf to the *Shady Valley*, thence his Order is called, *Ordo Vallis Umbroſæ*, and there adding ſome conſtitutions of his own to the *Benedictine Rule*, he begins a *new Order* which was approved by *Alexander* 2. *A. D.* 1070. and he was *Canonized*, ſaith *Wion*, by *Greg.* 7. by *Celeſtine* 3. ſaith *Miræus*. He ſeemed to have a great Zeal to reſtore their primitive Poverty, which he ſhewed in deſtroying two Monaſteries by a Miracle; the one by an Inundation of Water, becauſe it was too magnificently built, and the other by Fire, becauſe it had received the whole Patrimony of a Perſon who came into their Order; and out of his great Zeal for *Holy Poverty*, ſaith *Antonine*, *he not only tore the Writings aſunder; but prayed God to be revenged on that Monaſtery, which he was no ſooner almoſt gone from, but the greateſt part of it was burnt to the Ground.*

Aub. Miræ. Origin. Monaſt. l. 2. *c.* 5. *Arnold. Wion. l.* 1. *c.* 33. *Antonin. tit.* 15. *c.* 17.

Arnold. Wion. l. 5. c. 6.

Antonin. tit. 16. c. 23. ſ. 1, 2.

Long after theſe *Ludovicus de Barbo*, A. D. 1409. attempted the *Reformation* of the *Benedictine Order* in *Italy*, by reſtoring Poverty, Chaſtity and Obedience; and this was called the *Congregation of S. Juſtina de Padua*, and ſince the *Congregation of Caſſino*; wherein many new *Conſtitutions* were added to the *Benedictine Rule*: ſeveral other attempts of *Reformations* are mentioned by *Antonine* and others. But to how little purpoſe all the former *Reformations* of the *Monaſtick ſtate* were, we need no other Teſtimony, than of S. *Antonin*, who reckoning up the original *Benedictines*, the *Camaldulenſes*, *Vallis Umbroſæ*, the *Cluniacenſes*, *Ciſtertians* and *Carthuſians*, he concludes with a paſſionate lamentation of their monſtrous degeneracy, in the words of S. *Bernard*; and afterwards adds, *that it was ſcarce poſſible at firſt to believe, that an Order begun with ſo much ſeverity as that of Monks ſhould fall into ſo great looſneſs; when the old Monks met together in* S. Antony'*s time, their Minds were ſo taken up with divine Things, that they forgot their bodily Refreſhments; but now, ſaith he, it is quite otherwiſe, nothing of the Scriptures, nothing that concerns Mens Souls, nothing but idle Talk and Laughing when the Monks do meet together; and* S. Bernard *complains of them, as though there were nothing but Idleneſs, and Luxury, and Intemperance to be found among them.* The *Ciſtertians* whom S. *Bernard* magnified ſo much in his time, were declined, ſaith S. *Antonin*, *ſo far from the ſteps of their Fathers, that they were become unprofitable.* The *Cluniacenſes*, he ſaith, *were as black within as without:* the *Camaldulenſes were degenerated from the ſteps of* Romualdus, *and were all gone backward, a very few excepted.* Among thoſe of the *Vallis Umbroſa* there *was ſcarce one to be found who did good: in a word*, he ſaith, *all the Monkiſh and Regular Orders, which began with ſo much fervour and zeal, had ſo far by degrees fallen off from the Rules of their Fathers, that they had nothing left among them but their meer Vows*; and how well thoſe were kept in ſuch a degeneracy is eaſie to imagine.

Joh. Brompton. ad A 1103. n. 60. Robert. de Monte de Abbat. c. 11.

Guibert. de vit. ſua Jacob. de Vitri. hiſt. Occid. l. 18. Pet. Cluniac. de mirac. l. 2. c. 28. Polyd. Virg de rerum Invent. l. 7. c. 3.

The only Order which he allows to have preſerved to his time its firſt vigour, was the *Carthuſian*. Which began about the ſame time with the *Ciſtertian*: but *Bruno* the firſt Inſtitutor of it was far from thinking the *Benedictine Rule* to be *perfect*; and therefore he *endeavoured* as *Romualdus* had done in *Italy*, to revive the old *Egyptian Diſcipline* and Severity; and with his Companions he began a kind of *Eremitical* Life, *living twelve together in diſtinct Cells, though within the ſame Walls, under the Inſpection of a Prior, with* 18 *Lay-Brethren and a few Mercenaries? their Diet was the courſeſt Bread, Wine very much diluted with Water; eating no Fleſh ſick or well, buying no Fiſh but eating them when given; Sundays and Thurſdays they might eat Cheeſe or Eggs; Tueſdays and Saturdays Pulſe or boil'd Herbs; the other days only Bread and Water; and they eat only once a Day except the great Holy-days, and then they eat together, and ſay Maſs, and keep their Canonical Hours in publick, which at other times, (excepting only Mattins and Veſpers) they obſerve in their Cells; where they are obliged to perpetual ſilence and labour, and Reading and Prayer. Their Habit is a ſhort and ſtrait Garment, rough and ſordid even to Frightfulneſs; and they wear Sackcloth next their Skin:* This is the Account given of their *Order* by *Guibert*, *Jacobus de Vitriaco*, and by *Petrus Cluniacenſis*, who commends it *for the Sanctity and Strictneſs of it*; *a very good Rule*, ſaith *Polydore Virgil*, *if the Paſſions of the Mind could be confined within Cells, and the Fleſh be tamed by Solitude and Idleneſs; which* S. Hierome *found it ſo hard to do with the* *greateſt Pains.* A moſt certain way to Heaven! if only *eating Fleſh,* and *cleanly Apparel,* and *converſing with our Friends,* were the Things that ſent Men to Hell. *Humbertus* complains that in his time *A. D.* 1264. a great deal of the Severity of their firſt Diſcipline was abated by *Diſpenſations* and *Relaxations*; but whatever agreeableneſs they may pretend in other things to the old *Egyptian Lauræ,* they are as far beyond them in the point of *Riches* as may be; for although they began at firſt with the pretence of great *Poverty,* and reſtraining their Goods, and Cattel, and Lands within certain Bounds, yet for their number they have attained to as great Riches as any *Order* whatſoever, whereas *Caſſian* ſaith, *The old Egyptian Monks had nothing at all to live upon but the Fruit of their own Labour, and refuſed to receive any thing to the advantage of the Monaſtery, from any who came into it.* Although the *Carthuſians* had no *Rule* given them at firſt, yet they have been governed by certain *Cuſtoms* of their own; among which one is, *that it is not lawful for them to obſerve the Diſcipline, or Vigils, or Religious Exerciſes, or Faſts of any other Religious Order*; which had been a very profane Cuſtom among them, if they had believed that their *Rules* were from *Divine Inſpiration.*

Humbert. ſerm. 25. *ad Carthuſ.*

Caſſian. l. 4. *c.* 4. *Col at.* 24. *c.* 11.

Monaſt. Anglic. Tom. 1. *p.* 952.

§. 13. When all the former *Monaſtick Orders* had loſt their Reputation in the World as to their pretence of *Poverty,* which they began with; then appeared another ſort who would not be called *Monks* but *Friars*; and to ſatisfie the World as to their *Poverty,* they declared they would have nothing appropriated to them as a Community, but would live upon the Charity and Benevolence of others, and therefore would go under the name of *Mendicant Friars*; which grew ſo numerous at firſt, that the *Council* of *Lyons* reduced them to four, *viz.* the *Dominicans, Auguſtinian Eremites, Carmelites,* and *Franciſcans.* But among theſe the higheſt Pretenders to *Poverty,* were the laſt mentioned; who would be contented with nothing ſhort of the *Perfection* of *Poverty*: For this above all things was S. *Francis* his *Miſtreſs,* which he pretends almoſt to adore; and in one of his *Collations* he calls *Poverty the Queen of Vertues, a ſpecial way to Felicity, the Root of Perfection: The hidden Treaſure mentioned in the Goſpel, for which a Man parts with all that he hath*; *to attain the height of which,* he ſaith, *a Man muſt not only renounce worldly Prudence, but in ſome ſort humane Learning too*: *for,* ſaith he, *that Man doth not perfectly renounce the World that retains the bag of his own Senſe within his Heart. Poverty,* he calls, *the Foundation of his Order, upon which it would ſtand or fall*; nay, ſuch a true Lover of *Poverty* he was, that they ſay of him, he could never be reconciled to the *Ants, becauſe they provided for themſelves ſo long before-hand.* But for thoſe of his *Order,* he charges them (as *Solomon* did about *Wiſdom,*) *above all things, to follow Poverty*; and eſpecially in their *Buildings*; and therefore bids them *build poor and mean Lodgings for themſelves*; *which they ought not to dwell in as their own, but to lodge in them as Travellers.* And he makes it one of the inviolable *Rules* of his *Order, that they ſhould have nothing appropriated to them, neither Houſe, nor Place, nor any thing.*

Opuſcul. S. Franc. Tom. 3. *Collat.* 5.

Reg. S. Franc. c. 6.

And as the *Carthuſians* Zeal was *againſt Fleſh,* ſo S. *Francis* his was againſt *Money*; which he ſtrictly enjoyns thoſe of his *Order never to touch*; as though the Soul were infected at the Fingers ends. As for *working, he leaves it to thoſe to whom God hath given the Grace of working*;

ing; which he perceived to be not near ſo common a *Grace* with c. 5. them, as that of *Idleneſs*; *if they did chance to work hard, they might receive Neceſſaries for it for themſelves and their Brethren, but by no means Money*; and the *height* of *Poverty*, he tells his *Diſciples*, c. 6. *would certainly bring them to Heaven. This was to be their Portion in this World, to which they muſt ſtick cloſe.* Which was a *Portion* eaſily left, and which they were very willing to part with; although S. *Francis* took as much care to ſecure it to them as Man could do: For the *Rule* concludes *with a heavy Imprecation of the Indignation of God and his Saints againſt thoſe who ſhould preſume to violate it.* And in his *Teſtament he earneſtly recommends to them, the ſtrict obſervation of his Rule; and forbids all Gloſſes upon it; and ſaith, that as he had written it ſimply and plainly, ſo he would have it underſtood by them without any Gloſs.* And to make this hard Leſſon to go down the eaſier, it is evident by the whole management of it, that S. *Francis* had a Mind to have his *Rule* received as from *divine Inſpiration*; which we do not find S. *Benedict* Wadding, Annal. A° 1223. n. 9, 10. himſelf ever pretended to, for he concealed his own *Rule*, and ingenuouſly confeſſeth at the end of it, *whom he had profited by*; but S. *Francis* very formally in imitation of *Moſes*, *goes up to a Mountain, and there in the Cleft of a Rock abides for Forty days together faſting, only with Bread and Water*; there he pretends to have his *Rule dictated to him by the Holy Ghoſt*; after the *Forty days*, down he comes to *Aſſiſium* and brings his *Rule* with him, and gives it to Br. *Elias*, to whom he delivered it to be kept. *Elias* did not like the ſeverity of it, and pretended to have loſt it; up goes S. *Francis* again to the *Mountain*, and brings it down new made. *Elias* and his Brethren were hugely troubled, but knew not how to help themſelves, at laſt they agreed to go to him together, and tell him they could not keep it (for *Elias* knowing his *Spirit* and *Self-will*, told them plainly he durſt not go to him alone) S. *Francis* ſuſpecting the matter, and ſeeing them coming towards him, aſſoon as they had got to the top of the Mountain, leaps out of the *Cleft* of the *Rock*, and with a fierce Countenance, asked *Elias*, *what the matter was?* he very ſubmiſſively tells him, *he came to him in the name of them all to intreat ſome abatement of the ſeverity of the Rule.* S. *Francis* immediately expreſſes a mighty Paſſion againſt them, and calls them in a ſolemn appeal to God, *an unbelieving and diſobedient Generation.* Forthwith, ſaith their *Annaliſt*, *a bright Cloud appeared, and upon it, Chriſt himſelf* (O horrible Blaſphemy!) *ſaying, Why art thou troubled Man, as though this were thy Work? Art thou the Lawgiver? Art thou the beginner of this Way? Are not all the Precepts preſcribed by my ſelf? Were not the Tables formed by me? thou wert only the Inſtrument and Pen of the Writer. I know what I dictated, and what I would have obſerved; the ſtrength of Men is known to me, I know what they can do, and what Aſſiſtance I can give them: I will have this Rule obſerved to a Tittle, to a Tittle, to a Tittle; without any Gloſs, any Gloſs, any Gloſs.* All this while S. *Francis* was kneeling and they trembling; then he tells them, *Brethren, you ſee how you have reſiſted the Will of God; if your Ears do not tingle yet, I will make the ſame Voice to be heard again; at which they were confounded and affrighted and fell upon their* N. 11. *Faces; and upon their promiſe of Obedience he deſcended,* ſaith *Wadding, like another* Moſes *carrying the Tables of the Law, with his Face fiery and ſhining*; but according to the *Vulgar Latin* it ſhould have been *horned* too. Notwithſtanding all this, they were at it again, and deſired

red that at leaſt they might have *ſomething in common*, for their numbers increaſed ſo faſt, it would be impoſſible to keep ſtrict *Poverty*. S. *Francis* goes up the Mountain once more, and returns with a promiſe only that *God would provide for them if they would keep to their Rule*, then they all ſubmitted to it. *Wadding* and *De la Hay* take great pains to prove, that this *Rule* was immediately even *by Chriſt himſelf*, not only from the Teſtimony of S. *Brigitt*, but of *ſeveral Popes*, viz. *Gregory* the ninth, *Nicholas* the third and fourth, *Clement* the fifth, *Julius* the ſecond. Upon this away goes S. *Francis* begging to *Rome*, when he comes there, the *Pope* told him *his Rule was too ſtrict*; but upon his ſolemn Affirmation, *there was not a word in it of his own, but it was all dictated by Chriſt himſelf*; it was confirmed by *Pope Honorius*, and he denounces a *Curſe* on the breakers of it. Surely, if the pretence of *Divine Inſpiration* for the *Monaſtick Rules* be received in the *Roman* Church, St. *Francis* bids much fairer for it than S. *Benedict*; for it is plain, he had a Mind to have it believed not only by his Brethren, but by the Pope and Cardinals, who joyned in the Confirmation; and by their whole Church.

N. 13.

De la Hay præf. in Regul S. Franciſc n. 16.

§. 14. Let us now ſee what this *Perfection* of *Poverty* ſoon came to, and whether any ſuch reſpect hath been ſhewn to this *Rule*, as if they did believe it to have been from *God*: Not long after St. *Francis* his Death, *Elias* being made their *General*, obtains Privileges from the *Pope for receiving of Money by a third Perſon*; directly againſt the *Letter* of the *Rule*; and ſoon after he lived ſplendidly and fared well, kept Horſes and a Retinue, and told them, all this was neceſſary for the ſupport of his Government. But this was too groſs, and would preſently have ſpoiled the *Reputation* of their *Order*, and therefore upon the Complaint made of it at *Rome*, he was diſcharged, and another choſen. Who was no ſooner in, but Diſputes aroſe among them about the Senſe of their *Rule*; and they appeal to the *Pope* (although St. *Francis* had declared *there ſhould be no Gloſſes made upon it*; *and that they ſhould not obtain Letters from the Pope*) upon which *Pope Gregory* the ninth publiſhed a *Bull*, declaring, *that they were not bound to admit of no Gloſſes* (What! although Chriſt himſelf in Perſon declared that none ſhould be made! From whence it is plain, that either the *Pope* in terms contradicts Chriſt, or he muſt look on all that pretence of *Chriſt's* Appearance, as an idle Story only made to amuſe the *Friars*) and withal adds ſeveral Gloſſes for Explication of the ſaid Rule. And the kind Pope adds, *That, although he believed* S. Francis *to have had a pious Intention in his former Command*; *yet*, without the leaſt regard to any divine Inſpiration, *he declares that they were not at all bound by it*; and gives theſe ſubſtantial Reaſons for it, *becauſe his Teſtament could not oblige, without the conſent of the Superiors and Brethren of the Order*; *neither had he power to oblige his Succeſſor*. What becomes of the *Divine Revelation* all this while? But the main thing which troubled the *Franciſcans* was, that they found their *Order* could not ſubſiſt without having ſome things *belonging* to them, as *Vtenſils*, *Books* and other *moveables*, and ſome among them ſaid, *the property of theſe things belonged to the Order in common*; the ſubtle Pope found out an excellent *Gloſs* for this, *viz. that they ſhould keep to their Rule, to have no property either in ſpecial or in common*; *but they ſhould have the uſe of them*; *only the Dominion and Property ſhould be reſerved to*

Annales Minorum. A. 1230. *n.* 8.

N. 14.

thoſe to whom it did belong; *and that nothing ſhould be ſold, exchanged, or alienated without the Authority and Conſent of the Cardinal Protector of the Order.* By which, the *Pope* (ſuppoſing the *Donors* not to reſerve the Property to themſelves) entitles himſelf and all his Succeſſors to the *Dominion* and *Property* of all *Houſes* and *Goods* belonging to the whole *Order*; which was not only a *Salvo* for their Conſciences, but a ſure way to keep them always in ſubjection to the *Papal See*. And from hence the Popes have taken upon them the management of their Affairs, by *Syndics* and *Procurators* impower'd by them, as appears by ſeveral *Bulls* of *Martin* the fourth and fifth, *Eugenius* the fourth, *Sixtus* the fourth, and others. And this ſame Pope *Gregory* the ninth takes to the *Apoſtolical See*, the *Right* and *Property* of the *Church* of *Aſſiſium*, which was magnificently built by the Contributions procured by *Elias* while he was *General* of the *Order*; and by Virtue of his *Apoſtolical Power* declares the Church to be wholly *Free* and ſubject immediately to the *Roman See*. This Favour of the *Popes*, and ſudden multiplication of this *Order*, and the manner of their Living, gave a very great Jealouſie to the *Secular Clergy* in all parts; for notwithſtanding this high *pretence* to *Poverty*, they knew that ſo many Men muſt be maintained out of the Church, one way or other, and although it were under the pretence of an *Eleemoſynarie* Maintenance, yet they undertaking the Office of preaching, and hearing Confeſſions, and having no *Titles*, could not ſubſiſt without manifeſt encroaching on the rights of the *Clergy*. And ſo it was found and complained of in all Parts, but to little purpoſe; the *Popes* for good ends of their own, reſolving to carry them through in ſpight of the *Biſhops* and *Clergy*. For this purpoſe they were forced to be ſtill writing *Bulls* in their behalf; ninety ſeven *Bulls* are printed together of this one Pope by their *Annaliſt* with a reſpect to their Order, (beſides many extant in the *Annals* themſelves) of which ſeveral of them are to the *Biſhops* of *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, and other Parts, *not to moleſt this new Order*. For as their *Annaliſt* ſaith, *about this time their Fame ſpreading abroad, the People gave liberally to them, and built them Houſes and ſtately Churches with rich Ornaments* (only to ſhew the *perfection* of their *Poverty*) *and finiſhed them with all manner of Conveniences for their Subſiſtence*; *which drew the Envy and Hatred of the Biſhops and Parochial Clergy upon them*: And the whole Controverſie between them was, whether theſe *independent Friars* ſhould gather *Congregations* to themſelves or no, and therein perform all divine Offices, and receive the *Oblations* of the *People* without any ſubjection to the *Biſhops*? And in this Diſpute, the *Pope* took part with the *Friars*, and publiſhed two *Bulls* in their behalf to all *Biſhops*, extant in the *Decretals*, enjoyning them to forbear giving any diſturbance to the *Friars* in thoſe Matters. And now the *Sublimity* of their *Poverty* began to ſhew it ſelf in the *Height* and *Statelineſs* of their *Fabricks*; if any one would ſee the *Habitation* of *Poverty*, he may read the Deſcription their *Annaliſt* gives of their *Convent* at *Paris*, and the *Church* belonging to it; and he will imagine (ſo much is the World altered) that *Poverty* did vye with *Solomon* himſelf, as to the Glory both of his *Temple* and *Palace*. There were ſome in thoſe days who were not ſubtle enough to reconcile theſe things with *perfect Poverty*, and thought a lower degree of it might have ſerved the *Franciſcans* as it did other *Friars*; but notwithſtanding theſe *glorious Fabricks* did not look very like the *poor*

Nitela Franciſc. Relig. p. 174.

Regeſt. Pontificium apud Wadding. p. 5.

Annales Minorum A. D. 1231. *n.* 55. *Martyrolog. Franc. in addit. Sect.* 190.

Decretal. Greg. l. 5. *tit.* 31. *c.* 16, 17.

Annales Minor. A. D. 1234. *an.* 19. *ad n.* 29.

Cottages S. *Francis* enjoyned them, nothing would content theſe Men but the very *ſublimity* of *Poverty*. *Richardus Armachanus* in his *Sermons* at *Pauls-Croſs* againſt the *Friars*, ſaith, *they were ſo far from the Poverty they pretended to, that he thought them bound in Conſcience to give in Charity to others out of their ſuperfluities*, *For*, ſaith he, *theſe Men who call themſelves Beggars, have Houſes like Kings Palaces, Fiſhponds larger than Earls have, Churches more coſtly than Cathedrals, more rich and noble Ornaments than all the Biſhops of the World; his Holineſs only excepted.* But it coſt him dear for not being able to reconcile theſe things with *perfect Poverty*: for after many Years trouble occaſioned by the *Friars* he died at *Avignon*. The plain *Country-man* in *Chaucer* asks the *Friar* a great many untoward *Queſtions* concerning their *Order*, which I doubt the *wiſeſt* of their *Order* will not eaſily anſwer; as

Ric. Armac. Serm. 4. fol. 163.

Freer, how many Orders be on earth, and which is the perfecteſt Order? Is there any perfecter Rule than Chriſt himſelf made? If Chriſts Rule be moſt perfect, why ruleſt thou thee not thereafter? Why ſhall a Freer be more puniſhed for breaking the Rule that his Patron made, than if he break the heſts that God himſelf made?

Chaucer. p. 348. laſt Edit.

If your Order be perfect, why get you your Diſpenſations to make it eaſie? Certes, either it ſeemeth, that ye be unperfect, or he that made it ſo hard that he may not hold it. And ſiker if ye hold not the Rule of your Patrons, ye be not then their Freers, and ſo ye lye upon your ſelves.

Why make you as dede men when ye be profeſſed, and yet be not dead but more quick beggers than you were before? and it ſeemeth evil a Dede man to go about and beg.

Why make yee you ſo coſtly houſes to dwell in? ſith Chriſt did not ſo, and dede men ſhould have but Graves, as falleth it to dede men, and yet ye have more Courts than many Lords of England: for ye now wenden through the Realm, and ech night will lig in your own Courts, and ſo mow but few right Lords do.

Why be not under your Biſhops viſitation, and leege men to our King?

Why make yee men believe that your golden Trental ſung of you to take therefore ten ſhillings, or at leaſt five ſhillings, woll bring ſouls out of Hell or out of Purgatory? if this be ſooth, certes yee might bring all the ſouls out of paine, and that woll ye nought, and then yee be out of charity.

Why make ye men believe, that he that is buried in your habit, ſhall never come in Hell, and ye weet not of your ſelf whether ye ſhall to Hell or no? if this were ſooth ye ſhould ſell your high houſes to make many habits for to ſave many mens ſouls.

Why covet ye ſhrift and burying of other Mens Pariſhens, and none other Sacrament that falleth to Chriſtian folk?

Why buſie ye not to hear to ſhrift of poor folk as well as of Lords and Ladies, ſith they may have more plenty of ſhrift fathers than poor folk mow?

Why covet you not to bury poor folk among you? ſith they been moſt holy, (as ye ſayn that ye been for your poverty.)

Freer, when thou receiveſt a penie for to ſay a Maſs, whether ſelleſt thou Gods body for that penie, or thy prayer, or elſe thy travel? If thou ſaieſt thou wilt not travel for to ſay the Maſs, but for the penie, that certes if this be ſooth, then thou loveſt too little meed for thy ſoul: and if thou ſelleſt Gods body, other thy prayer, then it is very ſimonie, and art become a chapman worſe than Judas, that ſold it for thirty pence.

Why beareſt thou God in hand and ſlanderſt him that he begged for his meat? ſith he was Lord over all, for then had he been unwiſe to have begged, and have no need thereto.

Freer, after what Law ruleſt thou thee? where findeſt thou in Gods Law, that thou ſhouldſt thus beg? what manner men needeth for to beg? for whom oweth ſuch men to beg? Why beggeſt thou ſo for thy Brethren? If thou ſaieſt, for they have need, then thou doſt it for the more perfection, or elſe for the leaſt, or elſe for the mean. If it be the moſt perfection of all, then ſhould all thy Brethren do ſo, and then no man needed to beg but for himſelf, for ſo ſhould no man beg but him needed. And if it be the leaſt perfection, why loveſt thou then other men more than thy ſelf? For ſo thou art not well in charity, ſith thou ſhouldſt ſeek the more perfection after thy power living thy ſelf moſt after God. And thus leaving that imperfection, thou ſhouldſt not ſo beg for them. And if it is a good mean thus to beg as thou doſt, then ſhould no man do ſo, but they been this good mean, and yet ſuch a mean granted by you can never be grounded on Gods Law, for then both lerid and leard that ben in mean degree of this world ſhould go about and beg as you do. And if all ſhould do, certes well nigh all the world ſhould go about and beg as ye done, and ſo ſhould there be ten beggers againſt one Paver.

Why wilt thou not beg for poor bedred men, that ben poorer than any of your Sect, that liggen and mow not go about to help himſelfes, ſith we be all Brethren in God, and that Bretherhed paſſeth any other that ye or any man could make, and where moſt need were, there were moſt perfection, either elſe ye hold them not your pure Brethren, but worſe, but then ye be unperfect in your begging? Whoſe ben all your rich Courts that ye han, and all your rich Jewels? ſith ye ſeen that ye han nought ne in proper, ne in common. If ye ſain they ben the Popes, why gather ye then of poor men and Lords and ſo much out of the Kings hand to make your Pope rich? And ſith ye ſain that it is great perfection to have nought in proper ne in common, why be ye ſo faſt about to make the Pope that is your Father rich, and put on him imperfection? ſithen ye ſaine that your goods ben all his, and ye ſhould by reaſon be the moſt perfect man, it ſeemeth openlich that ye ben curſid Children ſo to ſlander your Father and make him imperfect. And if ye ſain that the goods be yours then do ye ayenſt your rule; and if it be not ayenſt your Rule, then might ye have both plow and cart and labour as other good men done, and not ſo beg by Coſengery and idle as ye done. If ye ſay that it is more perfection to beg, than to travel or to work with your hand, why preach ye not openly and teach all men to do ſo? ſith it is the beſt and moſt perfect life to the help of their ſouls, as ye make Children to beg that might have been rich heirs.

Why hold ye not S. Francis his Rule and his Teſtament? ſith Francis ſaith, that God ſhewed him this living & this Rule; & certes if it were Gods Will, the Pope might not foredo it; or elſe Francis was a lier that ſaid in this wiſe.

Why will ye not touch no coined money with the Croſs, ne with the Kings head, as ye done other Jewels both of Gold and Silver? certes, if ye deſpiſe the Croſs or the Kings head, then ye be worthy to be deſpiſed of God and the King: and ſith ye will receive money in your hearts and not with your hands, it ſeemeth that ye hold more holineſs in your hands than in your hearts, and then be falſe to God.

Why have yee exempt you from our King's Laws, and viſiting of our Biſhops, more than other Chriſtian men that liven in this Realm, if ye be not guilty of Traitorie to our Realm, or Treſpaſſes to your Biſhops?

Freer, what Charity is this, to the People to lie, and ſay that ye follow Chriſt in poverty more than other Men done? and yet in curious and coſtly houſing, and fine and precious clothing, and delicious and liking feeding, and in treaſure and jewels, and rich ornaments, Freers paſſen Lords, and other rich worldly Men, and ſooneſt they ſhould bring their cauſe about (be it never ſo coſtly) though Gods Law be put a back.

Freer, what charity is this to preaſe upon a rich Man, and to entice him to be buried among you from his pariſh Church, and to ſuch rich men give letters of Fraternity confirmed by your general Seal, and thereby to bear him in hand that he ſhall have part of all your Maſſes, Mattens, Preachings, Faſtings, Wakings, and all other good deeds done by your Brethren of your Order (both whileſt he liveth and after that he is dead) and yet ye witten never whether your deeds be acceptable to God, ne whether that man that hath that letter, be able by good living to receive any part of your deeds; and yet a poor man (that ye wite well or ſuppoſen in certain to have no good of) ye ne given to ſuch letters, though he be a better man to God than ſuch a rich man; nevertheleſs this poor man doth not retch thereof? For as men ſuppoſen, ſuch letters and many others that Freers behoten to men, be full falſe deceits of Freers out of all reaſon, and Gods Law and Chriſtian mens faith.

Freer, what charity is this, to be Confeſſors of Lords and Ladies, and to other mighty Men, and not amend hem in their living? but rather as it ſeemeth to be bolder to pill their poor tenants and to live in lechery; and there to dwell in your office of Confeſſor for winning of worldly goods, and to be hold great by colour of ſuch ghoſtly offices? this ſeemeth rather pride of Freers, than charitie of God.

Freer, what charity is this, to ſain that who ſo liveth after your Order liveth moſt perfectly, and next followeth the ſtate of Apoſtles in poverty and penance, and yet the wiſeſt and greateſt Clerks of you wend or ſend, or procure to the Court of Rome to be made Cardinals, or Biſhops, or the Popes Chapleins, and to be aſſoiled of the vow of poverty and obedience to your Miniſters, in which (as ye ſain) ſtandeth moſt perfection and merit of your Orders, and thus ye faren as Phariſees, that ſain one and do another to the contrary?

Freer, was S. Francis in making that Rule he ſet thine Order in, a fool and a liar, or elſe wiſe and true? If ye ſain that he was not a Fool but wiſe, ne a liar but true: why ſhew ye contrary

trary to your doing, when by your ſuggeſtion to the Pope ye ſaid, that your Rule that Francis made was ſo hard, that ye mow not live to hold it without declaration and diſpenſation of the Pope, and ſo by your deed? Me let your Patron a Fool that made a rule ſo hard that no man may well keep, and eke your deed proveth him a lier, where he ſaith in his rule that he took and learned it of the Holy Ghoſt. For how might ye for ſhame pray the Pope undo that the Holy Ghoſt bit, as when ye prayed him to diſpenſe with the hardneſs of your Order?

Freer, is there any perfecter Rule of Religion than Chriſt Gods Son gave in the Goſpel to his Brethren? Or than that Religion that S. James in his Epiſtle maketh mention of? If you ſay yes, then putteſt thou on Chriſt (that is the Wiſdom of God the Father) unkunning, unpower, or evil will. For then he could not make his Rule ſo good as another did his, and ſo he had be unkunning; or that he might not make his Rule ſo good as another man might, and ſo were he unmighty; or he would not make his Rule ſo perfect, as another did his, and ſo he had been evil willed.

For if he might and could and would have made a Rule perfect without default and did not, he was not Gods Son almighty. For if any other Rule be perfecter than Chriſts, then muſt Chriſts Rule lack of that perfection, and ſo were default and Chriſt had failed in making of his Rule, but to put any default or failing in God is blaſphemie. If thou ſay that Chriſts Rule and that Religion S. James maketh mention of, is perfecteſt; why holdeſt thou not thilk Rule without more? And why clepeſt thou the rather of S. Francis, or S. Dominick's Rule or Religion or Order, than of Chriſts Rule, or Chriſts Order?

Freer, canſt thou any default aſſigne in Chriſts Rule of the Goſpell, with the which he taught all men ſickerly to be ſaved, if they kept it to their ending? If thou ſay it was too hard, then ſaieſt thou Chriſt lied, for he ſaid of his Rule, My yoke is ſoft and my burden light. If thou ſay Chriſts Rule was too light, that may be aſſigned for no default, for the better it may be kept. If thou ſayeſt, there is no default in Chriſts Rule of the Goſpel, ſith Chriſt himſelf ſaith it is light and eaſie: what need was it for Patrons of Freers to adde more thereto? and ſo make an harder Religion to ſave Freers, than was the Religion of Chriſts Apoſtles and his Diſciples helden and were ſaved by? But if they woulden that their Freers ſaten above the Apoſtles in Heaven for the harder Religion that they keepen here, ſo would they ſitten in Heaven above Chriſt himſelf for their more and ſtrict obſervations, then ſo ſhould they be better than Chriſt himſelf.

In theſe *Queſtions*, (beſides ſeveral others extant in *Chaucer*) we have the *Hypocriſie* and *Fraud* of theſe *Mendicant Friars* fully ſet forth by a Perſon who lived among them in the time of their greateſt flouriſhing here in *England*: Which Hypocriſie of theirs in the *pretence* of *Poverty* is atteſted by our *Hiſtorians*. *Walſingham* ſaith, *that they offered the Pope at one time, for a diſpenſation to break their Rule, as to the liberty of enjoying Rents and Lands,* 40000 *Florins of Gold, and much*

Walſingh. hiſt. p. 92. *A.D.* 1308

much more Money. The Pope asked *them, where their Money was? They told him, in the Merchants Hands; the cunning Pope pretended to take three Days time to conſider of it. In the mean time he ſends for the Merchants, abſolves them from their obligation to the Friars, and charges them under pain of an Anathema, to pay the Money into his Treaſury; and then tells the Friars, he would not have them to break their Rule; by which they were bound to touch no Money. And ſo,* ſaith he, *what they had unjuſtly gotten, was juſtly taken away.* I know no reaſon they could have to complain of any Injuſtice in the Pope, ſince they declare the *Property* and *Dominion* of what they enjoyed was in the *Apoſtolical See.* And it were pity the Pope ſhould have nothing but a meer Name and Title. *Matthew Weſtminſter*, from whom *Walſingham* took not only the Story, but moſt of the very Words of it, ſaith it was *quadringenta millia* and not *quadraginta*, as it is in *Walſingham*, 400000 *Florins of Gold* and *much more, to have the liberty to receive Lands and Revenues*; expreſly againſt their *Rule* and *Solemn Vow of perfect Poverty. Matthew Paris* deſcribes their *Frauds* as to the *Parochial Prieſts* and *other Convents*, their *Flatteries* and *Inſinuations* into *Great Men*; and adds, *that they were ſo excellently skilled in the Arts of getting Money, that the Pope made choice of them above others to be his Collectors, both here and in other Countries; in ſo much,* he ſaith, *that the Pope made them inſtead of Fiſhers of Men, Fiſhers of Money.* So much had they kept to their *Rule* in St. *Francis* his Senſe, *i. e.* to the *meer Letter* of it; for no Men were more skilful in the getting of Money, than they were; if they did but keep themſelves from *fingering* of it, they thought, they obſerved that part of this *Rule* at leaſt, whatever became of their *perfect Poverty.* Which he ſets forth, when he ſaith, *that within twenty four Years after their firſt coming into* England, *their Manſion Houſes were like Royal Palaces, wherein they had unvaluable Treaſures, moſt impudently tranſgreſſing the Rules of Poverty, which was the Foundation of their Profeſſion.* And then deſcribes *their hanging about great and rich Mens Beds when they lay a dying, in hopes of a Prey; their drawing People to Confeſs to them, their obtaining private Teſtaments, their commending their own Order, and diſcommending all others to that degree, that the People commonly believed they could not be ſaved unleſs they were ruled by the Mendicant Friars. Nay they were ſo buſie not only to get Privileges, but to inſinuate themſelves into Courts and great Families, that no Buſineſſes almoſt were managed without them, either relating to Money or Marriages; with much more to the ſame purpoſe in him*: And if we believe the concurrent Teſtimony of theſe Hiſtorians, there were never greater Hypocrites known, ſince the Phariſees, and before the Jeſuits, than theſe pretenders to *perfect Poverty*: Who hated that in their Hearts to which they made the greateſt ſhew of Love. We may perceive by *Chaucer* what ways they had of wheedling great Perſons into an Opinion, how much better it was to be buried among them, than any where elſe; the Biſhops ſaw well enough what all this was deſigned for, *viz.* to have the *Profits* of *Burials*; and therefore in behalf of the *Parochial Clergy* they oppoſed it as long as they durſt; but Pope *Innocent* IV. declared, *their Churches to be Conventual*, and *then to have liberty* of *burying in them*; which they made good uſe of, both here and in other Places, to their great Advantage. So that, what by the Favour of great Perſons whom they flattered to become their Confeſſors;

Mat. Weſt. A. 1299.

Mat. Paris ad A. D. 1235.

ad A. D. 1247.

A. D. 1243.

Annals Minor. ad A. 1252. *n.* 23.

ſors; what by their *Maſſes* and extraordinary Offices; what by Burials, and the charitable Benevolence of well diſpoſed Perſons to them; they made a good ſhift to keep themſelves a good way out of the reach of the *Perfection* of *Poverty*; while in the mean time they pretended to nothing more than that. But they found more comfort in their own *Purſe-opening way*, than the *Parochial Clergy* did in their *ſettled Maintenance*; they having found out the knack of pleaſing thoſe Humours in Perſons that had the greateſt command of their Purſes: But beſides theſe ways, when the charity of particular Perſons began to cool towards them, they had a certain *rate* upon Houſes which they lived upon, which *Sancta Clara* confeſſes, and ſaith, *it was eaſie for the People, and abundantly ſufficient for them.* So that laying all theſe ways together, *although they had ſworn ſo much affection to perfect Poverty; and profeſſed to love and admire it above all things*; yet they endeavoured with all their care and diligence to keep it from coming within their Doors.

Hiſtor. Minor. Provinc. Angliæ. ſ. 24.

§. 15. But all this would not ſatisfie them, for the *Conventual Friars* were never quiet, till for the greater *height* of *their Poverty*, they procured leave from the *Pope* that they might enjoy Lands and Poſſeſſions as well as others: So much is confeſſed by their *Martyrologiſt*, and the *defender* of their *Order* againſt *Bzovius*: Upon this a new *Reformation* began among them, firſt by *Paulutius Fulginas*, but very little regard was had to it, till *Bernardinus Senenſis* appeared in the head of it, and then it ſpread very much; theſe were called *Fratres de obſervantiâ* from their ſtrict obſervance of St. *Francis*'s *Rule*; and many and great Differences happened between them, which it hath coſt the Papal See ſome trouble to compoſe: Which were ſo high that *Leo* X. in the Preface to the *Bull* of *Union*, declares, *that almoſt all the Princes in Chriſtendom had interceeded with him to end the Controverſie between theſe two ſorts of Beggars, viz,* thoſe *who had good Lands and Revenues*; and others, *that had rich Houſes and Furniture and other Conveniencies, but had no endowments.* For this ſame *Pope* declared, *that theſe ſtrict Obſervantines might enjoy the moſt magnificent Houſes and coſtly Furniture without any diminution to the Perfection of their Poverty, becauſe the right and property of them was not in themſelves, but in the Papal See:* But I cannot underſtand why the ſame reaſon ſhould not hold for *Lands* too, ſuppoſing the ſame *Right* and *Property* to be in the *Popes*; for it cannot enter into my Head, that a Man is a jot the poorer, becauſe his Eſtate lies in *Goods and Jewels*, and not in *Lands*; or why this may not be in *Truſtees* hands as well as the other. Indeed that was the *ſolemn Cheat* in all this Affair, that how rich ſoever really this *Order* of *Mendicants* was; yet, forſooth, they had nothing at all to live upon but the *Alms* of the People, for they had vowed the *very height of Poverty. Why*, ſaith a plain *Countryman*, that is not well skill'd in Metaphyſicks, *the beggars in our Countrey do not live in ſuch ſtately Houſes, and have no ſuch rich Ornaments, nor feed ſo well, nor are ſo well provided for as you are: We that have Land of our own, would be glad to have all things found at ſo cheap a rate. Do you think that Riches lies only in trouble and care and hard Labour? If that be it, I confeſs you are poor enough: But in no other Senſe that I ſee.*

Martyrol. Franc. addit. ſ. 208.
Nitela Franciſc. Relig. p. 174.
Bernard. Senenſ. vit. c. 29.
Leo X. *Conſtit.* 23.
Leo X. *Conſtit.* 6.

Alas poor Man, ſaith the *good Friar*, we are as poor as *Job* for all this.

Now that cannot I underſtand for my Heart, ſaith the other; *ſurely you call things only by other Names than we do: And make that Poverty that we plain Men call Riches.*

Well, ſaith the *Friar*, I will ſhew my charity to your underſtanding in helping of that, if you will ſhew yours to us poor *Friars*; therefore you muſt know that although we have the full *uſe* and *poſſeſſion* for our benefit in the things you ſee, yet *Pope Nicholas* III. in the *Bull Exiit*, and *Pope Clement* V. in the *Bull Exivi de Paradiſo*, hath declared, *that we have no Propriety and Dominion in them, but that is reſerved to the Papal See*: So that we enjoy all things but have right to nothing.

Say you ſo, ſaith the *Country-man*, *Then I believe you come within the compaſs of the Statutes againſt Vagabonds and ſturdy Beggars, for you live upon that which is none of your own, and refuſe to Work.*

Tuſh, ſaith the *Friar*, that is an Heretical Statute, and we defie Queen *Elizabeth and all her Works*; as long as the *Pope* hath declared us to be poor, we are ſo and will be ſo, although we had ten times as much as we have: For our holy Father the Pope can change not only the *Names* but the *Nature* of things; nay I will tell you farther, if we had as much Wealth as the King of *Spain* in the *Indies*, if we had only the *poſſeſſion*, and the *ſupreme Right* or *Dominion* were declared to be in the *Pope*, we were in *perfect Poverty* for all this.

I cry you mercy, Sir, replies the *Country-man*; *I beſeech you intercede with his Holineſs to make me one of his Beads-men*; *for I perceive Poverty, as he makes it, is better than all my Lands that I have the Fee-ſimple of: But I pray think of a better way to keep me out of the reach of the* Statute; *for if I have no manner of right to what I enjoy, I may be indicted next Seſſions for all that I know*; *if I have any right to it, then I have a Property*; *and if I have a property, how can I ſwear that I have none, and will have none, neither in my ſelf, nor in common with others?*

Come, come, ſaith the *Friar*, theſe are things too high for you; it is enough for us, that have had *Scotus* of our Order, to be able to explain theſe things.

And yet *Pope John* XXII. could underſtand theſe Subtilties no more than a plain *Countrey-man*; for he declares the diſtinction of *Property* and *Uſe*, as it was applied by the *Franciſcans* from the *Bull* of *Nicolas* III. to be *meer Fraud* and *Hypocriſie*. For which we are to conſider, that among the Articles objected againſt one of the *Beguini* by the *Dominican Inquiſitor* at *Narbon*, *A. D.* 1321. this was one, *that Chriſt and his Apoſtles following the way of Perfection, had no right of Property and Dominion in any thing either in ſpecial or in common*: Which *Berengarius*, a *Franciſcan*, being preſent, utterly denied to contain any erroneous Doctrine; but ſaid, *it was a very good Catholick Opinion, and expreſly grounded on Pope* Nicholas III. *his Bull Exiit*: Upon which an *Appeal* was made to the *Pope* and *Cardinals*; the *Pope* to proceed with the greater ſatisfaction in this weighty Affair, ſends abroad to Univerſities and Learned Men to know their Opinion herein; and becauſe *Nicholas* III. had pronounced an *Anathema* againſt thoſe that ſhould take upon them to interpret or debate the *Bull Exiit*, he takes off this *Anathema* and gives all Men free leave to

Extrav. ad Condit. de vero ſignif.

to deliver their Judgments. In the mean time, the *Franciſcans* finding the *Perfection* of their *Order* called in Queſtion, and ſuſpecting the *Popes* ill-will towards them; they met together at *Peruſium*; and publiſhed their Sentence to all Chriſtian People, *that the foreſaid Article was Sound and Catholick, becauſe it had been approved by the Apoſtolical See.* The *Pope* being throughly nettled at this and other Carriages of theirs in the Controverſie between him and the Emperor, and at the inſolent Behaviour of *Friar Bonogratias*, who was ſent from the *General Chapter* to the *Pope*, declared *the Letter to be Heretical*, and their *Order* to be founded in *Hereſie*, as *Raynaldus* ſhews from a Letter of *Michael Cæſenas* then *General* of the *Order*, extant in the *Vatican Library*: And *finding*, ſaith *Raynaldus*, *that the Franciſcans under the pretence of Apoſtolical Poverty did heap up Riches to themſelves, which they would have the World to believe did not contradict their Vow and Rule, becauſe the Dominion and Property was reſerved to the Papal See, he publiſhed the* Bull, *Ad Conditorem*; in which he fully ſets forth the *Hypocriſie* of the *Franciſcans*, in pretending to the *perfection* of *Poverty*, upon this *reſervation* of the *Right* of *Property* and *Dominion* to the *Apoſtolical See*: For, ſaith he, *the perfection of a Chriſtian Life lies principally in Charity, which the Apoſtle calls the Bond of Perfection; which the contempt of worldly things did only prepare Men for, by taking off that Sollicitude which the care of worldly Affairs did carry along with it: But where the ſame Sollicitude continues, their expropriation,* as he calls it, *can add nothing to Perfection. But*, ſaith he, *it is notorious that the Franciſcans, after the ſaid Reſervation of Property to the Popes, were rather more than leſs ſollicitous about the procuring and keeping of worldly things, both by Suits at Law, and otherwiſe. And under the pretence of this reſervation, they have unreaſonably boaſted of the Perfection of their Poverty; becauſe they have the bare Vſe of things without Property or Dominion. But if they would attend to Things rather than bare Words, and ſubmit to Truth; they would find, that they had much more than the bare Vſe having the liberty to ſell, exchange or give away. And in things conſumed by Vſe, to ſeparate the Property from the Vſe, is repugnant both to Law and Reaſon: And ſuch a reſerved Dominion is not real but verbal, and a meer fiction: But ſuppoſing there could be a bare Vſe, yet it could not be given the Property reſerved; becauſe there can be no difference between ſuch a bare Vſe, and the full Dominion.* This and much more is contained in the *Pope's Bull*, which fully manifeſts, that all this pretence of *Poverty* was a meer *Juggle*, and fit only to deceive the Simple. For in things neceſſary to Life, it is impoſſible to part with the *Property* and *Dominion* of them; and in other things, it is great *Hypocriſie* to pretend *Poverty* under the greateſt Plenty, meerly becauſe a titular *Dominion* is reſerved to another Perſon. For as *Augerius* the *Provincial* of the *Carmelites* ſaid truly upon this occaſion, *the perfection of Poverty doth not lie ſo much in the Title, as in the Vſe of things.* viz. *ſuch as tends to abate the motions of the Fleſh and ſwellings of the Mind*; which he did not underſtand how it could be attained by a *plentiful Vſe*, ſuppoſing it could be without *Property* or *Dominion*.

Raynald. Annales A. D. 1322. *n.* 55.

Raynald. n. 68.

But notwithſtanding this *Bull* of *John* XXII. and the great Truth and Reaſon contained in it, the *Franciſcans* ſtill went on with the ſame *Hypocriſie*; and they obtained that Favour of following *Popes* to recal the *Bull*, *Ad Conditorem*, (which ſurely needed not to have been done in caſe *Nicholas* III. and he had not differed, as *Bellarmine* and others would fain make the World believe) which was expreſly done by *Martin* V. in the *Bull Amabilis Fructus*, which was confirmed by *Eugenius* IV. *Calixtus* III. *Nicholas* V. *Pius* II. *Paul* II. *Sixtus* IV. *Alexander* VI. and *Leo* X. Who all proceed upon the ſame *ſolemn Foppery*, that the *Franciſcans* had the *perfection* of *Poverty*, becauſe the *Dominion* and *Property* of their *Houſes*, *Goods* and *Eſtates* was not in *themſelves* but in *the Papal See.* I might farther have ſhewn the *Hypocriſie* of this pretence of *Poverty*, from the Reſolutions of their *Caſuiſts* in this matter, and the frivolous Subtilty of their diſtinctions to ſalve Mens Conſciences; but this is ſufficient to my preſent purpoſe, to ſhew how vain and fooliſh the pretence to *perfection* was in this *Mendicant* way, which is fully confuted (ſuppoſing it to have been what it pretended) by that ſaying of our *Saviour*, *it is a more bleſſed thing to give, than to receive.*

Bell. de Rom. Pon. l. 4. *c.* 14.

Annales Minor. A. 1322. *n.* 61, 62, &c.

Act. 20. 35.

§. 16. Hitherto the *Perfection* of a *Chriſtian Life*, was ſuppoſed to lie in *abſtraction* from the *World*, and *Poverty*, and *diligence in the publick Performance of the Eccleſiaſtical Office*; but theſe latter Ages the World would have produced an *Order* of a very different nature from all before it, but yet pretending to *Divine Inſpiration* in the Settlement of it: And that is the *Order* of *Jeſuits*. For the *Monks* having loſt their reputation by *Lazineſs*, and the *Friars* by their *Hypocriſie*; and their Churches Affairs requiring an *Order* buſie and active: It was neceſſary that a new one ſhould be advanced upon other pretences than the foregoing. And the *Jeſuits* very well underſtanding how much all the former pretences were ſeen through; and yet how neceſſary it was in ſome things to ſeem to comply with them, they pitched upon ſuch a Model of their own, which took in what ſeemed moſt for their Advantage; and yet propoſed ſuch an *end* of their *Society* as ſeemed to advance it above all before it. For as *Ribadineira* well argues in their behalf, *the perfection of any Society is to be taken from the end of it; now the end of their Society they pretended to be Charity and Edification, which was in it ſelf more excellent than any of the former Religious Orders.* And that which other *Orders* accounted their *Perfection*, they expreſſed very little regard to: Which was either, 1. *The conſtant Performance of the Eccleſiaſtical Office.* 2. *Corporal Auſterities.* 3. *A Contemplative Life.* 4. *The ſolemn Vows.* As to every one of theſe the *Jeſuits* have done our Work for us, and have ſhewed that the *Perfection* of a *Chriſtian State* doth not lie in any of them.

Vit. Ignat. l. 3. *c.* 22.

1. Not, *in attendance on the performance of the Eccleſiaſtical Office*; for by the *Pope's Bulls* and *Conſtitutions* of their *Society* they are excuſed from having *any Choire*, or *from ſaying their Canonical Office in publick, although they be Prieſts*; and this is declared by the *Pope*'s at the ſame time, when they declare, *that this Order was begun by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*; as appears by the *Bulls* of *Paul* III. and *Julius* III. And after the *Council* of *Trent*, *Gregory* XIII. confirmed the ſame Privilege to them, *that they might the better attend to their ſtudying, reading and preaching*; which *Ribadineira* and *Pallavacini* ſhew to have more *excellency* and *perfection* in it, than *attendance on the Choire*; which they not only prove from a *Council* under *Gregory the Great*, but from the practice of other *Religious Orders*, which excuſe their *Profeſſors* and *Preachers*, as being imployed about a nobler Work.

Literæ Apoſtol. Bull. Paul 3. *p.* 8. *Julii* 3. *p.* 58. 67. *Greg.* 13. *p.* 135.

Vit. Ign. l. 3. *c.* 22. *p.* 347. *Pallavac. vindic. Societ. Jeſu. c.* 13. *p.* 65.

Thom. Hurtado Reſolut. Morales p. 308.

De inſtit. horar. Canonic. l. 1. c. 13. n. 18.

Work. And *Thomas Hurtado* quotes an Expreſſion of a *Jeſuit*, wherein he commends their *Order* above any other, *becauſe they have more regard to preaching and other Duties, than the Office of the Choire*, which ſaith he, *is a publick Affront to all Orders both of Monks and Friars:* And another Expreſſion of *Valentia*, worſe than the former, *viz. Chorus ad ineptos*; *viz.* that ſuch a conſtant attendance on the Offices of the Choire ſo often Day and Night, wherein the Monaſtick Orders placed ſo much of the perfection of their lives, was for thoſe that were good for nothing elſe: And *Oliver Bonarte* doth imply, *that the Canonical Officers were intended to keep the Monks from Idleneſs.* How very much different is this from the opinion of thoſe who place the perfection of the Monaſtick Life in this conſtancy of their publick Devotion?

Sfort. Pallavac. Vindicat. Societ. Jeſu. c. 13.

2. Not, *in corporal Auſterities.* For they have no rule at all by the *Bulls* and *Conſtitutions* of their *Order*, requiring any of theſe, as to *Dyet*, or *Habit*, or *chaſtiſing* themſelves; but they are left to the private diſcretion of particular Perſons; yet *Ribadineira* ſaith, *they do not deſpiſe thoſe that uſe them*; which I cannot eaſily believe, if any credit may be given to the Letter of the Jeſuit *Bariſonius*, which hath been ſeveral times printed; bearing date from *Bononia*, *April* 21, 1608. wherein among other things, which he highly commends, their Society for above any other Religious Order, this is one, *That they do not require thoſe Severities in Dyet, Habit, or Lodging, which not only afflict the Body, but weaken Men's Spirits, and dull their Underſtandings.* And *Cardinal Pallavacini* in his *Defence of the Society*, chiefly againſt the *Objections* of other *Orders*, doth not only confeſs, *that they do not require thoſe Rigours and Severities either in Dyet or other ways*, which others pretend to, *but that the moderate way they proceed is much more convenient and agreeable to the deſign of a Religious Society. And becauſe the chief Employments of the Society requires ſharpneſs of wit, which according to* Ariſtotle, *is joyned with a more delicate Temper of Body, which is eaſily put out of Order with hard uſage, therefore he looks upon the uſe of hardſhips, as very contrary to their main intention, becauſe they weaken both the Body and Mind together. All the Office of Vertue as to theſe things*, he ſaith, *is to retrench all Extravagancies, and ſuch things which rather provoke than ſatisfie the Appetite; and an ability to endure hardſhips, is rather an effect of Nature than Grace:* And the *Perfection* of a *Porter*, and not of a *Chriſtian.*

Jul. Nigron. Comment. in Regul. Commun. ſociet. Jeſu part 3. ſ. 13, 14, &c.

Martyrolog. Franc. addit. ſ. 221.

3. Not, *in a Contemplative Life.* For they undertake to prove, that the *Works* of *Charity*, which their Society is chiefly deſigned for, viz. *Preaching*, *adminiſtring Sacraments*, *teaching Youth*, &c. are more excellent than a Life of *Contemplation.* On this account *Julius Nigronus* at large proves the *greater excellency* of their *Order* than of any other; which the *Franciſcan Martyrologiſt* will by no means allow to the *Jeſuits.* And that which the *Jeſuits* boaſt the moſt of, *viz.* their *fourth Vow of Obedience* to the *Pope* about *Miſſions*; he contends that their *Order* was under that *Vow* in a more eminent manner long before them, as he proves from *Bonaventure*, and others. Which is a thing I am willing to leave them to contend about.

4. Not, *in the ſolemn Vows.* For the *Jeſuits* have found out a notable device of a *ſimple Vow*: By which they underſtand ſuch a *Vow* as binds Men no longer than the *Society* thinks fit. *Gregory* XIII. in

his *Bull* of *Confirmation*, declares, *that after the two Years Novitiate are over, thoſe who will remain in the Society muſt take the three ſubſtantial Vows, but only ſimple, and not ſolemn, after which they are incorporated into the Society*; *notwithſtanding which the General of the Order upon a cauſe which he ſhall judge reaſonable, may diſmiſs them*; *and abſolve them from all obligation of their Vows.* Whereas before the *perfection* of the *Monaſtick State* was ſuppoſed to lie in the perpetual *Obligation* of the three Vows; and none were accounted of a *Religious Order*, that had not taken upon them ſolemn Vows, (notwithſtanding which *Gregory* XIII, immediately before this mentions the *Divine Inſtinct by which* Ignatius *did make theſe Conſtitutions of his Order*) and after adds, *that thoſe who are only under theſe ſimple Vows, are as much partakers of all the Merits* (which no doubt are very great) *and privileges of the Order, as thoſe who are profeſſed*; *and as truly Religious as they, and liable to the puniſhment of Apoſtates, if they depart without leave*: Which the ſame *Pope* confirms by another *Conſtitution* (this ſimple *Vow* not being ſo eaſily digeſted by other *Orders*, and being thought repugnant to the very conſtitution of a *Religious Order*) But there was a *Myſtery* in this *ſimple Vow*, not ſo eaſily apprehended by ſuch whoſe Brains were too much mortified by Penances: For notwithſtanding they had obtained ſo much Favour from *Pope Pius* V. to paſs among the *Mendicant Orders* (becauſe their *Domus profeſſæ* have no endowments, though their *Colleges* have) that they might enjoy the great *privileges* belonging to them; yet they took as much care as could be taken to prevent any ſuch Scandal as that of *Poverty* falling upon their *Society*. But this was not to be done after the dull way of the *Hypocriſie* of the *Mendicant Friars*; but they found out finer and ſubtiler Devices of their own: To this end, they made the diſtinction of the *Colleges* and *Domus Profeſſæ*; the former were capable of the richeſt Endowments, wherein they took care for the education of Youth; in the other were only *Profeſſed Jeſuits* who had taken the *Solemn Vows*; and were imployed in Preaching, Writing, Sacraments, *&c.* now theſe were to be without Endowments to excite the freer Benevolence of the People; but yet ſuppoſing their Charity ſhould cool, the Endowments of the *Colleges* were to be in the Hands of the *Præpoſitus* and the *Society*; who would be ſure not to ſuffer their chief Men to want. And they have ſo very few of theſe, that *Cardinal Pallavacini* ſaith, *that there are but about thirty of them belonging to the whole Society*; *whereas* he confeſſes, *that there were about Eighteen Thouſand Perſons of their Society.* But beſides many other Artifices made uſe of by them to draw the kindneſs of the Great Ones to them (for they little regard any other; and *Bariſonius* ſaith, *ſome of the Mendicants had ſo expoſed themſelves by ſelling Maſſes at ſo low a rate, that there was a neceſſity of reforming, if not of utterly deſtroying the whole Order*) the *Jeſuits* reſerved this way of improving the ſtock of the Society, by the Myſtery of the ſimple Vows, *viz.* that thoſe who are under them may *poſſeſs Eſtates*, which they cannot under the *ſolemn Vows*; (notwithſtanding that one of theſe *Vows* is that of *Poverty*, and that in the firſt year of *Novitiate*, *they are to renounce all Temporal Goods not only which they have at preſent, but may have hereafter*) by this means, they can not only diſcharge themſelves of unprofitable Members without any burden to the Society; but in caſe any *Inheritance* chance to fall to any under the *ſimple Vow*, they put in a fair claim to it; for

Literæ Apoſtolic. p. 217.

p. 219, 220.

Literæ Apoſtol. p. 116.

Pallavac. Vindicat. Societ. Jeſu c. 9. p. 35. c. 13. p. 67.

he is declared *capable to inherit*, and yet he hath parted with his *right to the Society* when he became a *Member* of it: And if it cannot be done any other way, they releaſe him of his *ſimple Vow*, and leave the reſt to his Ingenuity. This is a fetch ſomewhat above the fat Hearts of the *Monks*, or the more groſs *Hypocriſie* of the *Friars*; but I think is far enough from perſwading any Man that the Conſtitutions of this Order came from the *Inſpiration* of the *Holy Ghoſt*.

§. 17. The only Society remaining in the Roman Church, of any Name, which puts in claim to *Divine Inſpiration* in the Founders of it, is that of the *Oratorians*: So the Preface to the *Conſtitutions* of the Congregation of the Oratory, ſaith, *that* Philip Nerius *was wont to ſay, that not he, but God himſelf was the Author of it.* The beginning of this Congregation was laid by *Nerius* in Private Meetings in his Chamber, *A. D.* 1551. which afterwards proving too little for his Company, he removed to a Room over the Church of St. *Hierom*; where *Cæſar Baronius*, *Franciſcus Tauruſius*, and others of his Diſciples, though not in Orders, did hold forth to the People: By which means, ſo great a number flocked to them, that *Nerius* was accuſed for keeping Conventicles before the *Eccleſiaſtical Judge*; but notwithſtanding the ſevere Rebukes he received from him, they did not give over the Exerciſes of the Oratory; and at laſt obtained leave to continue them. He was ſo uſed to *Ecſtaſies and Raptures*, that *Gallonius* ſaith, *it was eaſier for him to fall into one of them, than for another Perſon to think of Worldly Matters; and that to avoid them, he was forced to divert his Mind from Divine Thoughts.* *A. D.* 1564, he laid the Foundation of his Congregation, and made ſome Orders for the Government of it; and beſides the *daily Exerciſes* at the *Oratory*, *Baronius* and *Bordinus* preached on Sundays in the *Florentine's Church*; every day of the Week, Saturday only excepted, four of the Fathers in their courſe made plain Diſcourſes to the People for half an Hour a piece; the firſt two were *Moral*, and the latter relating to *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* and the *Lives* of the *Saints*; which part *Nerius* afterwards allotted to *Baronius*, from whence he took the occaſion of writing his *Annals*; but *Barnabeus* ſaith withal, *that* Nerius *had much ado to keep* Baronius *from embracing one of the ſevereſt Religious Orders*, till *Conſtantius Taſſonus* pretending *Divine Inſpiration*, told him, *God had not called him to it.* *A. D.* 1575. *Gregory* XIII. gave them his *Bull* for ſettling the *Congregation* of the *Oratory* in the Church of St. *Maria in Vallicella*; with the *Parochial Charge* belonging to it; and in imitation of this, others were ſet up at *Naples* and ſeveral other Places of *Italy*. *Philip Nerius* being made Preſident of the Congregation, ſets himſelf to the framing the Conſtitutions of it; in the firſt place he declared it to be his Mind, *That none who were, or ſhould be of that Order, ſhould enter into any Vows at all; and that if any had a Mind to make ſolemn Vows, they ſhould leave the Congregation, and betake themſelves to ſome Religious Orders; for he deſigned thoſe of his Society ſhould be thought Religious only by the good Example of their Lives, and their diligence in preaching; and that the manner of living among them ſhould be in a mean between the Licentiouſneſs of the World, and the Auſterities of the Religious Orders.* Among the *Conſtitutions* of the *Oratory*, this is one, *that in caſe the major part ſhould conſent to the bringing Vows, Oaths, or ſolemn Promiſes among them, they may have the liberty to go to what Religious Order they pleaſe*,

Gallon. vit. Phil. Nerii p. 65.

Barnab. vit. Baron. c. 7.

Gallon. p. 147.

P. 157.

P. 207.

Barnab. vit. Baron. c. 18.

C. 8.

Gallon. vit. Nerii p. 313.

Conſtitut. Congreg. Oratorii, c. 4.

pleaſe, but the leſſer part is to enjoy all the endowments of the Congregation, as long as they continue in that liberty wherein the Congregation was firſt ſettled: Which *Conſtitution* was approved by *Paul* V. And in his time in imitation of this at *Rome* a new Congregation of the *Oratory* was ſet up at *Paris* without any *Vows*, and with *a full liberty of the Members of it, as to the diſpoſal of their Eſtates; ſo as they obtain no right, they loſe none by being of the Congregation, and pretend to no Privileges or Exemptions from the Juriſdiction of the Biſhops; but profeſs to live, as much as any other Clergy-men, in ſubjection to them*; which Congregation, by the encouragement of the Biſhops hath ſpread very much in *France* in a little time, being brought in by *Peter de Berulle, A. D.* 1611. and before his death, *A. D.* 1628. the *Sammarthani* ſay, *That the Congregation of the Oratory was diffuſed almoſt over all* France: And I do not queſtion it found the greater Favour from the *Biſhops*, becauſe its Conſtitution is ſo repugnant to that of the *Religious Orders*; which place their greateſt perfection in thoſe *Solemn Vows*, which the *Oratorians* make nothing of. And thus we have brought the Pretence of *Divine Inſpiration* ſo far, that we have ſeen thoſe things deſpiſed and rejected by it in the Roman Church, wherein the *perfection* of the *Monaſtick State* was placed by the firſt *Founders* of it; which is certainly ſufficient to diſcover that this Pretence muſt be Counterfeit in ſome or other of theſe; and according to *Cardinal Bona*'s Rule in ſuch Caſes, *we have reaſon enough from hence to ſuſpect them all.*

Congreg. Oratorii Jeſu Chriſt. c. 2.

Gallia Chriſtian. Tom. 4. *p.* 993.

Aquin. 2. 2. *q.* 186. *art.* 7.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Converſion of England, *and the difference between the* Britiſh *and* Saxon *Chriſtians.*

§. 1. MR. *Creſſy*, in the heat of his Zeal for the Honour of St. *Benedict*, would make the Vindication of him to be *not barely the Duty of thoſe of his own Order, but the common concernment of the whole Nation:* And I cannot blame him, conſidering the weakneſs of his Cauſe, that he calls in ſo many to his aſſiſtance. He had a mind to engage *the whole Weſtern Patriarchate* againſt me, but being ſomewhat fearful leſt they ſhould not obey his Command, and riſe like one Man for the Honour of the Founder of *his* Order, he ſummons the *Arierban* of the *Engliſh Nation, as moſt eſpecially concerned* in the Quarrel. If Mr. *Creſſy*'s Rhetorick had been equal to his Paſſion, and if his own Rage could have enflamed a Nation, what cauſe ſhould I have had to repent the attempt of Eclipſing the Glory of his Order, by charging Fanaticiſm on the Founder of it? But he comforts himſelf with the hopes *that ſcarce any one hereafter will be willing to imitate my malignant Ingratitude: Malignant Ingratitude!* Methinks it ſounds very well, eſpecially in the ſame Chapter, wherein he calls me *Theological Scarron, a Man of poyſonous Hatred, not only againſt the Church-Catholick Militant, but Triumphant too; than whom he does not know any Adverſary, that could with all his Study, have ſhewed himſelf more impotent in his Paſſions, and leſs ſucceſsful in Reaſoning.* And after ſuch obliging Kindneſſes as theſe, had he not juſt reaſon to charge

P. 15.

P. 17.

P. 35.

me with *malignant Ingratitude?* Which being the utmoſt and moſt comprehenſive terms of Reproach, put me in ſome hopes, that he hath brought up all that which lay ſo uneaſie at the very bottom of his Stomach: And now I ſhall reaſon the Caſe with him; and in truth, I do not find the charge of *Ingratitude* laid upon me, any further than as I am a Native of *England*, in which he ſaith, *Chriſtianity was eſtabliſhed by the Diſciples of St.* Benedict: Which being expreſſed in ſuch large and general terms, gave juſt occaſion to the *Perſon* of *Honour* to tell him, "That Chriſtianity was planted with us "many hundred Years before the Birth of St. *Benedict*; and that we "may reaſonably believe that it was ſooner planted in *Britain*, than "it was at *Rome* it ſelf, ſince the laſt Year of *Tiberius* was before St. "*Peter*'s coming to *Rome*. Therefore Mr. *Creſſy* craves leave to explain himſelf by ſaying, *that he did not ſpeak it of the planting Chriſtianity in our Iſland*; but he ſaith, *that which he ſaid was* (not by his favour *that which he ſaid*, for he ſaid no ſuch thing; but that which he now tells us he meant by what he ſaid, was) *that* England, *or the Country and Nation of the* Engliſh Saxons, *who drove the Chriſtian* Britains *out of our part of the Iſland, was indeed converted by the Diſciples of St.* Benedict; *and this*, he ſaith, *truly he muſt ſtand to.* Some would be glad to meet with any thing, which a Man of ſo uncertain a Humour as he hath been, will at laſt *ſtand to*; but the only reaſon is, becauſe *he muſt*, *i. e.* becauſe he is a *Benedictine*; and therefore muſt believe and defend any thing that makes for the Credit of his Order. It is very unhappy to Mr. *Creſſy*, that when he had Truth and Reaſon on his ſide, he could not *ſtand* to it then; but there are ſome troubleſome *Inſects*, which fly up and down, and make a great noiſe, buzzing in *the Air*, and *never ſtand to it* till they at laſt fall into the moſt filthy Places.

Animadv. p. 29.

Epiſt. Apol. ſect. 35.

But ſince Mr. *Creſſy* thinks this a great aggravation of my Crime, and is ſo reſolved *to ſtand to it*, I ſhall try whether he be not capable of being *ſhocked* even in this fundamental point of the Honour belonging to the *Engliſh Benedictine* Order. If then, it cannot be proved, either that Chriſtianity was firſt brought among the *Engliſh Saxons* by the *Benedictines*; or if it were, that it was *eſtabliſhed* in *England* by their means, then all the reaſon Mr. *Creſſy* will have left *to ſtand to* this Aſſertion will be only, becauſe *he muſt*.

§. 2. I begin with the firſt bringing of Chriſtianity among the *Engliſh Saxons*; and notwithſtanding that the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of thoſe times, is for the moſt part delivered by *Saxon Monks*, who had always a kindneſs for the *Roman Miſſionaries*, and very little for the *Britiſh Biſhops* (as may be eaſily diſcerned even in *Bede* himſelf) yet by laying ſeveral Circumſtances together, we may make it appear that *Auguſtin* and his *Companions* were not the firſt who brought the knowledge of Chriſtianity among the *Engliſh Saxons*. The firſt Settlement we find the *Saxons* made in this *Nation*, (for no account of their Religion is to be expected before) was after the famous Victory of *Aurelius Ambroſius*, wherein *Hengiſt* was defeated; and afterwards his Son *Occa*, *Eoſa* and the reſt of the *Saxons* in thoſe Parts, ſubmitted themſelves to Mercy; upon which *Ambroſius* gave them a *Country* near *Scotland*, and entred into a League with them: Which, ſaith *Matthew Weſtminſter*, happened *A. D.* 490. wherein he followed the *Britiſh*

Matthew Weſtmonaſt A.D. 490.

Britiſh Hiſtorians; for the *Saxon* generally omit any Victories of the *Britiſh Forces*, and this particularly; yet *William* of *Malmesbury*, who relates it ſomewhat differently, ſaith, *that* Hengiſt *ſent* Occa *and* Ebuſa *into the Northern parts, who having conquered thoſe which oppoſed them, they brought the reſt to a voluntary ſubmiſſion.* So that here we find the *Britains* and *Saxons* united together ſo early under the *Saxon Government*, which according to the computation of *Henry* of *Huntingdon*, was but forty Years from the *Saxons* firſt coming into *England*; and that theſe *Britains* continued a long time in theſe Northern parts, appears not only by the Name of *Cumberland* (for *Camden* ſhews, that the *Cumbri* and *Cambri* were the ſame) but from the riſing of *Caedwalla* the *Prince* of the *Britains* in thoſe parts, againſt *Edwin* the *King* of the *Northumbers*, who is ſaid by *Beda to have reigned both over the* Engliſh *and* Britains, *and was killed A. D.* 633. and the *Britains* in thoſe parts are ſaid *to have enjoyed their Liberty for forty ſix Years*, *viz.* to the time of *Beda*'s Writing his Hiſtory; which was *A. D.* 731. and after the coming in of the *Saxons* 285. Now in this Kingdom of the *Cambri John* of *Tinmouth*, or *Capgrave* out of him, ſaith, *that St.* Kentigern *came to preach Chriſtianity, and particularly, he ſhewed that* Woden *the chief God of the* Saxons, *was a mortal Man and a King of the* Saxons, *from whom ſeveral Nations were derived.* Now I deſire to know, whether this were not preaching *Chriſtianity* among the *Saxons*, and that long before the coming of *Auguſtin*, for *Alford* places it in *A. D.* 566. and the landing of *Auguſtin A. D.* 597. *No*, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, *he preached only to the* Picts, *who were revolted to the* Saxon *Idolatry*: And to prove that, makes uſe of an excellent way by corrupting his Author; for the Words in *Capgrave* are theſe, *Woden vero quem principalem Deum crediderunt & Angli, de quo originem duxerant, cui & quartam feriam conſecraverant, hominem fuiſſe mortalem aſſeruit, & Regem Saxonum a quo plures nationes genus duxerant*: Which he thus renders, *And as for* Woden *whom (by the ſeduction of the* Saxons) *they eſteemed their principal God, and to whoſe Honour they conſecrated the fourth Day of the Week*, &c. What pretence is there to underſtand theſe Words of the *Picts*, and not of the *Saxons* themſelves? I know *Alford* brings that Clauſe in by way of *Parentheſis*, and reads it thus (*& præcipue Angli de quo originem duxerant*, &c.) but I have ſet the Words down exactly as they are publiſhed by *Bollandus* the *Jeſuit*, who mentions his own care in the publiſhing of it: *But*, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, *it is plain he meant the* Picts, *becauſe it is ſaid that by his Doctrine he freed the Nation of the* Picts *from Idolatry and Hereſie*: Here again Mr. *Creſſy* diſcovers his admirable Ingenuity; for the Words in *Capgrave* are, (ſeveral things being interpoſed) *Pictorum patriam quæ modo Galwedia dicitur ab Idololatriâ & Hæreticâ pravitate, doctrinâ ſua purgavit*: Which he mentions as a diſtinct thing from his former preaching in the *Regnum Cambrenſe*; of which the former Words are expreſly ſpoken. And although *Alford*, Mr. *Creſſy*'s Author, will by no means allow any *Saxons* to be converted by *Kentigern*, (for fear forſooth the *Saxons* ſhould not owe their entire Chriſtianity to St. *Gregory*'s *Miſſionaries*) yet *Bollandus* ingeniouſly confeſſeth, that both *Kentigern* and *Gildas* did employ their Zeal and Charity towards the Converſion of the *Engliſh Saxons*. For in the Life of *Gildas*, publiſhed by *Joh. à Boſco*, it is ſaid, *that the Northern parts of* Britain *flocked to his preaching, and forſaking the errors of Gentiliſm they*

deſtroyed

Willi. l. Malmsburie. de geſtis Reg. Angl. l. 1. *c.* 3.

Henric. Huntingd. Hiſt. l. 2.

Camden in Cumberland p. 630. & 648.

Bede l. 2. *c.* 20.

L. 4. *c.* 26.

L. 5. *c.* 24.

Capgrav. vit. Kentig. apud. Bolland. 13. *Jan. c.* 6.

Alford. Annal. Eccleſ. ad A. C. 560.

Church-Hiſt. l. 12. *c.* 3. *ſect.* 7.

Bolland. Præf. gen. c. 1. *ſ.* 7.

Bolland. Feb. 24. *vit. S. Ethelbert. Comment. præv. ſ.* 1. *n.* 8.

Bibliothec. Floriac. hiſt. vit. S. Gildæ c. 8.

deſtroyed their Idols, and were baptized in the Faith of the Holy Trinity. Mr. *Creſſy*, although he allows the next Paſſages to be underſtood of *Gildas Sapiens*, who lived after the *Saxons* had over-run the Iſland; yet, he applies the former paſſage to an elder *Gildas*, called *Gildas Albanius*, that it might with leſs probability be underſtood of the Converſion of the *Saxons*; but *Bollandus* hath ſufficiently proved that there was but one *Gildas* called by thoſe ſeveral Titles, and ſo much is acknowledged by the *French Benedictines*, ſo that no relief can be had from thence. Thus we ſee what ground we have to believe that the *Northern Saxons* were acquainted with Chriſtianity, before the *Order* of *Benedictines* was ever heard of. The next Settlement we find, was of the *Weſtern Saxons* by *Cerdic*, who landing with a great Force after the Death of *Hengiſt*, A. D. 495. did ſo weary out the *Britains*, that *Malmesbury* ſaith, *that they willingly yielded themſelves to him, and lived quietly together under his Government*; and is it then reaſonable to conceive that ſo many *Saints* as lived in that *Age* by the Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, ſhould not in all that time acquaint their Neighbours with the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, (eſpecially if it be true, which Mr. *Creſſy* reports of them, *that they wrought ſo many Miracles*) ſuch as St. *David*, St. *Juſtinian*, St. *Dubricius*, St. *Paternus*, St. *Theliau*, St. *Paulens*, &c. Certainly theſe Men were in all reſpects better qualified than *Auguſtin* the *Monk*, if one half of the *Legends* concerning them be true: and why ſhould they neglect ſo neceſſary a duty where they had ſuch advantages of doing it, and ſuch an eaſie way of working miracles to convince the Saxons? Shall we ſay, as *Bede* doth, *that the Britains wholly neglected it?* but that muſt certainly be underſtood of ſuch wretched *Britains*, as *Gildas* deſcribes, not of ſuch *Saints* as theſe were: And *Bollandus* thinks thoſe Words of *Bede* do need a limitation, viz. *that ſuch Apoſtolical Men were but few in compariſon of thoſe afterwards.* Or ſhall we ſay, that, theſe Saints had a great mind to do it, but becauſe of the continual Wars and Perſecutions, they were forced to retire to a Monaſtick Life? No, Mr. *Creſſy* himſelf tells us, *that* Cerdic *did permit the Inhabitants of* Cornwal, *paying an Annual Tribute, to enjoy the exerciſe of the Chriſtian Religion*; which, ſaith he, *appears by the great number of Saints, which in theſe and the following times flouriſhed there.* If there were ſuch a number of *Saints* then, how came they never to employ themſelves in the Converſion of their Neighbour Infidels? I had thought thoſe who Glory ſo much and beyond all reaſon in the *Converſion* of *Remote Infidels*, would have allowed their *Saints* to have converted thoſe that were ſo near at hand; eſpecially conſidering how ſucceſsful they were, where they undertook it. For, St. *Kentigern*, they tell us, for his ſhare purged *Galloway*, converted *Albania*, and ſent Diſciples to the *Orcades*, *Norway*, and as far as *Iſeland*. Methinks, a little Charity would have done well nearer home, when the *Saxons* needed it ſo much, and they bred up ſuch numbers of *Diſciples* under them, as is reported of *Gildas*, *Iltutus*, St. *David*, and the reſt of them. But if notwithſtanding all this, Chriſtianity was unknown to the *Saxons*, what will become of the *Saintſhip* of thoſe Perſons who were ſo highly qualified, by the *Gift of Tongues*, and all ſorts of *Miracles*, (if their Writers ſay true) and yet utterly neglected to preach Chriſtianity to the *Saxons?* But for all that I can ſee, the Reputation of theſe

Church hiſt. l. 12. *c.* 10. *n.* 3. *L.* 11. *c.* 5. *n.* 4.

Bolland. 29 *Jan. præf. ſ.* 2.

Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Bened. ſ. 1. *p.* 138.

Malmeſ. hiſt. Angl. l. 1. *c.* 2.

Church hiſt. l. 11. *c.* 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

Bed. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. *c.* 22.

Bolland. vit. Ethelb. ubi ſupra.

Church hiſt. l. 11. *c.* 14. *n.* 3.

theſe *Britiſh Saints* muſt veil, when it ſtands in competition with the *Apoſtolicalneſs* of *Auguſtine* the *Monk*.

§. 3. *But although in theſe remoter parts the Britains being mixed with the Saxons might acquaint ſome of them with the Chriſtian Religion; yet ſurely in* Kent *and thoſe parts to which* Auguſtin *came, he was the firſt who brought the knowledge of Chriſtianity among them.* This is as far from being true as the other: for to omit what *Alford* confeſſeth to be very probable, *viz. that* Irmiric, *Father to* Ethelbert *did permit the Chriſtian Religion to be profeſſed in his Kingdom*; I ſhall inſiſt upon what is more certain; *viz.* the Confeſſion of *Bede* himſelf; *that the Fame of the Chriſtian Religion was brought to* Ethelbert *before the coming of* Auguſtin, *by the means of a Chriſtian Wife which he had of the Royal Family of the Franks named* Bertha: *whom he received from her Parents on that condition, that he would ſuffer her to enjoy her Religion, and to have a Biſhop to attend her whoſe name was* Luidhardus. What can be more plain from hence, than that the firſt Entertainment which *Chriſtianity* met with in the *Saxon* Court was by the means of Queen *Bertha* and her Biſhop *Luidhardus?* This *Queen Bertha* was the only daughter of *Charipertus, King* of *Paris* one of the four Sons of *Clotharius*, among whom his Kingdom was divided) by *Ingoberga*; and her marriage is mentioned by *Gregorius Turonenſis*, to the Son of the *King* of *Kent*; which marriage was in all probability ſolemnized before the death of *Charipertus*; now *Charipertus* died *A. D.* 567. ſo that *Chriſtianity* had been known about thirty years in *King Ethelbert*'s Court before ever *Auguſtin* ſet footing upon Engliſh ground. And is it conceivable that when a Biſhop had performed the Exerciſes of the Chriſtian Religion for thirty years in a Church for that purpoſe, *viz.* S. *Martin*'s near *Canterbury*, the *Engliſh Saxons* ſhould know nothing of Chriſtianity till *Auguſtin*'s arrival? But this is not all; for we have great reaſon to believe that the Converſion of the *Saxons* to Chriſtianity is in a great meaſure owing to this *Queen*, and her *Biſhop Luidhard*, or *Letardus*; who had been *Biſhop* of *Senlis* in *France*, as *Thorn* tells us. I know herein how much I ſhall provoke the whole Generation of *Romiſh Miſſionaries*; but I value not the diſpleaſure of thoſe whom Truth and Reaſon will enrage. *William* of *Malmesbury* (himſelf a *Benedictine* Monk, and one of the moſt judicious of our *Monkiſh* Hiſtorians) ſaith, *that by* Ethelbert*'s match to Queen* Bertha, *the Saxons began by degrees to lay aſide their barbarous Cuſtoms, and by Converſation with the French became more civilized: to which was added the holy and ſingle Life of* Letardus *the Biſhop, who came over with the Queen, by which without ſpeaking he did invite the King to the knowledge of Chriſt our Lord: by which means it came to paſs that the Mind of the King being already ſoftened, did ſo readily yield to the preaching of* Auguſtin. By which it appears that the main of the buſineſs as to the *King's* Converſion was effected before *Auguſtin*'s coming; only for the greater ſolemnity of it, a *Miſſion* from *Rome* was obtained; and I am much deceived, if *Gregory* himſelf doth not imply that it was at the requeſt of the *Engliſh Saxons* themſelves. I know very well what an idle Story the *Monks* tell of the occaſion of the Converſion of the *Engliſh* Nation, *viz. S.* Gregory*'s ſeeing ſome pretty Engliſh boys to be ſold for Slaves at* Rome, *and having luckily hit upon two or three pious Quibbles in alluſion to the Names of their Nation, and* Country,

Alford Annales Eccleſ. ad A. D. 561. *n.* 1.

Bed. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. *c.* 25.

Greg. Turon. l. 4. *c.* 26. *L.* 9. *c.* 26.

Chronic. W. Thorn. c. 2. *ſ.* 2.

Malmesbur. de geſtis Reg. Angl. l. 1. *c.* 1.

Countrey, and King, he was at laſt in good earneſt moved to ſeek the Converſion of the whole Nation. A very likely Story for ſo grave a Saint! I do not quarrel with it on the account of *the cuſtom of ſelling Engliſh Slaves*, but for the *Monkiſhneſs*, *i.e.* the *ſillineſs* of it. I know *Bede* reports it, but he brings it in after ſuch a faſhion, as though he were afraid of the anger of his *Brethren* the *Monks* if he had left it out; for he mentions it as a reverend Tale with which the *Monks* uſed to entertain themſelves, that had come down to them, by that infallible method of Conveyance, viz. *Oral Tradition*, and quotes nothing elſe for it. Whereas in the Preface to his Hiſtory he tells his Readers, *that in the matters relating to* Gregory *he relyed on* Nothelmus *who had been at* Rome, *and had ſearched the Regiſter of the Roman* Church; but we ſee as to this Story he ſaith, *he had nothing but an old Tradition for it.* But ſince Mr. *Creſſy* is ſo zealous in Vindication of this Story, I deſire the other part of it may not be left out, which is told by *Brompton Abbot* of *Jorval*; viz. *that* S. Gregory *and his Companions were come three days journey towards* England; *and then ſitting down reading in a Meadow, a Graſhopper leapt upon his Book and made him leave off reading; then S.* Gregory *thinking ſeriouſly upon this little Creatures Name* (for his Wit lay much that way) he preſently found this Myſtery in it, *Locuſta*, ſaith he, *quaſi loco ſta:* which ſaith *Brompton he ſpake by a Prophetick Spirit, for Meſſengers immediately came upon them from* Rome *and ſtopped their journey.* And ſurely he had been much to blame to undertake ſuch a journey upon the Inſtigation of one *quibble*, if he had not been as ready to turn back upon the Admonition of another. But to ſet aſide theſe *Monkiſh fopperies*; the beſt *Authority* we can have in this caſe is of S. *Gregory* himſelf: ſeveral of whoſe Letters are ſtill extant in the *Regiſter* of his *Epiſtles*, relating to this Affair. In one ſent to the *Kings* of *France*, *Theodoric* and *Theodebert*, he expreſſeth himſelf thus; *Atque ideo pervenit ad nos, Anglorum gentem ad fidem Chriſtianam, Deo miſerante, deſideranter velle converti, ſed ſacerdotes veſtros è vicino negligere, & deſideria eorum ceſſare ſua adhortatione ſuccendere. Ob hoc igitur Auguſtinum ſervum Dei præſentium portitorem, cujus zelus & ſtudium bene nobis eſt cognitum, cum aliis ſervis Dei prævidimus illuc dirigendum. Quibus etiam injunximus ut aliquos ſecum e vicino debeant presbyteros ducere, cum quibus eorum poſſint mentes agnoſcere, & voluntatem admonitione ſua, quantam Deus donaverit adjuvare:* and to the ſame purpoſe he writes to *Brunichildis* their Mother. *Indicamus ad nos perveniſſe Anglorum gentem Deo annuente velle fieri Chriſtianam*, &c. Which are the moſt remarkable Teſtimonies we could deſire to our purpoſe: for theſe Letters were ſent by *Auguſtin* the *Monk*, before ever he had been in *England*; and therein the *Pope* expreſſeth *the deſire of the Engliſh Nation to embrace Chriſtianity* (not barely of *Ethelbert* and his *Court*) *that this deſire was made known at* Rome; *that upon this the Pope ſends* Auguſtin *and his Companions*; *that the French who were their Neighbours had been too negligent in this Work, and began to be more ſlack than formerly in it*; *that however now, ſince he had taken ſo much care to ſend theſe on purpoſe for that work, he intreats them to ſend over ſo many Prieſts as might ſerve for their Interpreters*: which is a plain diſcovery, that there had been entercourſe about the Chriſtian Religion between the *French* and the *Saxons* before; and that ſtill they underſtood their Language ſo well, as to ſerve for Interpreters to *Auguſtin* and his *Brethren*. Mr. *Creſſy* who

Beda hiſtor. Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 1.

Church hiſt. l. 12. c. 16. L. 13. c. 1. Joh. Brompton Chron. Regum Cantiæ in init.

Gregor. ep. l. 5. ep. 58.

Ep. 59.

who pares and clips Teſtimonies to make them ſerve his purpoſe, renders thoſe words, *Anglorum gentem deſideranter velle converti, & velle fieri Chriſtianam*; only thus; *that the Engliſh Nation were in a willing diſpoſition to receive the Chriſtian Faith*: but certainly not a *bare diſpoſition*, but a *deſire* too is implyed in them, and the latter words with the ſame ingenuity he thus expreſſes the ſenſe of; *but that the French Clergy and Biſhops their Neighbours were negligent and void of all Paſtoral ſolicitude towards them*: whereas methinks *deſideria eorum ceſſare ſua adhortatione ſuccendere*, are words, which although they do blame them for *preſent negligence*, do imply withal a *former care*; for how could they *ceaſe to do that* which they had never begun? And *Pope Gregory* in his Letter to the *Queen* whom he calls *Aldilberga* attributes very much of the ſucceſs of his *Miſſionaries* to *her Kindneſs and Prudence*; *although conſidering her Zeal and Learning, it was rather to be wondered that the work was ſo long in doing*: but, he ſaith, *God had reſerved the Glory of the Converſion of the Engliſh Nation, as a reward to her Vertue*; *and compares her with* Helena, *hoping that by her means the Converſion of the whole Nation would be made much more eaſie*; and he adds, *that her Fame had already reached as far as* Conſtantinople. By which we ſee how much the *knowledge* and *eſtabliſhment* of *Chriſtianity* in *this Nation*, is owing to the Care and Devotion of this good *Queen*: And that *Hadrianus Valeſius* had ſome reaſon to ſay, *that the Chriſtianity of* England *was owing rather to the Franks, than the Romans*.

Church hiſt. l. 13. *c.* 1. *n.* 7.

*Greg. Ep. l.*9. *ep.* 50.

v. Mezeray ad A. D. 570.

Hadrian. Valeſ. Rerum Franc. Tom. 2. *p.* 19.

§. 4. But ſuppoſing we ſhould yield that *Auguſtin* and his *Brethren* were the firſt who brought *Chriſtianity* among the *Engliſh Saxons*; how comes from thence ſuch a mighty obligation to the *Benedictine Order*? Is it ſo unqueſtionable that they were all *Benedictine*'s who came over, or that any of them were ſuch? By all the ſearch I can make, this may very well bear a Diſpute. For it is agreed on all ſides, that *Auguſtine* followed the ſame Rule, and was of the ſame *Order* that St. *Gregory* himſelf was of; and no meaner a Perſon than *Cardinal Baronius* hath utterly denyed that St. *Gregory* was of the *Benedictine Order*; methinks his Authority might at leaſt have made Mr. *Creſſy* not ſo peremptory in this Matter, and not ſo reſolved *to ſtand to it*: Eſpecially conſidering the Reaſons which he gives. For he plainly proves from St. *Gregory*'s own Words in his *Dialogues*, *that when he founded his Monaſtery in* Rome, *he did not take his Abbot from the Benedictine Monks, who were then removed by the perſecution of the Lombards to the Lateran Church*; *but ſent into the Province* Valeria *for one* Valentius, *whom he called his own Abbot*; and withal ſhews, *not only that the Benedictine Monaſtery at* Rome *had a diſtinct Succeſſion of Abbots, but that the Monaſteries of that Province, from whence* Valentius *was taken, were not under the Benedictine Rule*: *And that* Joh. Diaconus *was much to blame for making* St. Gregory *a Monk under one* Hilarion, *when himſelf ſaith expreſly, he was under* Valentius. The freedom of this Diſcourſe of *Baronius* brought a ſwarm of *Benedictine* Monks about him; *Bellottus*, *Conſt. Cajetanus*, and others; but *Antonius Gallonius* undertook the defence of *Baronius*; and at large ſhews, *that the Benedictines produced nothing but Trifles, Forgeries and Lyes to defend themſelves*; and *Spondanus* confeſſes that Gallonius *had with great ſtrength overthrown the Benedictine's Arguments*. But of late the *French Benedictines* have renewed the Quarrel againſt *Baronius*, who yet make

*Reyner. Apoſtol. Benedict. ſ.*1.

Baron. Annal. ad A. D. 581. *n.* 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

Apologeticus liber Antonii Gallonii adverſ. Conſt. Bellottum. Rom. 1604.

Spondan. ad A. D. 581. *n.* 5.

*Joh. Mabillon præfat. ad Acta Sanctorum Ordin. Benedict. ſ.*7.

make uſe only of the baffled Arguments of the former *Benedictines*; and after all confeſs, *that they are but conjectures; and that the greateſt ſtrength they have lies in* Auguſtin *the Monk and his Companions being of that Order.* If therefore we deſire them to prove *Auguſtin* to have been a *Benedictine*, they preſently fly to St. *Gregory's* being ſo; if we would have them prove *Gregory* to have been a *Benedictine*, then they ſay he muſt be, becauſe *Auguſtin* was ſo. So that the main proof of the point is, *that it muſt needs be ſo*; and it muſt needs be ſo, and they are reſolved *to ſtand to it*, becauſe it is for the Honour and Advantage of their Order. And therefore our *Engliſh Benedictines* have thought themſelves more than a little concerned in this Controverſie: For what would open the Purſes and Hearts of the People more towards them, than for them to be accounted the *Apoſtolical Order* of *England*? Alas! what have the Merits of the *Jeſuits* been to theirs? They, an upſtart Order, that have converted ſome in theſe latter Times to Treaſon and the Gallows; but the *Benedictines*, the ancient *Apoſtolical Benedictines*, were the only Perſons who *converted England* to the Chriſtian Faith; and therefore they deſerve greater Reſpect than the *Jeſuits*; however, the others have been too cunning for them. Thus we ſee, upon what *Hinge* the *Controverſie* turns: And I cannot ſay, the *Benedictines* have been wanting to themſelves; for Mr. *Creſſy* hath not been the only Perſon, who hath reſolved *to ſtand to it* in this matter. *Reynerius* hath publiſhed a Voluminous Book to this purpoſe, which he calls, *The Apoſtleſhip of the* Benedictines *in* England; and he proves it chiefly from the *common Tradition of the Engliſh Nation.* And what Demonſtration can be greater, than the *Infallibility* of *Oral Tradition*? This is proving it in *I. S.* his *Scientifical way. As though it were poſſible for the People to be deceived in a matter of ſuch Conſequence; which Mothers would be ſure to teach their Children, viz.* that *Auguſtin* the *Monk* and his Companions, were by no means *Equitians*, or of any other Order, but right and true *Benedictines*. I confeſs *Reyner* hath luckily hit on the right Mathematical way; the very ſame *Monſieur Arnauld* hath taken for *Tranſubſtantiation*: For, ſaith *Reyner*, *I will inſtance in an Age wherein all the Monaſteries and Cathedral Churches poſſeſſed by Monks in* England, *were in the hands of the Benedictines,* viz. *in the Age of* William *the Conquerour:* For which he quotes many Authors, as *Monſieur Arnauld* doth to prove *Tranſubſtantiation* to have been the Faith of the ſame Age: *Now ſince it is evident that the* Benedictine *Order was then in poſſeſſion, and no time can be inſtanced in wherein the* Benedictine *Order was brought into* England *from the time of* Auguſtin, *it neceſſarily follows, that* Auguſtin *and his Companions brought it in.* Here is a demonſtration in the Caſe! which I grant to be altogether as good as that which the Men for *Oral Tradition* do produce for their *Articles* of *Faith*. Thus he proves it, from Teſtimonies of Authors, and the Foundation of Monaſteries and the particular Hiſtories of them; by which it appearing, that they were at ſuch a time of the *Benedictine* Order, and no account being given of any change of the Order, he thinks it ſufficiently proved that they were Originally *Benedictines*. But is it not poſſible to ſuppoſe that the Hiſtories being afterwards written by *Benedictine Monks*, they would for the honour of their *Order* conceal any ſuch alteration, if it had happened among them? We find in other Countries, the *Benedictines* have done the ſame thing, and why ſhould

Apoſtolatus Benedict. Angliæ opera Clement. Reyneri. A.D. 1626. S. 2. p. 7.

S. 3. p. 9.

ſhould we wonder if they have done it in *England?* *Trithemius*, who was no Fool, for the greater Honour of the *Benedictines*, reckons *Capraſius* among the famous Men of that Order; but the Miſchief of it is, that *Capraſius* lived about a Hundred Years before St. *Benedict*: As *Vincentius Baralis* obſerves. So likewiſe he places St. *Cæſarius* among them, who dyed (after he had been Biſhop of *Arles* Forty Years) before St. *Benedict*, and therefore was ſomewhat unlikely to be bred up a Monk in his Order: Indeed in one of his *Homilies* he calls St. *Benedict our Father*; but the ſame *Vincentius* obſerves, that the name *Benedict* was foiſted in by the *Monks*, no ſuch Name appearing in the Ancient *MS.* And it appears by the foregoing Chapter that this Demonſtration will not hold in *France*; and certainly there is as little reaſon it ſhould in *England*.

Trithem. de viris illuſtribus ordin S. Benedict. l. 3. *c.* 279.

Chronclog. Sanctorum Inſulæ Lerinenſ. p. 193.

Trith. l. 3. *c.* 84.

Baralis, p. 261.

§. 5. For Mr. *Broughton* hath taken a great deal of pains to prove, *That there were other antient Orders which continued after the coming of* Auguſtin, *that neither* Gregory *nor* Auguſtin, *nor his Companions could be* Benedictines; *that the Monaſtick Rules introduced by* Auguſtin *were very different from thoſe of* Benedict; *both in Habit, Cuſtoms, publick Service and other particulars: and that not any one Monaſtery, till about an hundred years after* Auguſtin's *coming into* England, *was or could be of* S. Benedict's *Rule or Order*: and in anſwer to the former Demonſtration, he ſaith, *That ſince it is evident there was no ſuch thing in* Ethelbert *and S.* Auſtins *time: the other latter times are produced to no purpoſe; all Men granting that both* Benedictine *Monks, and many latter Orders were in* England *in thoſe days.* And what doth meek Mr. *Creſſy* anſwer to *angry* Mr. *Broughton*, as he calls him? He produces the Teſtimony of our four Learned *Antiquaries* Sr. *R. C.* Sr. *H. Sp.* Mr. *Selden* and Mr. *Cambden*; which he produces falſly and to little purpoſe. Falſly, for he thus introduces it; *that they expreſly in oppoſition to Mr.* Broughton *teſtifie, that whereas he affirmed, that the firſt* Converters *of* Saxons *in* England, *were not* Benedictines, *but* Equitians, *&c.* Who affirmed this? Mr. *Broughton?* I wiſh Mr. *Creſſy* would learn to write either with more honeſty, or more care. For Mr. *Broughton* in the very Title-page of his *Book* ſaith, *That the Deſign of it is to prove, that in the Primitive Church of the* Saxons, *there was no Rule, nor Order from* Egypt, *nor of S.* Benedict, *nor of S.* Equitius: and in the body of his Book he very often diſproves *their Opinion who made* Auguſtine *and his Companions to be of an* Equitian *Order*: And Mr. *Broughton* writ ſince their teſtimony, and in confutation of it. Now their Teſtimony, as it is ſet down by Mr. *Creſſy*, is thus, *that they having ſpent much time in ſearching the Antiquities of our Nation, do affirm, they could find only two ſorts of Monks in the ancient* Saxon *Churches, the firſt ſuch as followed the* Egyptian *form of Monachiſm, before St.* Auſtin's *Arrival* (which plainly makes againſt Mr. *Creſſy*, being an expreſs acknowledgment, that there was another Order of *Monks* among the *Saxons*, and conſequently that *Chriſtianity* was entertained by them before St. *Auſtin's* Arrival in *England*) *and the other* Benedictines, *Companions of St.* Auſtin. *And as for* Equitians, *no ſuch Name was extant in any ancient Record. Moreover, that whereas they could exactly diſcover the Original and Entrance of all other Religious Orders, and could name the very Years, they could not do ſo of the* Benedictines, *which firmly argues that St.* Auguſtine *and his Aſſociates were* Benedictines, *&c.* I could

Broughtons Memorial, c. 13, 14, 18, 23, 24, 25, *&c.*

C. 30.

Epiſt. Apol. ſect. 35.

could hardly believe that Perſons of ſo much Underſtanding would ever draw up ſuch a Teſtimony as this, which at leaſt ſeems to contradict it ſelf; for whereas they ſay, *they could not Name the Year when the* Benedictines *came in*; *and yet they ſay that St.* Auguſtine *and his Companions did bring the* Benedictine *Order hither*; the time of whoſe coming they as certainly knew, as of any other Orders, looks too much like a Contradiction for ſuch great Men to be guilty of. But we muſt ſuppoſe they meant any Year after *Auguſtine*'s coming; yet I can hardly think ſuch knowing Perſons ſhould not at leaſt be able to give a very probable conjecture concerning it. For in the MS. Life of *Wilfrid* extant in the *Library* of one of thoſe Learned Perſons, and written by one that lived in the ſame time with him, and whoſe Name is mentioned by *Bede* in his Hiſtory, viz. *Steph. Eddius* or *Heddius*, we have this Account of him; *that at fourteen Years of Age, he was ſent by Queen* Eanfled *to attend upon a Nobleman called* Cudda *in the Monaſtery of* Lindisfarn: *After he had been there a while the Spirit moved him* (ſuggerente Spiritu Sancto) *to go to* Rome *to viſit the Apoſtolical See*; adhuc inattritam viam genti noſtræ temptare in cor adoleſcentis ſupradicti aſcendit; *a Road very little frequented by our Nation* (it ſeems then *Pilgrimages*, and *Appeals* to *Rome* were very little known in thoſe days). *The Queen underſtanding his deſire ſends him to* Erconbert *King of* Kent, *who found out a companion for him whom he calls* Biſcop-baducing; (but more commonly known by the name of *Benedict Biſcop*, whoſe life is written by *Bede*, and their going together is mentioned in his Hiſtory.) Wilfrid *ſtays a while behind in* France; *but afterwards arriv'd at* Rome, *where by the help of* Boniface *the Arch-Deacon he was well inſtructed in the Rules of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, and admitted to the Popes Favour and Benediction*: after which he ever continued the Popes moſt humble Servant.) *In his return through* France *he received the Tonſure of St.* Peter; (for it ſeems they were ſo cunning in thoſe Days, to know exactly the different Cuts of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, and of *Simon Magus*, (as we may ſee afterwards) and *Wilfrid* was guilty of no *malignant Ingratitude* for this favour, for he *ſtood to it* with great zeal againſt the *Scots*, who liked St. *Paul*'s Cut better.) *Upon his return he was entertained with great kindneſs by* Alchfrid *the Son of* Oſwi, *by whom he was drawn off from the Cuſtoms of his Country to thoſe of* Rome, *from whom* Wilfrid *received the Monaſtery of* Rippon, *and ſoon after was made Prieſt by* Agilbertus. Then happened the famous Conference between *Wilfrid* and *Colman*, Arch-biſhop of *York*, about the time of *Eaſter*, and the right *Tonſure*, wherein *Wilfrid* ſhewed a more than ordinary zeal for the *Roman Cuſtoms*; inſomuch that when upon the Ceſſion of *Colman* he was choſen *Biſhop* he refuſed to be conſecrated by any of them, as *Schiſmatical Perſons*; and therefore in great humility he deſired leave to be conſecrated in *France*. In the mean time *Ceadda* by King *Oſwi*'s conſent was made *Biſhop*, and conſecrated at home; *Wilfrid* upon his return finding the See full, was employed by *Vulpher* King of the *Mercians* to ſettle Monaſteries; and after the Death of *Deus-dedit*, he was ſent for by *Ecbert* King of *Kent*, *where he went up and down through his Countrey*, and then adds, *& cum Regula Benedicti inſtituta Eccleſiarum bene melioravit, he improved the Orders of Churches by the Rule of St.* Benedict; which is in effect to ſay, *that he firſt brought this Order among them*; for how could he *better* their *Orders* by it, if they had it among them before? And he preſently

Vit. S. Wilfrid. c. 2, 3. MS. *in Biblioth. Cotton.*

Bed. Hiſt. l. 4. *c.* 2.

Bed. Hiſt. Abbatum Wiremuth, &c.

Bed. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 5. *c.* 20.

Vit. Wilfrid. c. 5.

C. 7.

C. 10.

C. 12.

C. 14.

preſently adds, *Tunc ergo in illis regionibus ſancto Epiſcopo ſicut Paulo Apoſtolo magnum oſtium fidei Deo adjuvante apertum eſt*: As though the receiving the *Order* of St. *Benedict* were of as much conſequence as *believing the Chriſtian Faith.* After three Years by *Theodore*'s means then *Arch-biſhop* of *Canterbury*, he was put into the *Arch-biſhoprick* of *York*, and *Ceadda* depoſed; he had not been long there, but refuſing to conſent to the making of three *Biſhops* under him, he was deprived by *Theodore*: *Wilfrid* appeals to *Rome*, and haſtens thither himſelf, where he was kindly received (for *Rome* from its Foundation hath been an *Aſylum* for *Fugitives*, eſpecially when their coming helps to increaſe its *Grandeur*) *Pope Agatho* with his Council, Orders his reſtitution, and threatens Deprivation and Excommunication to thoſe that refuſe him: *Wilfrid* returns loaden with *Reliques*, and the *Popes Bull*; the *King* and the *Biſhops* refuſe to obey the *Popes* Command; and inſtead of reſtoring him, the *King* commits him to Priſon, and afterwards baniſhed him; and he returned not home till the ſecond Year of *Aldfrid*, where he continued not long, but he was baniſhed again for refuſing to ſubmit to the *Synodical Conſtitutions* at home. Then a *Synod* was called of all the *Biſhops* of *England*, to which *Wilfrid* was ſummon'd, where he upbraided the Biſhops, *that they had oppoſed the Popes Command for twenty two Years, and wondered they durſt prefer the Conſtitutions of* Theodore *before the Bull of the Pope*. (Was not *England* in great ſubjection to *Rome* at that time, when all the *Biſhops* (one factious Perſon excepted) refuſed to obey the Pope upon an Appeal for two and twenty Years together? and governed themſelves by their own Conſtitutions in oppoſition to the Popes expreſs Command?) Notwithſtanding, the *Biſhops* perſiſt in their reſolution, and would hearken to no terms, unleſs *Wilfrid* would ſubmit to their Sentence, and oblige himſelf to *run no more beyond Sea*; which he refuſes to do, and appeals again to *Rome*, upon which *Wilfrid* and all his Adherents were ſolemnly excommunicated. But it is obſervable, that where *Wilfrid* ſpeaks the moſt in his own Vindication, he inſiſts on theſe things as his great Merits: *That he had been the great Inſtrument of converting the* Scots (*and Engliſh* following them) *to the true* Eaſter *and the right Tonſure*; *and that he had brought the Monks under the Rule of St.* Benedict, *which no Man had brought among them before*. By which we ſee, that *Wilfrid* (at leaſt in the *Northern* parts) was the firſt who brought in the *Benedictine Order*. Which paſſage *Eadmerus*, a *Benedictine Monk* in the Life of *Wilfrid*, thought convenient to leave out, although he takes moſt of the reſt out of *Heddius*; and ſo doth *Fredegodus* in the rumbling Verſes of his Life, publiſhed lately by the *Benedictines* of *France*: But *William* of *Malmesbury* hath the very ſame Words in effect of *Wilfrid*, *that he gloried that he had been the firſt who brought the* Benedictine *Order into thoſe parts*. It is a ſtrange Objection of *Reyner* againſt this, *that he would not boaſt of doing it there, unleſs it had been every where elſe in* England *before his time*; for we have no mention at all of this *Rule* here before his *time*; and he might think he had cauſe to glory to begin that *Order* in the *North*, and to give an Example to others: And if our Hiſtorians ſay true, he brought it into the *Midland* parts, for he had a great hand in the conſecration of the *Abby* of *Eveſham*, which Pope *Conſtantine* in his *Bull*, ſaith, *it was to be under the* Benedictine *Rule*, *quæ minus in illis partibus adhuc habetur*, which

C. 29.

C. 31.

C. 41.

C. 42.

C. 43.

C. 44.

Eadmer. vit. Wilfr. MS. in Biblioth. Cotton.

V. Secul. 3. Benedict. p. 221.

Malmesb. de geſtis Pontif. Angl. l. 3.

Reyner. Apoſtolat. Benedict. tr. 1. ſect. 1. ſect. 8.

Id ſect. 11. p. 39.

Monaſtic. Anglican. Tom. 1. p. 144.

is yet very little known in thoſe parts. So that the coming in of the *Benedictine Order* into thoſe parts of *England*, is not a matter of ſo great obſcurity as thoſe Learned Perſons ſuppoſed; and that ſome time after the Death of *Auguſtine* and his *Companions*; but it hath been therefore thought ſo obſcure, becauſe only this Author, who was never yet printed, makes ſo expreſs mention of it; the *Benedictines* afterwards thinking it made for their Honour to conceal it.

§. 6. The greateſt difficulty ſeems to be about our *Church* of *Canterbury*, of which Mr. *Selden* ſaith, *that it was always ſuppoſed to be of the* Benedictine *Order, from its firſt Foundation by* Auguſtin. *For*, ſaith he, *ſince there were always Monks there, and no other Order named, we have reaſon to believe them to have been* Benedictines; *for the name of Monk being ſet without addition of Family, he ſuppoſes in the Weſtern parts to have implyed a* Benedictine, *as in the Eaſtern one of S.* Baſil'*s Order.* Suppoſing this were granted of the latter times, after that the *Benedictine Order* prevailed in the times of *Dunſtan*; when the *Concordia Regularis Anglicæ Nationis* was generally received after the Expulſion of the Canonical and Secular Clergy out of moſt *Cathedrals*; yet I can ſee no reaſon at all for it before, when there were ſo many different *Rules* of *Monks* both here and in *Italy* and *France*. All thoſe who lived after the Monaſtick way, whether they lived by Rule, or only under the Government of a Superiour, had equally the name of *Monks* given to them. But of all ſorts of *Monks* of that time, thoſe whom *Auguſtin* brought with him, and were ſettled at *Canterbury*, ſeem to be the fartheſt from the *Benedictine* Rule; for any one that looks into that, will eaſily ſee that it was intended for *illiterate Perſons*, who were to imploy themſelves in *Work* when the Office of the *Choire* was over; and for ſuch who lived at a *diſtance* from *Cities*, and conſequently were to have all conveniencies within themſelves, and all the Monks in their Courſe were to go through the Office of the Kitchin and ſuch like: But thoſe whom S. *Gregory* ſent over with *Auguſtin* were *Clergy-men*, and to be conſtantly imployed in preaching and other duties of their Function: and when *Auguſtin* ſent to *Gregory* for directions (after he was made *Biſhop*) how he ſhould live among them; *Gregory* takes not the leaſt notice of the *Benedictine Rule*, which on ſuch an occaſion he would certainly have done, if they had been of that Order; but only tells him, *he ought to live with his Clergy after the Cuſtom of the Primitive Church, which was to have all things in common.* From which it is very plain, that he conſidered them as *Clergy-men*; who if they had been tyed to the *Benedictine Rule*, could have had very few hours of the day, either for Study, or their other Imployments. Only he adviſeth them *in the beginning of this Church to follow the pattern of the Church of* Hieruſalem, *to live in a Community together*: Much after the ſame way which S. *Auguſtin* had brought into reputation in *Africa* among his *Clergy*, and who from thence in latter times were called *Canons Regular*. And which is very obſervable to our purpoſe, *Eugenius* the fourth in a *Bull* in behalf of the Canons of the *Lateran Church*, ſaith expreſly, that St. *Gregory commanded* Auſtin *to eſtabliſh this Order in the Engliſh Church.* And theſe *Canons* (without the firſt community) continued in the *Church* of *Canterbury*, long after the *Benedictine Monks* were brought into it. For I find

Selden. Not. in Eadmer. p. 215.

Bed. Hiſt. l. 1. c. 27.

Pennot. de Canon. l. 2. c. 14.

find as low as *Thomas Becket*'s time, that *Alexander* the third writ to the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*, to make good his promiſe to one whom he had admitted *Canon of that Church*, and promiſed him the firſt *Prebend* that fell; from whence the *Gloſs* of the *Canon Law* deduceth, that a Man may be inſtituted *Canon* of a Church, and yet expect the next vacancy, ſuppoſing that he receives ſome Profits though but ſmall the mean while. And *Thomas Becket* mentions the *Prebends* of *Canterbury* that were vacant in one of his *MS. Epiſtles* to *Henry* II. And that *Monks* and *Canons* have both continued in the ſame Church, is fully proved by *Pennottus*. If therefore I ſhould grant, that the *Benedictine Monks* came early into that Church, yet that proves nothing as to the Converſion of the *Nation* by them; for thoſe were of the *Clergy* who were employ'd in that work; the *Monks* by the *Benedictin Rule* being ſo ſtrictly tyed to the ſervice of the *Choire*, as made them fit for very little beſides. I ſhall not therefore diſpute with *Malmesbury* or Mr. *Selden*, *whether* Alfric *were the firſt who brought in the Monks; or whether they were not ſettled by* Boniface *in the time of* Laurentius? but this I inſiſt upon, that whereas by that conſtitution of *Boniface*, the *Clergy* of that *Church* were required to aſſociate to them a *Company of Monks*; in all probability it was intended for this purpoſe, that while the others were imployed in other Duties of their Function, the *Monks* might be ready to attend the ſervice of the *Choire*: and yet neither *Boniface* nor *Gregory* ever call them by the name of *Benedictine Monks*; or ſo much as once mention that *Rule* in all the Affairs relating to the *Saxon Church*: which will ſeem very ſtrange, conſidering its Novelty at that time, and what ſmall reputation it was in, either in *France*, or *Italy*. And however *Wilfrid*, or *Benedict Biſcop* might in ſome particular Monaſteries introduce the *Benedictine Rule*; yet as that Learned Gentleman Sir *John Marſham* hath obſerved, *there is no General Conſtitution preſcribing it, before the Council of* Wincheſter *under* Dunſtan, *A. D.* 965. and then it was not the *pure Benedictine Rule*, but a *Collection of antient Cuſtoms* accommodated to that *Rule*; as will eaſily appear to any that will compare the *Rule* and that *Concordia Regularis* together; not as it was imperfectly publiſhed by Mr. *Selden*, but as it is extant entire in *Reyner's Appendix*. Methinks ſo great a Zealot, as *Dunſtan* was for the Benedictine Order, ſhould not have continued the *old Cuſtoms* together with that *Rule*, if he had been of Mr. *Creſſy*'s Mind, in believing it to have been written by *Divine Inſpiration*: nay, *Wilfrid* and *Benedict Biſcop*, were not for the *pure Benedictine Rule*; for the former, ſome ſay, joyned the *Gregorian Office* with it, and the latter declares expreſly, *that he had gathered his Rule out of the Cuſtoms of ſeventeen Monaſteries*: Which was a very vain and fruitleſs labour, if he had thought S. *Benedict* writ his *Rule* by the *Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*.

ec retal. Greg. l. 3. tit. 5. de Præb. c. Relat.

Codex. Epiſtol. MS. l. 1. ep. 62.

Pennotti Hiſt. Tripartit. de Canon. Reg. l. 1. c. 61.

Malmesbur. de geſt. Pontif. l. 1.

Præfat. ad Sec. 1. Benedict. p. 43.

Propulæ ad Monaſt. Anglican.

Reyner. Append. p. 3. p. 77.

Præfat. Bened. n. 89.

The *French Benedictines* who have lately undertaken to prove that *the Benedictines converted* England, do ſuppoſe, without reaſon, that ſince by the *Conſtitution* of *Boniface* it appears *that there were Monks very early in the Church of* Canterbury, *they muſt be either Equitian or Benedictine Monks*; we meddle not with *Equitian Monks*, which our learned *Antiquaries* upon good grounds ſay, *they meet with no Footſteps of in our Records*: that was a particular conceit of *Baronius*, and was quitted by his defender *Gallonius*; but we ſay, that in *Italy* at that time, there were ſeveral Inſtitutions of *Monks* different from

Præfat. Bened. ad ſec. 1. ſ. 8.

is yet very little known in thoſe parts. So that the coming in of the *Benedictine Order* into thoſe parts of *England*, is not a matter of ſo great obſcurity as thoſe Learned Perſons ſuppoſed; and that ſome time after the Death of *Auguſtine* and his *Companions*; but it hath been therefore thought ſo obſcure, becauſe only this Author, who was never yet printed, makes ſo expreſs mention of it; the *Benedictines* afterwards thinking it made for their Honour to conceal it.

Selden. Not. in Eadmer. p. 215.

§. 6. The greateſt difficulty ſeems to be about our *Church* of *Canterbury*, of which Mr. *Selden* ſaith, *that it was always ſuppoſed to be of the* Benedictine *Order, from its firſt Foundation by* Auguſtin. *For,* ſaith he, *ſince there were always Monks there, and no other Order named, we have reaſon to believe them to have been* Benedictines; *for the name of Monk being ſet without addition of Family, he ſuppoſes in the Weſtern parts to have implyed a* Benedictine, *as in the Eaſtern one of S. Baſil's Order.* Suppoſing this were granted of the latter times, after that the *Benedictine Order* prevailed in the times of *Dunſtan*; when the *Concordia Regularis Anglicæ Nationis* was generally received after the Expulſion of the Canonical and Secular Clergy out of moſt *Cathedrals*; yet I can ſee no reaſon at all for it before, when there were ſo many different *Rules* of *Monks* both here and in *Italy* and *France*. All thoſe who lived after the Monaſtick way, whether they lived by Rule, or only under the Government of a Superiour, had equally the name of *Monks* given to them. But of all ſorts of *Monks* of that time, thoſe whom *Auguſtin* brought with him, and were ſettled at *Canterbury*, ſeem to be the fartheſt from the *Benedictine* Rule; for any one that looks into that, will eaſily ſee that it was intended for *illiterate Perſons*, who were to imploy themſelves in *Work* when the Office of the *Choire* was over; and for ſuch who lived at a *diſtance* from *Cities*, and conſequently were to have all conveniencies within themſelves, and all the Monks in their Courſe were to go through the Office of the Kitchin and ſuch like: But thoſe whom S. *Gregory* ſent over with *Auguſtin* were *Clergy-men*, and to be conſtantly imployed in preaching and other duties of their Function: and when *Auguſtin* ſent to *Gregory* for directions (after he was made *Biſhop*) how he ſhould live among them; *Gregory* takes not the leaſt notice of the *Benedictine Rule*, which on ſuch an occaſion he would certainly have done, if they had been of that Order; but only tells him, *he ought to live with his Clergy after the Cuſtom of the Primitive Church, which was to have all things in common.* From which it is very plain, that he conſidered them as *Clergy-men*; who if they had been tyed to the *Benedictine Rule*, could have had very few hours of the day, either for Study, or their other Imployments. Only he adviſeth them *in the beginning of this Church to follow the pattern of the Church of* Hieruſalem, *to live in a Community together*: Much after the ſame way which S. *Auguſtin* had brought into reputation in *Africa* among his *Clergy*, and who from thence in latter times were called *Canons Regular*. And which is very obſervable to our purpoſe, *Eugenius* the fourth in a *Bull* in behalf of the Canons of the *Lateran Church*, ſaith expreſly, that St. *Gregory commanded* Auſtin *to eſtabliſh this Order in the Engliſh Church.* And theſe *Canons* (without the firſt community) continued in the *Church* of *Canterbury*, long after the *Benedictine Monks* were brought into it. For I find

Bed. Hiſt. l. 1. c. 27.

Pennot. de Canon. l. 2. c. 14.

find as low as *Thomas Becket*'s time, that *Alexander* the third writ to the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*, to make good his promiſe to one whom he had admitted *Canon of that Church*, and promiſed him the firſt *Prebend* that fell; from whence the *Gloſs* of the *Canon Law* deduceth, that a Man may be inſtituted *Canon* of a Church, and yet expect the next vacancy, ſuppoſing that he receives ſome Profits though but ſmall the mean while. And *Thomas Becket* mentions the *Prebends* of *Canterbury* that were vacant in one of his *MS. Epiſtles* to *Henry* II. And that *Monks* and *Canons* have both continued in the ſame Church, is fully proved by *Pennottus*. If therefore I ſhould grant, that the *Benedictine Monks* came early into that Church; yet that proves nothing as to the Converſion of the *Nation* by them; for thoſe were of the *Clergy* who were employ'd in that work; the *Monks* by the *Benedictin Rule* being ſo ſtrictly tyed to the ſervice of the *Choire*, as made them fit for very little beſides. I ſhall not therefore diſpute with *Malmesbury* or Mr. *Selden*, *whether* Alfric *were the firſt who brought in the Monks: or whether they were not ſettled by* Boniface *in the time of* Laurentius? but this I inſiſt upon, that whereas by that conſtitution of *Boniface*, the *Clergy* of that *Church* were required to aſſociate to them a *Company of Monks*; in all probability it was intended for this purpoſe, that while the others were imployed in other Duties of their Function, the *Monks* might be ready to attend the ſervice of the *Choire*: and yet neither *Boniface* nor *Gregory* ever call them by the name of *Benedictine Monks*, or ſo much as once mention that *Rule* in all the Affairs relating to the *Saxon Church*: which will ſeem very ſtrange, conſidering its Novelty at that time, and what ſmall reputation it was in, either in *France*, or *Italy*. And however *Wilfrid*, or *Benedict Biſcop* might in ſome particular Monaſteries introduce the *Benedictine Rule*; yet as that Learned Gentleman Sir *John Marſham* hath obſerved, *there is no General Conſtitution preſcribing it, before the Council of* Wincheſter *under* Dunſtan, *A. D.* 965. and then it was not the *pure Benedictine Rule*, but a *Collection of antient Cuſtoms* accommodated to that *Rule*; as will eaſily appear to any that will compare the *Rule* and that *Concordia Regularis* together; not as it was imperfectly publiſhed by Mr. *Selden*, but as it is extant entire in *Reyner's Appendix*. Methinks ſo great a Zealot, as *Dunſtan* was for the Benedictine Order, ſhould not have continued the *old Cuſtoms* together with that *Rule*, if he had been of Mr. *Creſſy*'s Mind, in believing it to have been written by *Divine Inſpiration*: nay, *Wilfrid* and *Benedict Biſcop*, were not for the *pure Benedictine Rule*; for the former, ſome ſay, joyned the *Gregorian Office* with it, and the latter declares expreſly, *that he had gathered his Rule out of the Cuſtoms of ſeventeen Monaſteries*: Which was a very vain and fruitleſs labour, if he had thought S. *Benedict* writ his *Rule* by the *Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*.

Decretal. Greg. l. 3. tit. 5. de Præb. c. relat.

Codex. Epiſtol. MS. l. 1. ep. 62.

Pennotti Hiſt. Tripartit. de Canon. Reg. l. 1. c. 61.

Malmesbur. de geſt. Pontif. l. 1.

Præfat. ad Sec. 1. Benedict. p. 43.

Propulæ ad Monaſt. Anglican.

Reyner. Append. p. 3. p. 77.

Præfat. Bened. n. 89.

The *French Benedictines* who have lately undertaken to prove that *the Benedictines converted* England, do ſuppoſe, without reaſon, that ſince by the *Conſtitution* of *Boniface* it appears *that there were Monks very early in the Church of* Canterbury, *they muſt be either Equitian or Benedictine Monks*; we meddle not with *Equitian Monks*, which our learned *Antiquaries* upon good grounds ſay, *they meet with no Footſteps of in our Records*: that was a particular conceit of *Baronius*, and was quitted by his defender *Gallonius*; but we ſay, that in *Italy* at that time, there were ſeveral Inſtitutions of *Monks* different from

Præfat. Bened. ad ſec. 1. ſ. 8.

thoſe of S. *Equitius* and S. *Benedict*. For every Perſon who affected that kind of Life, and was able to found a Monaſtery, gave ſuch *Rules* to it, as he thought fit. Some were firſt inſtituted for *Devotion and Labour*, as it is plain the *Benedictine Order* was, by the Rule of it; others for *Devotion* and *Study*, as it is evident thoſe of *Caſſiodore* were, by the occaſion of them, and the Counſel he gives them, others for thoſe of the *Clergy* to live together after a *Monaſtick* way; of which ſort *Pennottus* ſhews there were many in *Italy* at that time, after the bringing over that *Order* from *Africa* by *Gelaſius* Son of *Valerius* a Biſhop of *Africa*, who had been one of St. *Auguſtin*'s Diſciples. Now there being ſo many ſeveral ways and deſigns of a Monaſtick Life at that time, it can by no means be ſufficient to prove the ancient *Monks* of *Canterbury*, mentioned by *Boniface* to have been *Benedictines*, becauſe they were not *Equitians*; and if we ſuppoſe them to have been Monks joyned to the *Canonical* Clergy at *Canterbury* for attendance on the Choire, as the *Benedictine Monks* were to the *Canons* of the *Lateran Church* after the deſtruction of the *Monaſtery* of *Caſſino*; yet this is far enough from proving that *Auguſtin* or the *preaching Monks* were of that *Order*; which it is their deſign to prove: And themſelves ſuggeſt that concerning the Council of *Boniface* when *Mellitus* was at *Rome*, which affords us a good Argument againſt them; viz. *That when* Mellitus *was ſent to* Rome, *about the Affairs of the Engliſh Church, they confeſs that a Diſpute was raiſed about the Benedictine Monks whether they were capable of Prieſthood or no?* But what likelihood was there that ſhould have been ever called in Queſtion at *Rome*, if it had been a thing ſo notorious, that *Gregory* and *Auguſtin* and his *Companions* were of that Order, and had born the *Office* of *Prieſthood*? Who durſt have queſtioned it, after that St. *Gregory* had declared it not only by his Example, but by the *Miſſion* of *Auſtin* and his Brethren hither to preach and do all Prieſtly Offices? But the Ground of the Queſtion was not for the *Monks* bred up to *Learning*, as thoſe of St. *Gregory*'s own Monaſtery were, out of which *Auſtin* and his *Brethren* came; but for thoſe who were bred up only to Devotion and Labour, as thoſe of the *Benedictine* Order muſt be by their Rule; as to which it might very well bear a diſpute, ſince their time was to be otherwiſe employed; and all that *Pope* Boniface *had to ſay was, that S.* Benedict *doth no where forbid it*; but withal by his Rule he gives ſuch directions, that no Man can obſerve them, as every one ſwears to do, and perform the neceſſary Duties of the Prieſtly Office together. The Teſtimony of *Johannes Diaconus* hath been long ſince anſwered by *Gallonius*, who hath ſhewed him to be a very incompetent witneſs in this matter. But they have not at all taken notice of the *Teſtimony* of *Malmesbury*, who ſaith, *That the Benedictine Order came into* England *from the Abby of* Fleury; *being brought hither by* Oſwald; who had been a Monk there, not long before the *Council* of *Wincheſter*; which firſt made any eſtabliſhment of it here. I do not then deny, that this *Order* was introduced by a particular Devotion of ſome Perſons in ſome few Places before; to which the Teſtimonies of *Wilfrid*, *Benedict Biſcop*, and *Aldelmus* refer; but the general Reception of it was not before the times of *Dunſtan*; and with what Confuſions and Diſorders, with what Severities and Injuſtice to the Canonical and Secular Clergy it was then eſtabliſhed, may be eaſily ſeen in our Hiſtories. For *Dunſtan Oſwald*, and *Ethelwald* ſet themſelves with all their Power, (which

Caſſiod. Divin. lect. præfat. & *c.* 32.

Pennot. de Canonic. Regular. l. 2. *c.* 14, 15 &*c.*

Ivo part. 7. *c.* 22.

Gallon. Reſponſ. ad Monach. Bened. p. 108, 109.

Malmesbur. de geſtis Pontific. l. 3. *p.* 153.

(which was great by the Favour of King *Edgar*) to drive out the *Canons* out of the Cathedral Churches belonging to them, and to bring in the Monks in their rooms: And other Biſhops thought it a good way to preferment to follow their Example. And from hence forward the *Benedictine* Monks kept the poſſeſſion not only of the greater Monaſteries, but of ſeveral of the Cathedral Churches, contrary to the deſign of their Rule, if the *Ciſtertian* Abbats may be believed, who declare their Reſolution to keep the *Benedictine* Rule, and therefore would *wholly withdraw from Cities*, and *have nothing to do in Churches, that ſo they might live retired, not upon the Profits of Churches, but upon their own Stock and Induſtry, according to the intention of their Rule.* And that this *Reſolution* of the *Ciſtertians* was moſt agreeable to the *Benedictine Rule*, is declared by the many *Bulls* of *Popes* which are extant for the confirmation of the *Ciſtertian* Order, or rather *Reformation* of the *Benedictine*, according to the firſt *Deſign* and *Letter* of their *Rule*.

Exord. Cænob. Ciſt. c. 15. *in Biblioth. Ciſterc. To.* 1. *Regula Conſtitut. & Privileg. Ordin. Ciſtert. à Chryſoſt. Henriquez.*

§. 7. Thus far Mr. *Creſſy*'s reſolution to *ſtand to it*, *that Chriſtianity was eſtabliſhed in* England *by the Diſciples of St.* Benedict, hath drawn me to the Diſcourſe of the *Means* and *Perſons* by which *England* was converted; but it may be after all this, he may find out a reſerve to himſelf, viz. *that he did not mean it of the firſt knowledge of Chriſtianity, but of the firm Settlement of it*: But neither can this be his meaning, nor if it were, is it any truer than the former. It cannot be his meaning, for his Words are, *that the Engliſh Saxons were indeed converted by the Diſciples of St.* Benedict, by which it is plain he ſpeaks of the firſt *Converſion*; but ſuppoſe he did not, the *eſtabliſhment or ſettlement of Chriſtianity* is no more owing to the *Benedictines* than the firſt *Converſion* of the *Nation*. For which we are to conſider, that a ſudden Apoſtaſie ſoon happen'd to *Paganiſm* after the Death of the firſt *Princes* who profeſſed *Chriſtianity*. For *Eadbald* King of *Kent*, Son to *Ethelbert*, revolted from it; but he ſoon repented his *Apoſtaſie*, and ſent for *Mellitus* and *Juſtus* out of *France* again; but the ſtate of Chriſtianity remained more deſperate in the *Eaſtern* parts after the Death of *Sebert*, and the *Apoſtaſie* of his Sons: And although ſome hopes appeared by the Converſion of *Erpenwald*, yet his Death happening ſoon after, things were as bad as ever, till the return of *Sigebert* out of *France*, who brought *Felix*, a *Burgundian Prieſt* with him, who was the great inſtrument of reſtoring Chriſtianity in thoſe parts. Among the *Weſt Saxons*, *Birinus* was the firſt Preacher of Chriſtianity, but he was ſo far from being a *Benedictine*, that Mr. *Creſſy* himſelf confeſſeth, that he was not by Profeſſion a *Monk*. In the *Northern* parts, after the Revolt of the Sons of *Edwin*, Chriſtianity was wholly reſtored in the time of King *Oſwald* by the *Scotiſh Chriſtians*, among whom himſelf was Converted and Baptized. *Bede* at large relates the coming of *Aidanus*, and his excellent Piety, Zeal, and Charity; whoſe good Example many others followed, till by great diligence in Preaching, and an excellent Converſation, they had ſettled Chriſtianity much more firmly than ever: And from thence Chriſtianity was conveyed into the *Middle Parts* of *England* in the time of *Peada* by *Finanus*, who carried with him four Prieſts, *Cedda*, and *Adda*, and *Betti*, and *Diuma*, whereof the laſt was a *Scot*, and the other *Engliſh*: This *Diuma* was made Biſhop, and conſecrated by *Finanus*: After him ſucceeded *Ceolla*, a *Scot* too: After him *Trumhere*,

Bed. l. 2. *c.* 6.

L. 2. *c.* 15.

L. 3. *c.* 18.

L. 3. *c.* 7.

Church hiſt. l. 15. *c.* 4. *n.* 9.

Bed. l. 3. *c.* 1.

c. 3.

L. 3. *c.* 21.

here, conſecrated by the *Scots*; after him *Jaruman*, after him *Ceadda*. L. 3. c. 22. *At the ſame time*, ſaith *Bede*, *the Eaſt Saxons recovered the Chriſtian Faith by the endeavours of King* Oſwi *of* Northumberland *with their King* Sigebert; who was likewiſe baptized by *Finanus*, and he conſecrated *Cedda*, to be their *Biſhop*. By which we ſee that when *Chriſtianity* was *ſettled* and *eſtabliſhed* in *England*, how much more it was owing to the piety and care of the *Scottiſh Chriſtians*, than to the *Roman Miſſionaries*; for all the *Northern parts*, the *Midland* and *Eaſt Saxons* were throughly converted by them; the *Eaſt Angles* by *Felix* a *Burgundian*; the *Weſt Saxons* by *Birinus* one ſent from *Rome*, but no *Monk*; and only the parts of *Kent* by the *Roman Monks*, but not *Benedictines*. And hath not Mr. *Creſſy* now very great reaſon to *ſtand* to this *aſſertion*, *That the* Engliſh Saxons *were converted to Chriſtianity by* Benedictine *Monks*?

§. 8. But it may be yet, Mr. *Creſſy* thinks *they were never true Chriſtians till they had received the Roman Cuſtoms: And that the Honour of making them good Catholick Chriſtians belonged to the Benedictines, or at leaſt to the Roman Miſſionaries.* For all that I can find, they were very good Chriſtians in Mr. *Creſſy*'s Eſteem, but only in the *Cuſtoms* Church hiſt. l. 16. c. 18. n. 12. wherein they differed from the *Roman Church*. For Mr. *Creſſy* confeſſeth *that the* Scots, Picts *and* Britains *in all matters of Faith agreed with the* Saxon, *that is the Roman Church*: But it is plain withal, that the great Zealot for the *Church* of *Rome*, *Wilfrid*, refuſed to receive *Orders* among them, and gives this as the reaſon of it, *becauſe the Apoſtolical See did not allow them* Communion *with it*; for ſpeaking of the Steph. Hedd. vit. S. Wilfrid. c. 12. *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh* Biſhops, he ſaith, *quos nec Apoſtolica ſedes in communionem recepit, nec eos qui Schiſmaticis conſentiunt*: It ſeems then the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Churches* ſtood *excommunicated* at that time by the *Church* of *Rome*; and therefore he deſires to go into *France*, *ut ſine controverſia Apoſtolicæ ſedis, licet indignus, gradum Epiſcopalem merear accipere*; ſo that the Pope would neither allow their *Churches* nor Malmesb. de geſtis Pontif. Angl. l. 3. their *Ordinations*. So *William* of *Malmesbury* ſaith, *that he would neither be ordained by the* Scotiſh *Biſhops, nor by any ordained by them, becauſe the Apoſtolical See had rejected their Communion*. But what was it, I beſeech Mr. *Creſſy*, that *unchurched* the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Chriſtians*, and nulled their *Ordinations*, and made them deſerve Excommunication? *Why*, forſooth, *they had not the right Tonſure among them, and they did not keep* Eaſter *on the right Sunday*; theſe are all the material Differences Mr. *Creſſy* will allow, for the Cauſes of ſo much Severity. But doth Mr. *Creſſy* in good earneſt think, that theſe are of weight enough to *unchurch* whole Nations, and null their *Ordinations*? Mr. *Creſſy* hath very learnedly ſet forth the State of the Con- Church hiſt. l. 16. c. 18. n. 2. 3, &c. troverſie about *Tonſure*; and he tells us, "There were three ſeveral kinds of Tonſure; the firſt was called St. *Peter*'s, which was ſhaving the top of the Head, leaving below toward the Forehead and Ears a Circle or Diadem, repreſenting the Crown of Thorns which our Lord bore: The ſecond was St. *Paul*'s, which was either a total ſhaving, or at leaſt cloſe polling of the whole Head: The third was called *Simon Magus* his Tonſure, by which only a half Crown was formed on the lower part of the Head before, from one Ear to the other, all the reſt of the Hair being left at full N. 6. length: Now, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, the preſent Diſpute was, whether St. *Peter*'s manner of Tonſure in uſe at *Rome* was to be only re-

“ ceived in *Britainy?* A very weighty Controverſie I confeſs; and very fit for the *Head* of the *Church* to be ſo much concerned in; for ſo Mr. *Creſſy* tells us, *that the Popes of this Age took care, that St.* Peter*'s Tonſure ſhould be only received in* Britainy. N. 7. And was there not great reaſon for it, ſince it was to be a *mark* of their *Slavery* to the *Roman See?* Good Lord! that ever Men ſhould pretend to take *care* of *Souls*, and excommunicate whole *Churches* for not having the right faſhion of *ſhaving* their *Heads!* Could they ever believe that St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* were ſo concerned whether Mens Hair was cut in the form of a *Crown*, or all off? No, they ſay, that *Circumciſion* is nothing, and *Uncircumciſion* is nothing; but it ſeems the faſhion of *ſhaving* is a very great matter.

But I ſuppoſe the weight of the buſineſs lay in the keeping of *Eaſter* on a different *Sunday* from the *Church* of *Rome:* Mr. *Creſſy* pretends to ſome skill in this matter, and undertakes to correct many Miſtakes of *Proteſtants* about it: And therefore to prevent any needleſs Quarrels I will take the *Controverſie*, as Mr. *Creſſy* himſelf ſtates it, and then ſee what can be made of it againſt the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Churches*, and the *Engliſh* which followed their Example. “ The Error of the *Britains, ſaith he, (and conſequently of the reſt)* conſiſted not as generally Proteſtant Writers conceive, in conforming to the Aſiatick manner of the Quartodecimani, who kept their *Eaſter* always the ſame Day with the *Jews*, whether it were *Sunday* or not; but they made their computation from the fourteenth of the Moon to the one and twenty, by which means it came to paſs, that if the fourteenth of the Moon proved to be a *Sunday*, the *Jews* and *Britains* once in ſeven Years would obſerve their Paſchal Solemnity together; which was contrary to the univerſal practice of the Church, and utterly forbidden by the firſt General Council of *Nicea*. And a little before, *he ſaith*, that to diſtinguiſh the Chriſtian Paſch from the ſhadow of a Jewiſh obſervation, they ordained that it ſhould be ſolemnized only on a *Sunday*, yet not that on which the fourteenth Day of the Moon fell, but the *Sunday* following, and therefore counted always from the fifteenth to the one and twentieth, excluding the Day of the Jewiſh Paſch; which, *he ſaith*, was to be celebrated exactly on the fourteenth Day of the firſt Moon after the Vernal Equinox, on what Day of the Week ſoever it fell. For Mr. *Creſſy*'s ſatisfaction, or rather for the *vindication* of the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Churches*, and the *Engliſh* which followed them, I ſhall enquire into two things. 1. The true ſtate of the *Controverſie*. 2. Whether the *Roman Emiſſaries* either then had, or now have reaſon to charge them with contradicting the *univerſal practice of the Church, or the Decree of the Council of* Nice?

Church hiſt. l. 13. c. 18. n. 11.

N. 10.

§. 9. 1. For the ſtate of the *Controverſie*; we muſt conſider what they were charged with by their Enemies, and what they had to ſay for themſelves. *Bede*, where he firſt mentions it, gives this account of it; *that they did not keep the* Sunday *of* Eaſter *in its own time, for they reckoned from the Fourteenth of the Moon to the Twentieth: Which Computation*, ſaith he, *is contained in a Cycle of Eighty four Years: Stephanus Heddius* ſaith, *from the Fourteenth to the Two and Twentieth*; but that is a Miſtake. *Pope Honorius* charges them, *with contradicting the practice of the Univerſal Church, and the Decrees of general Councils. Pope John* who ſucceeded *Severinus* next after *Honorius*, charges them,

Bed. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 2.

Vit. S. Wilfrid. c. 10.

Bed. l. 2. c. 19.

with

here, conſecrated by the *Scots*; after him *Jaruman*, after him *Ceadda*. L. 3. c. 22. *At the ſame time,* ſaith *Bede, the Eaſt Saxons recovered the Chriſtian Faith by the endeavours of King* Oſwi *of* Northumberland *with their King* Sigebert; who was likewiſe baptized by *Finanus*, and he conſecrated *Cedda*, to be their *Biſhop*. By which we ſee that when *Chriſtianity* was *ſettled* and *eſtabliſhed* in *England*, how much more it was owing to the piety and care of the *Scottiſh Chriſtians*, than to the *Roman Miſſionaries*; for all the *Northern parts*, the *Midland* and *Eaſt Saxons* were throughly converted by them; the *Eaſt Angles* by *Felix* a *Burgundian*; the *Weſt Saxons* by *Birinus* one ſent from *Rome*, but no *Monk*; and only the parts of *Kent* by the *Roman Monks*, but not *Benedictines*. And hath not Mr. *Creſſy* now very great reaſon to *ſtand* to this *aſſertion, That the* Engliſh Saxons *were converted to Chriſtianity by* Benedictine *Monks*?

§. 8. But it may be yet, Mr. *Creſſy* thinks *they were never true Chriſtians till they had received the Roman Cuſtoms: And that the Honour of making them good Catholick Chriſtians belonged to the Benedictines, or at leaſt to the Roman Miſſionaries.* For all that I can find, they were very good Chriſtians in Mr. *Creſſy*'s Eſteem, but only in the *Cuſtoms* Church hiſt. l. 16. c. 18. n. 12. wherein they differed from the *Roman Church*. For Mr. *Creſſy* confeſſeth *that the* Scots, Picts *and* Britains *in all matters of Faith agreed with the* Saxon, *that is the Roman Church*: But it is plain withal, that the great Zealot for the *Church* of *Rome*, *Wilfrid*, refuſed to receive *Orders* among them, and gives this as the reaſon of it, *becauſe the Apoſtolical See did not allow them Communion with it*; for ſpeaking of the Steph. Hedd. vit. S. Wilfrid. c. 12. *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh* Biſhops, he ſaith, *quos nec Apoſtolica ſedes in communionem recepit, nec eos qui Schiſmaticis conſentiunt*: It ſeems then the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Churches* ſtood *excommunicated* at that time by the *Church* of *Rome*; and therefore he deſires to go into *France*, *ut ſine controverſiâ Apoſtolicæ ſedis, licet indignus, gradum Epiſcopalem merear accipere*; ſo that the Pope would neither allow their *Churches* nor Malmesb. de geſtis Pontif. Angl. l. 3. their *Ordinations*. So *William* of *Malmesbury* ſaith, *that he would neither be ordained by the* Scotiſh *Biſhops, nor by any ordained by them, becauſe the Apoſtolical See had rejected their Communion.* But what was it, I beſeech Mr. *Creſſy*, that *unchurched* the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Chriſtians*, and nulled their *Ordinations*, and made them deſerve Excommunication? *Why,* forſooth, *they had not the right Tonſure among them, and they did not keep* Eaſter *on the right Sunday*; theſe are all the material Differences Mr. *Creſſy* will allow, for the Cauſes of ſo much Severity. But doth Mr. *Creſſy* in good earneſt think, that theſe are of weight enough to *unchurch* whole Nations, and null their *Ordinations*? Mr. *Creſſy* hath very learnedly ſet forth the State of the Church hiſt. l. 16. c. 18. n. 2. 3, &c. Controverſie about *Tonſure*; and he tells us, “There were three ſeveral kinds of Tonſure; the firſt was called St. *Peter*'s, which was ſhaving the top of the Head, leaving below toward the Forehead and Ears a Circle or Diadem, repreſenting the Crown of Thorns which our Lord bore: The ſecond was St. *Paul*'s, which was either a total ſhaving, or at leaſt cloſe polling of the whole Head: The third was called *Simon Magus* his Tonſure, by which only a half Crown was formed on the lower part of the Head before, from one Ear to the other, all the reſt of the Hair being left at full N. 6. length: Now, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, the preſent Diſpute was, whether St. *Peter*'s manner of Tonſure in uſe at *Rome* was to be only re-

“ ceived in *Britainy?* A very weighty Controverſie I confeſs; and very fit for the *Head* of the *Church* to be ſo much concerned in; for ſo Mr. *Creſſy* tells us, *that the Popes of this Age took care, that St. Peter's Tonſure ſhould be only received in* Britainy. N. 7. And was there not great reaſon for it, ſince it was to be a *mark* of their *Slavery* to the *Roman See?* Good Lord! that ever Men ſhould pretend to take *care* of *Souls*, and excommunicate whole *Churches* for not having the right faſhion of *ſhaving* their *Heads!* Could they ever believe that St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* were ſo concerned whether Mens Hair was cut in the form of a *Crown*, or all off? No, they ſay, that *Circumciſion* is nothing, and *Uncircumciſion* is nothing; but it ſeems the faſhion of *ſhaving* is a very great matter.

But I ſuppoſe the weight of the buſineſs lay in the keeping of *Eaſter* on a different *Sunday* from the *Church* of *Rome*: Mr. *Creſſy* pretends to ſome skill in this matter, and undertakes to correct many Miſtakes of *Proteſtants* about it: And therefore to prevent any needleſs Quarrels I will take the *Controverſie*, as Mr. *Creſſy* himſelf ſtates it, and then ſee what can be made of it againſt the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Churches*, and the *Engliſh* which followed their Example. “ The *Church hiſt. l.* 13. *c.* 18. *n.* 11. “ Error of the *Britains, ſaith he, (and conſequently of the reſt)* conſiſt-“ ed not as generally Proteſtant Writers conceive, in conforming to “ the Aſiatick manner of the Quartodecimani, who kept their *Eaſter* “ always the ſame Day with the *Jews*, whether it were *Sunday* or “ not; but they made their computation from the fourteenth of the “ Moon to the one and twenty, by which means it came to paſs, “ that if the fourteenth of the Moon proved to be a *Sunday*, the “ *Jews* and *Britains* once in ſeven Years would obſerve their Paſchal “ Solemnity together; which was contrary to the univerſal practice “ of the Church, and utterly forbidden by the firſt General Council “ of *Nicea*. And a little before, *he ſaith*, that to diſtinguiſh the N. 10. “ Chriſtian Paſch from the ſhadow of a Jewiſh obſervation, they or-“ dained that it ſhould be ſolemnized only on a *Sunday*, yet not that “ on which the fourteenth Day of the Moon fell, but the *Sunday* “ following, and therefore counted always from the fifteenth to the “ one and twentieth, excluding the Day of the Jewiſh Paſch; which, “ *he ſaith*, was to be celebrated exactly on the fourteenth Day of “ the firſt Moon after the Vernal Equinox, on what Day of the “ Week ſoever it fell. For Mr. *Creſſy*'s ſatisfaction, or rather for the *vindication* of the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Churches*, and the *Engliſh* which followed them, I ſhall enquire into two things. 1. The true ſtate of the *Controverſie*. 2. Whether the *Roman Emiſſaries* either then had, or now have reaſon to charge them with contradicting the *univerſal practice of the Church, or the Decree of the Council of* Nice?

§. 9. 1. For the ſtate of the *Controverſie*; we muſt conſider what they were charged with by their Enemies, and what they had to ſay for themſelves. *Bede*, where he firſt mentions it, gives this account of it; *Bed. hiſt. Eccleſ. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *that they did not keep the* Sunday *of* Eaſter *in its own time, for they reckoned from the Fourteenth of the Moon to the Twentieth: Which Computation*, ſaith he, *is contained in a Cycle of Eighty four Years*: *Stephanus Heddius* ſaith, *Vit. S. Wilfrid. c.* 10. *Bed. l.* 2. *c.* 19. *from the Fourteenth to the Two and Twentieth*; but that is a Miſtake. *Pope Honorius* charges them, *with contradicting the practice of the Univerſal Church, and the Decrees of general Councils*. Pope *John* who ſucceeded *Severinus* next after *Honorius*, charges them, *with renewing an old Hereſie, and keeping* Eaſter *with the* Jews; *and all was,* ſaith Bede, *becauſe they did not reckon the* Eaſter Sunday *from the Fifteenth to the One and Twentieth, according to what was approved in the Council of* Nice. *Thoſe that came out of* Kent *and* Gaul, ſaith Bede, *L. 3. c. 25.* *charged the* Scots *that they kept the* Eaſter Sunday *contrary to the practice of the Univerſal Church: From this different practice,* ſaith Bede, *it ſometimes happened, that two* Eaſters *were kept in a year, and that which was* Eaſter-day *to the one was* Palm-Sunday *to the other:* And after *Naiton* King of the *Picts* had embraced the then *Roman Cuſtom* of *L. 5. c. 22.* *keeping Eaſter*, to ſhew to all the People the change he had made, *he removed the Cycle of Eighty four Years, and ſet up that of Nineteen.* So that the true ſtate of the whole Controverſie between them was no more but this, whether the old *Roman Cycle* of Eighty four ſhould continue, or the *Alexandrian Cycle* of Nineteen be followed? But the Combatants on both ſides talked like Men that did not underſtand the Matter they were ſo hot about: However *Colman* pleaded, *for their adhering to the ancient Tradition of their Church in this Matter, and that they had no reaſon to hearken to any Innovation by whomſoever introduced; for ſuppoſing the greateſt inconvenience that could happen, that they ſhould celebrate* Eaſter *on the Fourteenth together with the* Jews, *Steph. Hed. vit. Wilfrid c. 10.* *yet herein they had the Example of the Apoſtle St.* John, *and thoſe who were inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt; and we, (as* Polycarp *and others) are not aſhamed to follow their Example, and therefore we dare not, and will not* *Fredegod. vit. Wilfr. p. 176.* *change our Cuſtom. Fredegodus* makes *Colman* add further, *that they had not only conſtant Tradition for it, but that it was left in charge by St.* John *and his Diſciples, that if the* Sunday *fell on the Fourteenth, they ſhould keep their* Eaſter *on that Day*, And ſo much *Heddius* ſaith too, *Eadmer. vit. Wilfr. n. 15.* *Patres noſtri & anteceſſores eorum manifeſte Spiritu Sancto inſpirati ut erat Columcille* 14 *Luna die Dominica Paſcha celebrandum ſanxerunt. Eadmerus* makes the Command to come from St. *John* himſelf in thoſe Churches which were under his Care; "Which practice, ſaith *Colman*, hath been delivered down to us by an uninterrupted ſucceſſion of holy and prudent Men, and hath been inviolably obſerv'd hitherto, and therefore ought to be ſo ſtill. What could thoſe of the Church of Rome deſire more, than they bring for this practice? Nay, *I. S.* would have told them, "The Pope's Infallibility was not to be compared to that of Oral Tradition: What Certainty, would he ſay, could they have had of any thing, if they rejected ſuch Evidence as this? But it ſeems this kind of Tradition was not valued ſo much then, no nor any thing elſe when it oppoſes their Intereſts. It was not this or that Day, was, in truth, the occaſion of the Diſpute, but the poor *Britiſh* and *Scottiſh Chriſtians* muſt ſubmit to *the preſent Roman Church*, and do as they *Bed. hiſt. l. 3. c. 4.* would have them. *Beda* ſaith expreſly, "That they did not comply with the *Jews* as to the Day of the Week; but ignorantly, and by following uncertain Cycles, they miſtook in the certain Sunday; being Men of very great Devotion and Goodneſs, and learning only what was contained in the Writings of the Prophets, Evangeliſts and Apoſtles; But, be that as it would, no favour was to be ſhewed them without preſent compliance; and for this purpoſe *Wilfrid* was an excellent inſtrument. Who begins, in Bede, his Anſwer to *Colman* by ſaying, *the* Eaſter *we obſerve, we ſaw obſerved* *L. 3. c. 25.* *at Rome by all Perſons where* Peter *and* Paul *lived, and taught, and ſuffered*

fered, and were buried; *the ſame*, ſaith he, *is obſerv'd in* Italy, *and* Gaul, *in* Africa, Aſia, Egypt *and* Greece, *and all the World over*, except theſe obſtinate *Britains* and *Picts*. Very confidently ſaid! how truly will be ſeen afterwards. However he confeſſes, *That St*. John's *Practice was agreeable to theirs*: But St. *Peter when he preached at* Rome (there is the *Emphaſis* of it) *appointed otherwiſe, that it ſhould be kept on the* Sunday *that did fall between the Fifteenth and One and Twentieth*. It ſeems St. *Peter* and St. *John* differed as much about *Eaſter*, as St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* did about Tonſure. "And this, "*ſaith he*, all the Churches of *Aſia* after St. *John*'s Death and his "Succeſſors obſerved (it ſeems his Authority vaniſhed at his Death) "and the whole Church, which was not firſt decreed but confirmed "by the Council of Nice. What prodigious Ignorance and Confidence is here joyned together! as will appear preſently. *Colman* asked "him, What he thought of *Anatolius* a Man much commended "in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, who declared, that the Sunday was to be "taken from the Fourteenth to the Twentieth. *Wilfrid* tells him, "they did not underſtand him (no more than himſelf); and as to "their Anceſtors he was willing to think charitably of them, and "hoped that the keeping *Eaſter* on a wrong day, would not damn "them, as long as they had no better information. But, *ſaith he*, "for you and your Companions, if you refuſe to obey the Decrees "of the Apoſtolical See, yea of the Univerſal Church, confirmed "by Scripture, without all doubt ſin in it. For, *ſaith he*, our Lord "hath ſaid, *Tu es Petrus, & ſuper hanc Petram*, &c. This I confeſs is home to the Buſineſs, although the *Saxon Homilies* with no leſs than *malignant Ingratitude* underſtood the *Rock* of *Chriſt* himſelf and the faith which *Peter* confeſſed; but however *Wilfrid* made ſuch a noiſe with St. *Peter*'s Keys; that the good King *Oſwi* verily believing that he kept *Heaven Gates*, told them all plainly, *That for his part he would follow St*. Peter, *for fear he ſhould ſhut Heaven Gates againſt him when he came thither*: And we may be ſure the People could not but be mightily moved with this: By which means *Wilfrid* prevailed and *Colman* was forced to retire from his Biſhoprick. *Steph. Heddius* adds only farther, *That* Wilfrid *inſiſted on this, that the* Nicene *Fathers had appointed the Cycle of Nineteen, by which they could never keep* Eaſter *on the Fourteenth, and that an* Anathema *was pronounced againſt thoſe who ſhould keep it otherwiſe*. Thus far we have an account of the *State* of the *Controverſie*, from the Parties engaged in it.

V. Whelot. not. in Bed. l. 3. c. 25.

Steph. Hedd. vit. Wilfr. c. 10

§. 10. 2. Let us now ſee what reaſon there was for charging the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Chriſtians with oppoſing the practice of the Univerſal Church, and the Decrees of the Council of* Nice *in reckoning the* Eaſter Sunday *from the fourteenth to the twentieth, and not* (as the *Roman* Miſſionaries would have them) *from the fifteenth to the one and twentieth*. I ſhall therefore now ſhew, that if they were guilty of an *Error* or *Hereſie* in ſo doing, (ſo *Petavius* calls it *inſignis error, imo hæreſis Scotorum*) not only the *Apoſtles* and their *Diſciples*, but the *Roman Church* it ſelf was guilty of as great. The great Ignorance which *Wilfrid* and the reſt of the *Zealots* for the *Roman* Cuſtoms betrayed, lay in this, that what they ſaw practiſed in their time at *Rome*, they ſuppoſed to have been always obſerved there, and that it came from a Command of St. *Peter*, *that the Day of* Eaſter *ſhould be obſerved*

Petav. animadverſ. ad hæreſ. 51. Epiph.

ved as it was then in the Roman Church; whereas there was nothing like any *Apoſtolical Precept* for it, and the *Church of Rome* it ſelf had but lately embraced the *Alexandrian Cycle*, which *Wilfrid* would with ſo much Authority have inforced upon the poor *Scotiſh Chriſtians.* In the beginning of Chriſtianity nothing was looked on with greater indifferency than the Anniverſary Day of the Chriſtian *Paſch*; thence came ſo different Cuſtoms among ſeveral Churches; the *Churches* of *Aſia*, properly ſo called, *Syria*, *Meſopotamia* and *Cilicia*, obſerved it on what day of the *Week* ſoever it fell; as any one that knows any thing of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory underſtands: For as St. *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *they did not believe that any one ſhould be called to account that he obſerved the Paſch in this or that Month:* For they had neither the Leiſure nor the Curioſity to examine the *Cycles* then in uſe by the Rules of *Aſtronomy*; but took them as they found them among the *Jews* without comparing them with the heavenly Bodies. Now there were two things obſerved by the *Jews* for finding out the Days of *Paſſover*, *viz.* the *beginning* and *ending of the firſt Month*, and the *fourteenth* Day of the *Moon*, on the Evening of which they were to begin their *Paſſover*; and theſe two were obſerved by all Chriſtians in the beginning of the Chriſtian Church, till towards the end of the ſecond Century, according to the *Jewiſh Cycle*, which was of eighty four Years, as *Epiphanius* tells us; which although it were not exact according to the Motions of the Heavens, yet that was not thought a ſufficient ground for the alteration of it. Yea, *Epiphanius* mentions an *Apoſtolical Conſtitution* (quite different from what is now extant in the *Book* that goes under the Name of *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*) wherein "Chriſtians are commanded not to trouble themſelves with "Calculations, but that they ſhould keep the Feaſt at the ſame time "with the Brethren that came out of the Circumciſion, although "they were miſtaken (in their Calculations:) not with thoſe that "remain in the Circumciſion, but with thoſe that came out of it, ſaith *Epiphanius*, which he underſtands of the *Biſhops of Jeruſalem*, Fifteen of which continued to *A. D.* 136. till towards the end of the Empire of *Hadrian*, at which time *Marcus* was the firſt *Biſhop* that was made of the *Gentiles*. *Petavius* knows what to make of this *Conſtitution*, for by it, *he ſuppoſes the Chriſtians were obliged to keep* Eaſter *with the Jews on the Fourteenth Day*; for he takes it for granted, that the Biſhops of *Hieruſalem* did ſo; as he confeſſes ſome of the Apoſtles did; but the Learned *Primate* of *Armagh*, thinks *Petavius* miſtaken in this, becauſe although they did then follow the *Jewiſh* Computation, yet he ſuppoſes that they did keep *Eaſter* not with the *Jews* on what Day of the Week ſoever it fell, but on the *Sunday* in honour of our *Saviours Reſurrection*. And it cannot be denyed, that *Narciſſus Biſhop* of *Hieruſalem* and *Theophilus* of *Cæſarea*, with *Caſſius* of *Tyre*, and *Clarus* of *Ptolemais*, do in their *Synodical Epiſtle* declare, that they agreed with the Church of *Alexandria*, viz. *in keeping it on the Lord's day, and that this had been the conſtant practice of the Church of Hieruſalem.* And it is plain *Epiphanius* underſtood it ſo, or elſe it was to no purpoſe to diſtinguiſh in this Matter, *thoſe who remained in the Circumciſion, and thoſe which came out of it.* But notwithſtanding theſe Churches and the *Weſtern* did obſerve the *Lord's-day* for the *Paſchal Feaſt*, yet in the way of reckoning it, they did obſerve the *Jewiſh Computation*, both as to the *Age* of the *Moon* and the *Vernal Equinox.*

Athanaſ. de Synod. & ad African. ep.

Chryſoſt. Tom. 6. *p.* 382.

Epiphan. hær. 51.

Epiphan. hær. 50.

Petav. animad. in hæreſ. 70.

Uſſer. Prolegom. ad Epiſt. Ignat. c. 9.

Equinox. For altho' *Conſtantine* in his Letter doth upbraid the *Jews*, *that they kept their Paſch, before the Equinox* (which was then rightly fixed on *March* 21.) yet we are to underſtand it of the *Aſtronomical Equinox*, and not of that which was in Popular uſe among them, which might anticipate the other about three Days, becauſe according to their beginning the Month *Niſan* from *March* 5. the Fourteenth of the Moon might fall on the Eighteenth Day, and ſo their *Paſſover* be kept three Days before the *Equinox* at the time of the *Nicene Council*.) For, as *Clavius* obſerves, *God doth not tye his Church to the Subtleties of Aſtronomical Calculations, but to the common judgment of Senſe*, in which the *Equinox* hath the Latitude of four Days with us, and as many more in thoſe more *Southern* Parts. The like liberty was uſed in the Chriſtian Church before the *Nicene Council*: For in the *Council* of *Cæſarea*, they do allow the celebration of *Eaſter* before the *Equinox*, which they then ſuppoſed to be *March* 25. and yet they reckon three Days before that among thoſe on which the *Paſchal Sunday* might fall, as appears by the *Epiſtle* of one *Philippus*, about the *Council* of *Cæſarea*, extant in the Works of *Bede*; wherein, he ſaith, *That after the Reſurrection or Aſcenſion of our Saviour, the Apoſtles being diſperſed Abroad, and employed in preaching the Goſpel, could appoint nothing concerning the Paſchal Feaſt; but did obſerve it on the Fourteenth of the Moon, what day ſoever it fell upon.* (Thus far ſure the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh* Chriſtians were no *Hereticks* in doing as the *Apoſtles* did) *But after*, ſaith he, *the Apoſtles were gone, the Chriſtian Churches obſerved different Cuſtoms, both as to Paſchal Faſt and Feaſt; upon which by the direction of Pope* Victor *a Council was called at* Cæſarea *for ſettling the way of keeping* Eaſter; *where after they have fixed the Equinox on the eighth of the* 5. *Kal. of* April, *they determined that the three Days before ſhould be taken within the Paſchal Limits*; (ſo that the *Sunday* for *Eaſter* might be reckoned on any Day from the Eleventh *Kalend* of *April* to the Eleventh *Kalend* of *May*, *viz.* from the Two and Twentieth of *March* to the One and Twentieth of *April* incluſive; and withal they add, *that it ſhould not be lawful for any to exceed theſe limits.* And yet afterwards theſe limits were ſo far exceeded, that the *Latin Church* in *Leo*'s time made the *Cycle* of the *Paſchal Sundays* to conſiſt of Thirty three Days; and the *Alexandrian Cycle* took in two Days more, *viz.* the Twenty fourth and Twenty fifth of *April*, becauſe they found the former limits too ſtrait, unleſs they were underſtood of the πάσχα ϛαυρώσιμον as they called it, *i. e.* that the Anniverſary Day of Our Saviours Paſſion ſhould always fall between the Two and Twentieth of *March* and One and Twentieth of *April*.

Clav. Calendar. Gregor. c. 4. *ſect.* 7.

Bed. open. Tom. 2. *ſub tit. de Vernali Æquinoctio.*

§. 11. The firſt Perſon who publiſhed a *Paſchal Canon* was *Hyppolitus* Biſhop of *Porto*, *A.D.* 222. above an hundred Years before the Council of *Nice*, which was found *A. D.* 1551. and ſet forth by *Scaliger* with Notes upon it, in which *Canon* he makes the neareſt *Paſchal Sunday* to be the Sixteenth of the Moon, which is the Twentieth of *March*, beginning the Lunar Month the Fifth of *March*, which is one Day before the *Nicene Equinox*, and five before that of *Cæſarea*: And in which he reckons the *Paſchal Sundays* not from the Fifteenth to the One and Twentieth, but from the Sixteenth to the Two and Twentieth. By which we may eaſily ſee, what Reaſon *Wilfrid* had to make the then practice of the *Roman Church* to have been the univerſal Practice of the Chriſtian Church: For the two Fundamentals of the Rule then in uſe were, that the *Paſchal Sunday* ſhould be reckon'd from the Fifteenth to the One and Twentieth, and that it ſhould never be before the *Equinox.* The firſt we meet with who laid down this Rule about the *Equinox*, was *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, who ſat there from *A. D.* 247. to *A. D.* 264. wherein he was followed by *Anatolius* Biſhop of *Laodicea*, who would by no means have the *Paſchal Sunday* obſerved before the *Equinox*, which he following *Soſigenes* ſuppoſed to be the Twenty fifth of *March*, but made the firſt *Eaſter* day to be the Twenty ſeventh of *March.* But that which is moſt obſervable in him to our purpoſe is, that he reckon'd neither as the *Latins*, from the Sixteenth to the Two and Twentieth, nor as the *Alexandrians*, from the Fifteenth to the One and Twentieth, but from the Fourteenth to the Twentieth, juſt as the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh* Churches did, as appears by the ſecond, fifth and eighteenth of his Cycle publiſhed out of *MSS.* by *Ægidius Bucherius* with learned Annotations, and ſo makes no ſcruple at all of that, which *Wilfrid* and *Bede* made ſuch a great matter of, *viz.* of keeping *Eaſter* day upon the Fourteenth, and therein complying with thoſe notable *Hereticks* called the *Quartodecimani.* But *Anatolius*, in the Preface to his *Canon*, was ſo far from ſuppoſing an univerſal conſent of the Church in his time, that he complains of very different and contrary *Cycles* that were then in uſe, ſome following *Hyppolitus*'s Cycle of Sixteen; others the *Jewiſh* Cycle of Eighty four; others a Cycle of Twenty five; others of Thirty; and he mentions the endeavours of *Iſidore*, *Hierom*, *Clement* and *Origen*, all of *Egypt*, to compoſe this matter. But notwithſtanding all the care uſed to ſettle this Controverſie, the Breaches of the Church continued about it; and if we believe *Hen. Valeſius*, the Inhabitants of *Syria* and *Meſopotamia* had eſpouſed the celebrating *Eaſter* on the Fourteenth Day, not long before the Council of *Nice.*

Euſeb. l. 7. *c.* 20.

Ægyd. Bucher. de doctr. Tempor. p. 464.

Valeſ. not. in Euſeb. l. 5. *c.* 23.

But what differences ſoever happened before the Council of Nice, *was not an uniform practice ſettled by the decree of it, and all Churches obliged to reckon the* Paſchal Sunday *from the Fifteenth to the Twenty firſt, and conſequently the* Britiſh *and* Scotiſh *Churches were guilty of oppoſing the Univerſal practice of the practice of the Church at leaſt after the Council of* Nice? This is all the Pretence that I know can be left in this Matter; but neither was this decreed in the Council of *Nice*; nor if it were, was it univerſally obſerved after it. A *Synodical Epiſtle* was ſent out after the ending of the Council, which I ſuppoſe was the ſame with that of *Conſtantine*; *wherein all Chriſtians are diſſwaded from complyance with the Jews, and earneſtly exhorted to an agreement upon one day, and the leſſer part to ſubmit to the practice of the greater*: But no Limits are ſet, no Cycle eſtabliſhed by the Decree of the Council. For although *Dionyſius Exiguus* who brought in the *Alexandrian Cycle* into the *Latin* Church, would have it believed, *that herein he followed the* Nicene *Fethers*; yet *Ægidius Bucherius* a learned *Jeſuit*, hath fully proved, *That no Cycle or certain Rule was at all appointed by the Council of* Nice: Although ſoon after he confeſſes the Cycle of Nineteen, was found out, (as he probably thinks by *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*) and afterwards perfected by *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*, in the time of *Theodoſius* the Elder. But if the *Alexandrian* Cycle had been

Euſeb. vit. Conſtant. l. 3. *c.* 18, 19.

Dionyſ. Exigui ep. prima in Append. Bucherii p. 485.

Bucher. Commentar in Victorii Canon. Paſch. c. 3. *c.* 6.

been determined in the Council of *Nice*, how comes it to be omitted in the *Kalendarium Romanum* publiſhed by *Herwart*, which he ſaith, *was ſet forth the very Year of the* Nicene *Council A. D.* 325. wherein, tho' they are *Dominical Letters*, yet there are no *Golden Numbers*: (But if he were miſtaken in the time, and it came forth in the Reign of *Conſtantius*, the Argument will ſtill hold). And if there were ſo univerſal a conſent in the practice of the Church after, how came it to paſs that St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* in his *Paſchal Epiſtle* ſaith, *there was ſo much confuſion in the account of* Eaſter, *in the Church, the Camp, and the Palace?* How came *Theodoſius* to ſend ſo earneſtly to *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* about it? But above all, whence came ſuch mighty Differences between the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches* about *Eaſter*, long after the Council of *Nice*? Of which a full Account is given by the two learned Jeſuits, *Petavius* and *Bucherius*; which latter hath at large proved that the *Latin* Church did ſtill proceed according to the *Jewiſh* Cycle of eighty four, and not according to the *Alexandrian* of nineteen, and that they reckoned not from fifteen to twenty one, but from ſixteen to twenty two; from whence aroſe thoſe hot Conteſts about the right *Eaſter* between the *Biſhops* of *Rome* and *Alexandria*, eſpecially in the time of *Leo* in the Years 444 and 455. And *Paſchaſinus* in his Epiſtle to *Leo* about the former *Eaſter*, mentions the *Romana Supputatio*, as diſtinct from that of *Alexandria*, and as the occaſion of the Diſpute. In *A. D.* 455, there were eight Days difference between the *Eaſter* at *Rome* and at *Alexandria*, which cauſed great Diſputes, as may be ſeen in the Letters of *Leo* to *Martianus* and *Eudocia*; and the Anſwer of *Proterius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, of which *Proſper* in his *Chronicon* ſaith, that although *the* Latin *Church did ſubmit for Peace ſake, yet that it was in the right, and ſuch an Example ought not to be followed*: And the ſame *Proſper* doth often mention the Cycle of eighty four, as that which the *Latin Church did make uſe of at that time.* But this being found too ſhort and inſufficient, *Victorius* was employed to frame a new *Paſchal Canon* fitted to the uſe of the *Latin Church*, which was firſt printed by *Bucherius*; wherein, although he differed from the old *Latin* Calculation in the beginning of the *Lunar Month*, yet he proceeded ſtill in the old way of reckoning from ſixteen to twenty two. *Victorius* writ his *Paſchal Canon A. D.* 457. to *Hilarus*, Arch-deacon of *Rome*, who ſucceeded *Leo*; and it appears that the occaſion of Writing it, was from the difference between the *Alexandrian* and *Roman* Church in the Computation of *Eaſter*: So *Hilarus* confeſſes in his Epiſtle to *Victorius*; and *Victorius* ſhews wherein the difference lay, *viz.* in three things: The *Alexandrians* began their *Paſchal Month* from *March* 8. and reckoned it to *April* 5. incluſive; the *Roman* Church from *March* 5. incluſive to *April* 3. excluſive. The *Alexandrians* reckoned the fourteenth Moon from *March* 21. to *April* 18. the *Romans* from *March* 18. to *April* 15. incluſive. The *Alexandrians* reckoned the *Paſchal* Sunday from the fifteenth incluſive to the one and twentieth. The *Roman Church* from the ſixteenth to the two and twentieth. Now *Victorius* thought by his Canon to accommodate the difference between the two Churches, embracing the *Alexandrian* Cycle of nineteen, as more certain than the old *Latin* one of eighty four, but agreeing with the *Latins* in reckoning from ſixteen to two and twenty; and yet according to his *Canon*, the *Eaſter* differed ſometimes eight Days from

V. Euſeb. v. t. Conſt. l. 4. *c.* 34.

Cyrill. Ep. in Append. Bucherii p. 482.

Petav. Doct. Tem. l. 2. *c.* 63. *p.* 531.

Buch. doct. Temp. c. 4. 5, 6.

Paſchaſini Ep. Leon. 1. *inter Ep. Leon.* 63.

Leo Ep. 64, 65.

Proſper. Chron. A. 455.

Proſper. Chronic. A. D. 46, 130, 214, 298. 382.

V. Bucher. Comment. in Victorii Canon. Paſchal. p. 91.

Victor. Prolog. ad Can. n. 3, 4, 5.

Bucher. Comment. c. 8, 9.

that kept at *Alexandria*; and ſometimes it fell a Month later than it did according to the former *Latin Computation.* But this *Canon* of *Victorius* gave no ſatisfaction either to the *Eaſtern* or *Weſtern Church*; all the *Eaſtern Church* followed the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and the *Church* of *Milan* in the *Weſt*, from the time of St. *Ambroſe*, as appears by his Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Æmilia*: *Victor*, Biſhop of *Capua*, writ againſt *Victorius* his *Canon*, *A. D.* 550. upon a new Controverſie riſen in the Church about *Eaſter-day*; but this was twenty five Years after *Dionyſius Exiguus* had brought the *Alexandrian Canon* into the uſe of the *Roman Church*, which was *A. D.* 525. After which time it did by degrees prevail in the *Weſtern* parts, but was never fully received in *France*, till it was ſettled there by the Authority of *Charles the Great.*

Ambroſ. ep. 83.

§. 12. This is the ſhort and true Account of the *Paſchal Controverſie*, which made ſo much Noiſe, and gave ſo great diſturbance to the Chriſtian Church; let us now bring it home to the Caſe of the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh* Churches, and ſee what reaſon *Wilfrid* then, and the *Roman Miſſionaries* ſince, have had to condemn them. *Was it that they oppoſed the univerſal practice of the Chriſtian Church in not reckoning from fifteen to twenty one?* But we ſee the *Roman* Church it ſelf had but lately embraced that way of Computation, having before made uſe of the ſame Cycle the *Britains* did, of eighty four, and reckon'd from ſixteen to twenty two. *Was it, that according to their way, different* Eaſters *would be kept the ſame Year?* But, why ſhould this be worſe with the *Britains* and *Scots*, than with the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, which differed ſometimes a Month in their *Eaſter*; as, beſides what hath been mentioned already, appears by the ancient *Laterculus Paſchalis* firſt publiſhed by *Bucherius*, in which he ſhews, that within the compaſs of it, *viz.* an hundred Years, the *Eaſter* of the *Latins* was kept a Month ſooner than the *Alexandrians*, viz. *A. D.* 322, 349, 406. And *A. D.* 387. a threefold *Eaſter* was kept, ſome *March* 21, others *April* 25, others *April* 18, as appears by St. *Ambroſe*'s Epiſtle written on that occaſion. Again *A. D.* 577, a threefold *Eaſter* was kept, ſome keeping it the eighteenth of *April*, as thoſe which followed *Victorius*, others the 25th of *April*, *viz.* thoſe which followed the *Alexandrian Canon*; and others again, even in *Gaul*, as *Greg. Turonenſis* ſaith on the 12th Kal. of *April*, *March* 21. the very Day of the *Vernal Æquinox*: So he tells us, they did in compliance with the *Spaniards*, who it ſeems thought it no *Hereſie* ſo to do, even after the Decree of the Council of *Nice*. But I ſuppoſe the main fault of the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh* Churches was, *that at ſome times it would ſo happen that they might keep their* Eaſter-day *on the fourteenth of the Moon, and ſo comply with the Jews.* Was this it in truth which unchurched them all, and rendred their Ordinations null? The Apoſtles I am ſure did far more in compliance with the *Jews* than this came to, as to matter of *Circumciſion* and other things, and even in this point, if Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory may be credited, and yet I hope their Ordinations were good, and the Churches Orthodox which they planted. Methinks, it might have been called *compliance with the Apoſtles* as well as with the *Jews*? And will indeed compliance with an *Apoſtolical practice unchurch* whole Nations? It muſt be ſurely only with the Church of *Rome* that it can do ſo. And yet

Bucher. Comment. p. 264. *V. Labb. Chronolog. Technic. ad A.* 387. & *ad A.* 577.

Greg. Turon. l. 5. *c.* 17.

did not the Church of *Rome* it ſelf comply with the *Jews* in the uſe of their *Cycle*, and in the beginning of their Lunar Month on the fifth, and not on the eigth of *March* as the *Alexandrians*? And why ſhould one ſort of compliance unchurch People, and not another? If every *compliance* doth it, farewel to the *Church* of *Rome* it ſelf and her *Ordinations*, even after the *Nicene* Council. But, what if after all this, the Church of *Rome* after the embracing the *Alexandrian Cycle*, did comply more with the *Jews* than the *Britiſh Churches* did in keeping their *Eaſter* on the fourteenth of the Moon: For by that *Canon* they were to keep it on the fifteenth, and that was the great *Feſtival Day* among the *Jews*, for on the Evening of the fourteenth they did eat their *bitter Herbs*, but the next Day was the *ſolemn Feſtival*: And I would fain underſtand whether it were not a greater compliance with the *Jews* to feaſt the ſame Day they did, than to keep that for a *Feſtival*, on which they eat their *bitter Herbs*, and began the *Paſſover* only on the Evening? Beſides, they who kept it on the fifteenth, muſt celebrate the Memory of Chriſts Paſſion before the fourteenth, which certainly was as great an incongruity as could happen by keeping it on the fourteenth. But ſuppoſing it were a *compliance* with the *Jews*; it is plain it was not a ſtudied and deſigned compliance with them; for they kept their *Eaſter* on the *Lords Day* in oppoſition to them; only it happened *once in ſeven Years*, ſaith Mr. *Creſſy*, *that the fourteenth of the Moon and* Eaſter *met, and then they kept it with the Jews*: If this were it which *unchurched* them; how hard was it for ſuch *Britains* and *Scots to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven!* Or rather, how hard is it for ſuch who can *Unchurch* whole Nations of *Chriſtians* on ſuch pitiful Accounts as theſe? St. *Paul* would have ſaid, I will keep no *Eaſter* while the World ſtands, *rather than deſtroy* whole *Churches* of ſuch *for whom Chriſt died.* But what do we meddle with St. *Paul*, they are only the *Uſurpers* of St. *Peter*'s *Chair*, that dare ſo eaſily, in their own Opinion, ſend *whole Churches to Hell*, *viz.* for doing no more in effect, than themſelves had done not long before. Nay, to conclude all, it is very probably ſuppoſed by two learned Perſons, that what the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Churches*, at that time accounted the fourteenth of the Moon, was in truth the ſixteenth, (whether by the correction of *Sulpitius Severus*, as Biſhop *Uſſer* ſuppoſes, or the *ſhortneſs of the Cycle*, as *Bucherius*, is no matter at all.) And I hope all Perſons ſhall not be preſently ſent to Hell, that do miſtake in the *Computation* of *Eaſter*, according to the Judgment of the *Roman Church*; for then God have Mercy on all thoſe that do not follow the *Gregorian Account.* And I think the difference as great and as weighty now, as it was in the famous *Diſpute* between *Wilfrid* and *Colman*: But if notwithſtanding this difference, the *Britiſh* and *Scotiſh Chriſtians* were very good *Chriſtians*, and ſo many *Engliſh Churches* were planted by them, Mr. *Creſſy* muſt harden his Forehead in *ſtanding to it*, that the *Engliſh Saxons were converted by Benedictine Monks.*

Ægid. Bucher. Commentar. in Paſch. Canon. p. 190. *Uſſer. de Primord. Eccleſ. Britan. p.* 934.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the Penal Laws againſt Papiſts.

Epiſt. Apol. ſect. 98, 99 p. 119. §. 1. I Am now come to that which Mr. *Creſſy* looks upon as a *very important Subject*, and deſerving ſerious conſideration; which is, *how far thoſe who acknowledge ſubjection to a foreign Power*, as all *Engliſh* Catholicks do, *can give ſatisfaction to the State of their Fidelity to his Majeſty?. Which*, he ſaith, *the Perſon of Honour repeats in ſeveral Places, and is moſt accurately deſcanted upon in his nine Queſtions near the concluſion of his Book.* I ſhall therefore give a ſhort account of what the *Perſon* of *Honour* ſaith upon this Subject; and then conſider what Mr. *Creſſy* offers by way of Reply to it.

Animadv. p. 10. 1. He ſaith, “ That the *Perſonal Authority* of the *Pope*, was that,
“ and that only which firſt made the *Schiſm*, and ſtill continues it,
“ and is the ground of all the animoſity of the *Engliſh Catholicks*
“ againſt the *Church* of *England*, and produced their ſeparation from
“ it; and if they will renounce all that *Perſonal Authority* in the *Pope*,
“ and any obedience to it within His Majeſty's Kingdoms, they will
“ purge themſelves of all ſuch jealouſie or ſuſpicion of their Fidelity,
“ as may prove dangerous to the Kingdom, and againſt which
“ the *Laws* are provided: Becauſe it is their dependance on a foreign
“ Juriſdiction, which makes them or their Opinions taken notice of
“ by the *Politick Government* of the Kingdom.

P. 243. “ 2. That it is neceſſary for the perſonal ſecurity of Kings and
“ Princes, and for the Peace and Quiet of Kingdoms, that it may
“ be clearly made manifeſt, what the *Authority* and *Power* is, that a
“ *foreign Prince* doth challenge in another Princes Dominions contrary
“ to, and above the Laws of the Land, and what obedience it is
“ that Subjects may pay to ſuch a *foreign Prince*, without the privity,
“ and contrary to the Command of his own Soveraign; which
“ cannot be done by a general Anſwer, but by diſtinct aſſigning the
“ bounds of the *Popes Temporal* and *Spiritual Power* in *England*; and
“ what the full intent of them is, that the King may diſcern whether
“ he hath enough of either to preſerve himſelf and the Peace
“ of the Kingdom.

P. 245. “ 3. That till ſuch time as the *Roman Catholick Subjects* of *England*
“ give as good Security to the King for their Fidelity and Peaceable
“ Behaviour, as all his other Subjects do, they have no cauſe
“ to wonder that they may be made Subject to ſuch Laws and Reſtraints,
“ as may diſable them from being dangerous; when they
“ profeſs to owe Obedience to a *Foreign Prince*, who doth as much
“ profeſs not to be a Friend to their Country, and will not declare
“ what that Obedience is.

P. 9, 10, “ 4. That the *Roman Catholick Subjects* of *England* have a more
“ immediate dependance on the *Pope*, than is allowed in any Catholick
“ Countries: And that thoſe who under pretence of Religion
“ refuſe to declare, that it is in no Earthly Power to abſolve them
“ from their Fidelity to the King, do refuſe to give as full ſatisfaction
“ and ſecurity for their Allegiance, as *Catholick Subjects* do give

“ for their Fidelity to *Catholick Kings*: There being no *French Roman* P. 246.
“ *Catholick* who dares refuſe to do it.
“ 5. That there is ſo much the more reaſon to require this, ſince P. 71, 72.
“ the late inſtance of the *Iriſh Rebellion*, wherein the *Pope* abſolved
“ the Kings Subjects from their Oaths, and took upon himſelf to be
“ their *General* in the *Perſon* of his *Nuncio*, and aſſumed the Exerciſe
“ of the *Regal Power*, both at *Land* and *Sea*, and impriſoned thoſe
“ Catholicks, and threatned to take away their Lives who had P. 247.
“ promoted the Peace, and deſired to return to the *King's Sub-*
“ *jection*; and hath ſince given a ſevere Check to thoſe of the
“ *Iriſh Nobility* and *Clergy*, who had declared that the *Pope* had no
“ Power to diſpenſe with their *Fidelity* to his Majeſty, or to abſolve
“ them from any Oaths they ſhould take to that purpoſe: And im-
“ ployed his *Nuntio* to diſcountenance and ſuppreſs that *Declaration*,
“ and to take care that it ſhould proceed no further; and that
“ *Cardinal Barbarine* at the ſame time put them in mind, *that the* P. 75.
“ *Kingdom of* England *was ſtill under Excommunication*; and ſince that,
“ the *Pope* hath made many *Biſhops* in *Ireland*, which his Predeceſſors
“ had forborn to do from the Death of *Queen Elizabeth*, to *A. D.*
“ 1640. And therefore there is no reaſon to believe, that the *Court*
“ of *Rome* doth recede from its former Principles, as to theſe
“ things.

§. 2. Theſe ſeveral Particulars carry ſo much weight along with them, as may eaſily raiſe the expectation of any one, to ſee what Mr. *Creſſy* will reply to them. And in truth he enters the *Field* like a *Champion*; for he ſaith, *his Apology is publiſhed* Permiſſu Superiorum; Epiſt. Apol. p. 101. *and what he writes on this ſpecial Subject*, he deſires the *Perſon* of *Honour to conſider, not as the inconſiderable opinion of one particular Perſon only. And he doth aſſure him, that there is not any one Point of Controverſie upon which they more earneſtly deſire to be ſummoned to give an account of before equal Judges, than this.* Thus he enters the Liſts, and walks his Ground, and brandiſhes his Sword, and makes Legs to the Judges with more than ordinary aſſurance, and fails in no point of a *Champion*, but overcoming his Adverſary. Which he is ſo far from, that after theſe Bravado's and Flouriſhes, he dares not ſtand before him; but looks round about him to diſcern any way to eſcape. But although it be beneath the Greatneſs of his Adverſary, to purſue him over all his Bogs, and to draw him out of Faſtneſſes; yet I ſhall endeavour to bring him into the Liſts again, that his Adverſary may not go away Bluſhing at ſo mean a Triumph.

There are five things which Mr. *Creſſy* offers at by way of Anſwer to the Diſcourſe of the *Perſon* of *Honour* on this ſubject. P. 112, 113. 1. *That there is no reaſon to ſuſpect the Catholick Subjects of* England *to be more wanting in Fidelity to their Prince than of other Nations, whoſe Catholick Anceſtors were ſo far from acknowledging any Supremacy of the Pope in Temporals, and much leſs any Authority in him to depoſe Princes, that even in thoſe times when Church-men had the greateſt Power in this Kingdom, Statutes were made with the joynt Votes of the Clergy upon occaſion of ſome Uſurpations of the* Roman *Court, in which the Penalty was no leſs* Stat. 25. & 27 Edw. 3. Stat. 16. R. 2. *than a Præmunire againſt any one who without the King's Licence ſhould make any Appeals to* Rome, *or ſubmit to a Legat's Juriſdiction, or upon* *the Pope's Summons go out of the Kingdom, or receive any Mandates or Briefs from* Rome, *or purchaſe Bulls for Preſentments to Churches: And which is moſt conſiderable, the Ground of their rejecting Papal Uſurpations is thus expreſſed, For the Crown of* England *is free, and hath been free from Earthly Subjection at all times, being immediately ſubject to* God *in all things touching the Regalities of the ſame, and not ſubject to the Pope; to which,* he ſaith, *the Biſhops aſſented, and the Lords and Commons declared their Reſolution to ſtand with the King in the Caſes aforeſaid, and in all other Caſes attempted againſt him, his Crown and Regality in all points, to live and to die.*

2. *That whatſoever they ſuffer here in* England *by virtue of the Penal*
P. 125. *Laws, it is purely for their Religion and the Catholick Faith*; and
P. 122. therefore he parallels *our Penal Laws, with thoſe of the* Medes *and* Perſians
againſt Daniel; *and of* Nero, Domitian *and* Diocleſian *againſt the*
P. 44. *Apoſtles and their Succeſſors: And yet Mr.* Creſſy confeſſes, *that the*
P. 104. *occaſion of the Penal Laws, was the Treaſonable Actions of ſome of their own Religion*; but he adds, *that they were ſcarce one ſcore of Perſons, and abhorred by all the reſt, for which Actions of theirs,* he confeſſes, *that care is taken of exacting Oaths both of Fidelity and Supremacy from* Roman *Catholicks as dangerous Subjects; and Days of Thankſgiving are kept for the diſcovery and prevention of ſuch Perſonal Treaſons*; *whereas,* ſaith he, *the whole Kingdoms deliverance from almoſt an univerſal Rebellion deſigning the extinction of Monarchy and Prelacy both, and executing the Murder of the lawful Sovereign is not eſteemed a ſufficient Motive for ſuch publick Thankſgivings, neither it ſeems is there at all a neceſſity of requiring from any a Retraction of the Principles of Rebellion, or a promiſe that it ſhall not be renewed.* By which we might think Mr. *Creſſy* had been utterly a ſtranger in his own Countrey, and had never heard of the Thirtieth of *January*, or the Twenty ninth of *May*, which are ſolemnly obſerved in our Church, and the *Offices* joyned with that of the Fifth of *November*, and are purpoſely intended for that very thing which he denies to be taken notice of by us, in ſuch a manner. What muſt we ſay to ſuch Men? Who openly and to our Faces deny that, which the whole Nation knows to be true. Theſe Stories might have paſſed abroad, where they have been wont to lye for the *Catholick Cauſe*, but to have the impudence to ſay ſuch things here, which every Boy can confute, is not the way to advance the *Reputation* of their *Church* among us.

And what doth Mr. *Creſſy* think, *the Renunciation of the Covenant* was intended for, if not to prevent the Miſchief of the former Rebellion? And is it poſſible for any Man who knows the Laws of his Countrey concerning theſe Matters, to dare to ſay in the face of the Kingdom, *That it ſeems there is no neceſſity at all of requiring from any a retraction of the Principles of Rebellion, or a promiſe it ſhall never be renewed?* If this be the way of defending the Innocency of *Roman* Catholicks, I had rather be accounted guilty, than have my Innocency thus defended.

3. He ſaith, *We alſo confidently affirm,* (ſo we have ſeen he hath
P. 100. done too much already) *that by virtue of the Spiritual Juriſdiction inherent in the Pope, the Temporal Rights and Power of the King* (*or even of the meaneſt of his Subjects*) *are not at all abridg'd, or prejudic'd. Which aſſertion,* he ſaith, *hath been always maintained in* France, *the Pope not contradicting it*; *from whence it follows, that it is agreeable to Catholick*

Religion. After this I expected he ſhould ſpeak home to the purpoſe, and ſay, *this is all the Power challenged by the Pope as to* England, *or owned by any* Roman *Catholicks here*; which, finding what he had affirmed about other Matters, I thought he would have made no ſcruple of; but I ſee he durſt not, either for Conſcience or meer Shame. But how then doth he get over this difficulty? *Why* Engliſh *Catholicks*, ſaith he. *ſhould be ſuſpected not to be as tender of the juſt Rights and precious Lives alſo of their Sovereign, as the Catholick Subjects of any other Kingdom, and why they ſhould be thought to be willing to acknowledge any Temporal Power direct or indirect, to be inherent in the Pope over the King or Kingdom, to which not any Catholick Gentleman or Nobleman would ſubmit, I cannot imagine.* I am very much to ſeek for the ſenſe of this, and know not what *the ſubmitting* relates to; but I ſuppoſe ſomething left out, or ſtruck out by his *Superiours*, who did not take care to leave ſenſe behind: But is this indeed all the ſecurity Mr. *Creſſy* offers, *that he cannot imagine it ſhould be otherwiſe here than in* France? We find, when he pleaſes, he can imagine ſtrange things: And is this only out of the reach of his imagination? What doth he think, *of the Kingdoms being under Excommunication at* Rome, as *Cardinal Barbarine* takes care *to put the* Iriſh *Nobility in mind*, for ſome good end doubtleſs. Is the *Kingdom of* France *ſo?* What doth he imagine of *Bulls* from *Rome* prohibiting the taking the *Oaths* required? Are there any ſuch things in *France?* What doth he think of the *Pope's Nuncio* appearing in the Head of an *Army*, and abſolving the *Kings* Subjects from their Allegiance? I confeſs, it was not much better in *France* in the time of the *Holy League*; but what opinion had they of the *Pope's Temporal Power* then? Cannot Mr. *Creſſy* imagine that there are ſuch People in *England* as *Jeſuits*? and it is not many Years ſince their *Reaſons* were therefore ſhewed to be *unreaſonable* in pleading an exmption from the *Sanguinary Laws, becauſe they did not hold the Pope's Power of depoſing Princes, and abſolving Subjects from their Allegiance.* And do not the *Jeſuitical* Party ſtill plead that their opinion is the common Doctrine of their *Church*, confirmed by *General Councils*, and approved by *multitudes* of *Divines* of all ſorts; and that the contrary is only aſſerted here, by a very inconſiderable Party, whereof ſome are *excommunicated* at *Rome* for their Zeal in this Matter? And do not we know, how much greater ſway the *Jeſuitical Party* hath among the *Nobility* and *Gentry*, then the deſpiſed *Secular Prieſts*? I do not at all queſtion but the *Nobility* and *Gentry* of *England* would do as much to preſerve the *juſt Rights and precious Lives of their Soveraigns*, as of any Nation in the World, and have as great a ſenſe of their own *Honour* as well as *Intereſt*, and of the *Duty* they owe to their *Countrey*. But ought not the *Law* to take ſo much the more care to keep their *Conſciences* untainted in theſe things? They being ſuch Perſons whoſe Loyalty cannot be corrupted, but under a *pretence* of *Conſcience*; and their *Conſciences* being ſo much in danger, by being under the direction chiefly of thoſe who are the ſworn *Servants* to the *Papal Power*.

4. He offers by way of *ſatisfaction* concerning their *Fidelity*, *that*
they will ſubſcribe the French *Declaration lately made by the* Sorbon, *or* P. 108.
the Cenſure of the Faculty at Paris, A. D. 1626. *and that very few, if*
any at all would refuſe Subſcription to that Form preſcribed by the State, P. 116.

the Pope's Summons go out of the Kingdom, or receive any Mandates or Briefs from Rome, *or purchaſe Bulls for Preſentments to Churches: And which is moſt conſiderable, the Ground of their rejecting Papal Uſurpations is thus expreſſed, For the Crown of* England *is free, and hath been free from Earthly Subjection at all times, being immediately ſubject to* God *in all things touching the Regalities of the ſame, and not ſubject to the Pope;* to which, he ſaith, *the Biſhops aſſented, and the Lords and Commons declared their Reſolution to ſtand with the King in the Caſes aforeſaid, and in all other Caſes attempted againſt him, his Crown and Regality in all points, to live and to die.*

P. 125. 2. *That whatſoever they ſuffer here in* England *by virtue of the Penal Laws, it is purely for their Religion and the Catholick Faith*; and therefore
P. 122. he parallels *our Penal Laws, with thoſe of the* Medes *and* Perſians
againſt Daniel; *and of* Nero, Domitian *and* Diocleſian *againſt the A*-
P. 44. *poſtles and their Succeſſors: And yet Mr.* Creſſy confeſſes, *that the occa*-
P. 104. *ſion of the Penal Laws, was the Treaſonable Actions of ſome of their own Religion*; but he adds, *that they were ſcarce one ſcore of Perſons, and abhorred by all the reſt, for which Actions of theirs,* he confeſſes, *that care is taken of exacting Oaths both of Fidelity and Supremacy from* Roman *Catholicks as dangerous Subjects; and Days of Thankſgiving are kept for the diſcovery and prevention of ſuch Perſonal Treaſons; whereas,* ſaith he, *the whole Kingdoms deliverance from almoſt an univerſal Rebellion deſigning the extinction of Monarchy and Prelacy both, and executing the Murder of the lawful Sovereign is not eſteemed a ſufficient Motive for ſuch publick Thankſgivings, neither it ſeems is there at all a neceſſity of requiring from any a Retraction of the Principles of Rebellion, or a promiſe that it ſhall not be renewed.* By which we might think Mr. *Creſſy* had been utterly a ſtranger in his own Countrey, and had never heard of the Thirtieth of *January*, or the Twenty ninth of *May*, which are ſolemnly obſerved in our Church, and the *Offices* joyned with that of the Fifth of *November*, and are purpoſely intended for that very thing which he denies to be taken notice of by us, in ſuch a manner. What muſt we ſay to ſuch Men? Who openly and to our Faces deny that, which the whole Nation knows to be true. Theſe Stories might have paſſed abroad, where they have been wont to lye for the *Catholick Cauſe*, but to have the impudence to ſay ſuch things here, which every Boy can confute, is not the way to advance the *Reputation* of their *Church* among us.

And what doth Mr. *Creſſy* think, *the Renunciation of the Covenant* was intended for, if not to prevent the Miſchief of the former Rebellion? And is it poſſible for any Man who knows the Laws of his Countrey concerning theſe Matters, to dare to ſay in the face of the Kingdom, *That it ſeems there is no neceſſity at all of requiring from any a retraction of the Principles of Rebellion, or a promiſe it ſhall never be renewed?* If this be the way of defending the Innocency of *Roman* Catholicks, I had rather be accounted guilty, than have my Innocency thus defended.

P. 100. 3. He ſaith, *We alſo confidently affirm,* (ſo we have ſeen he hath done too much already) *that by virtue of the Spiritual Juriſdiction inherent in the Pope, the Temporal Rights and Power of the King* (*or even of the meaneſt of his Subjects*) *are not at all abridg'd, or prejudic'd. Which aſſertion,* he ſaith, *hath been always maintained in* France, *the Pope not contradicting it; from whence it follows, that it is agreeable to Catholick*

Religion. After this I expected he ſhould ſpeak home to the purpoſe, and ſay, *this is all the Power challenged by the Pope as to* England, *or owned by any* Roman *Catholicks here*; which, finding what he had affirmed about other Matters, I thought he would have made no ſcruple of; but I ſee he durſt not, either for Conſcience or meer Shame. But how then doth he get over this difficulty? *Why* Engliſh *Catholicks*, ſaith he. *ſhould be ſuſpected not to be as tender of the juſt Rights and precious Lives alſo of their Sovereign, as the Catholick Subjects of any other Kingdom, and why they ſhould be thought to be willing to acknowledge any Temporal Power direct or indirect, to be inherent in the Pope over the King or Kingdom, to which not any Catholick Gentleman or Nobleman would ſubmit, I cannot imagine.* I am very much to ſeek for the ſenſe of this, and know not what *the ſubmitting* relates to; but I ſuppoſe ſomething left out, or ſtruck out by his *Superiours*, who did not take care to leave ſenſe behind: But is this indeed all the ſecurity Mr. *Creſſy* offers, *that he cannot imagine it ſhould be otherwiſe here than in* France? We find, when he pleaſes, he can imagine ſtrange things: And is this only out of the reach of his imagination? What doth he think, *of the Kingdoms being under Excommunication at* Rome, as *Cardinal Barbarine* takes care *to put the* Iriſh *Nobility in mind*, for ſome good end doubtleſs. Is the *Kingdom of* France *ſo?* What doth he imagine of *Bulls* from *Rome* prohibiting the taking the *Oaths* required? Are there any ſuch things in *France?* What doth he think of the *Pope's Nuncio* appearing in the Head of an *Army*, and abſolving the *Kings* Subjects from their Allegiance? I confeſs, it was not much better in *France* in the time of the *Holy League*; but what opinion had they of the *Pope's Temporal Power* then? Cannot Mr. *Creſſy* imagine that there are ſuch People in *England* as *Jeſuits?* and it is not many Years ſince their *Reaſons* were therefore ſhewed to be *unreaſonable* in pleading an exmption from the *Sanguinary Laws*, *becauſe they did not hold the Pope's Power of depoſing Princes, and abſolving Subjects from their Allegiance.* And do not the *Jeſuitical* Party ſtill plead that their opinion is the common Doctrine of their *Church*, confirmed by *General Councils*, and approved by *multitudes* of *Divines* of all ſorts; and that the contrary is only aſſerted here, by a very inconſiderable Party, whereof ſome are *excommunicated* at *Rome* for their Zeal in this Matter? And do not we know, how much greater ſway the *Jeſuitical Party* hath among the *Nobility* and *Gentry*, then the deſpiſed *Secular Prieſts?* I do not at all queſtion but the *Nobility* and *Gentry* of *England* would do as much to preſerve the *juſt Rights and precious Lives of their Soveraigns*, as of any Nation in the World, and have as great a ſenſe of their own *Honour* as well as *Intereſt*, and of the *Duty* they owe to their *Countrey*. But ought not the *Law* to take ſo much the more care to keep their *Conſciences* untainted in theſe things? They being ſuch Perſons whoſe Loyalty cannot be corrupted, but under a *pretence* of *Conſcience*; and their *Conſciences* being ſo much in danger, by being under the direction chiefly of thoſe who are the ſworn *Servants* to the *Papal Power*.

4. He offers by way of *ſatisfaction* concerning their *Fidelity*, *that*
they will ſubſcribe the French *Declaration lately made by the* Sorbon, *or* P. 108.
the Cenſure of the Faculty at Paris, A. D. 1626. *and that very few, if*
any at all would refuſe Subſcription to that Form preſcribed by the State, P. 116.

P. 111. *in caſe that unlucky Word Heretical were left out.* As though all thoſe
P. 120. who had hitherto refuſed to take that *Oath*, had done it only upon
this nicety, that the Word *Heretical* were not to be taken in the
ſenſe of the *Givers*, but of the *Takers* of the *Oath*: Whereas Mr.
Creſſy himſelf ſaith, *that common Reaſon teaches, that all Oaths, Pro-*
P. 112. *feſſions and Promiſes are to be underſtood in the ſenſe of thoſe who frame
and require them, and not of thoſe upon whom they are impoſed.* But if
this were all the ground of refuſing this *Oath* among any of them,
Mr. Creſſy therein charges them with the *want* of *common Reaſon*:
Whereas I ſhall make it appear in the progreſs of this Diſcourſe,
that this was far from being the true and only reaſon of the *Roman
Catholicks* refuſing the *Oath* of *Allegiance*.

5. *That ſince Ordination abroad doth not in the leaſt render* Engliſh
Prieſts defective in their Duties to the Civil Magiſtrate; it will follow
P. 121. *that whatſoever Penalty is inflicted on them on ſuch an account, is not in-
flicted according to the Rule of Juſtice, and by conſequence, that whatſoever
Blood ſhall be ſhed, the guilt of it before God will be imputed to the whole
Kingdom, ſince it is ſhed by virtue of the whole Kingdom's Votes, and Con-
ſent given long ſince upon Motives long ſince ceaſed.* And therefore he
charges it deeply *upon my Conſcience to endeavour to free the whole King-
dom from ſuch a guilt.* This is the ſubſtance of what Mr. *Creſſy* ſaith
upon this *very important Subject*, as himſelf calls it; and by vertue
P. 119. whereof he hopes, *the Pœnal Laws may be repealed, and thoſe of their
Religion may enjoy the Liberty of their Religion, and all the Rights of
Free-born Subjects.* Which are things too *important* to be debated in
P. 98. ſuch a manner by Perſons, who by making Reflections on the *Ju-
ſtice* and *Wiſdom* of a *Nation*, do endeavour to expoſe the *Laws* and
Government of it to the Cenſure and Reproach of the Malicious and
Ignorant. But ſince our *Laws* are ſo publickly accuſed of *Injuſtice*
and *Cruelty*, and the Kingdom charged with the *guilt of innocent Blood*,
I hope I may have leave, as an *Engliſh-man* to vindicate the *Laws*
of our *Country*, and as a *Proteſtant*, to wipe off the Aſperſion of
Cruelty from our *Religion*: Which I ſhall do without the leaſt in-
tention of Miſchief to any Men's Perſons, or of ſharpening the ſeveri-
ties of Laws againſt them.

§. 3. And to proceed with the greateſt clearneſs in this matter, I ſhall conſider,

1. The Charge of Injuſtice and Cruelty which he lays upon our *Penal Laws*.

2. The Propoſals he makes in order to the repeal of them, and giving a full liberty to the exerciſe of their Religion.

1. *The charge of Injuſtice and Cruelty upon our Penal Laws.* Whoſoever adventures to charge the publick *Laws* of a Kingdom in ſuch a manner, ought to be very well adviſed upon what Grounds he proceeds; and to underſtand throughly the Nature and Conſtitution of *Government*, and *Rules* of *Juſtice*, and the power of interpreting as well as making *Laws*, and the certain bounds within which *Laws* may make Actions *Treaſonable*, and how far Actions thought *Religious* by the Perſons who do them, may become *Treaſonable* when they are againſt *Laws* made for the Publick Safety; and what Actions of *Religion* make Men *Martyrs* when they ſuffer for them, and what not; for it is certain, they are not all of equal conſequence and

neceſſity; theſe and many other things a Man ought to come well provided with, that dares in the Face of the whole World to charge the *Laws* of his own Nation with *Injuſtice and Cruelty*. But Mr. *Creſſy* may be excuſed in this matter, for that would indeed be an *unjuſt* and *cruel Law* to require *impoſſibilities* from Men: I wiſh ſo noble a Subject had been undertaken by a Perſon fit for it, that could have managed it otherwiſe than in a bare declamatory manner. But ſince he is the *Goliah* that dares ſo openly defie our *Laws* and *Government*, I ſhall make uſe of his own Weapons to cut off the Heads of this terrible Accuſation. For, 1. he grants, *That the Laws made by their Catholick Anceſtors,* viz. *the Statutes of* Præmunire *and* Proviſors *were juſt Laws.* 2. *That our King hath reaſon to expect as much ſecurity of the fidelity of his Catholick Subjects, as any Catholick Prince hath from his.* 3. *That all Chriſtian Kings have in ſome ſenſe a kind of Spiritual Authority, that they ought to be Nurſing Fathers to God's Church, that they ought to promote true Chriſtian Doctrine, both touching Faith and Manners, and to employ their Power when occaſion is, to oblige even Eccleſiaſtical Perſons to perform their Duties, and all their Subjects to live in all Chriſtian Piety and Vertue.* Epiſtle Apologet. p. 102. Theſe are his own Words, which in ſhort come to this, that they are bound to promote and preſerve the true Religion. P. 105. 4. *That it is abſolutely unlawful for them to defend their Religion, being perſecuted by Soveraign Magiſtrates, by any other way but ſuffering;* which, he ſaith, *they do ſincerely profeſs according to their perſwaſion.* 5. *That the Treaſonable Actions of Perſons of their own Religion were the occaſion of making and continuing the Penal Laws; for upon their account,* he ſaith, *they are thought dangerous Subjects, and care is taken to exact Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy from them.* P. 104. 6. *That where the Popes temporal Power is owned, eſpecially as to depoſing Princes, there can be no ſufficient ſecurity given as to the Fidelity of ſuch Perſons.* This I prove from his ſaying, *that there is no reaſon to queſtion their Fidelity, whoſe Anceſtors were ſo far from any Supremacy of the Pope in Temporals, and much leſs any Authority in him to depoſe Princes, that they made the Statutes of* Præmunire *and* Proviſors, (which by his favour is a very weak Argument, unleſs Men can never be ſuppoſed to degenerate from the *Vertues* of their *Anceſtors*) P. 116, 117. but beſides, *the ſatisfaction he offers, is by renouncing the Pope's Temporal* Power, *and declaring that his Power of depoſing Princes, and abſolving Subjects from their Allegiance, is repugnant to the Word of God, although they dare not call it Heretical*; from whence it follows, that Mr. *Creſſy* doth not think thoſe can give ſufficient ſecurity for their Fidelity, who dare not thus far renounce the Pope's Power.

7. *That where there is no ſufficient ſecurity given for the Fidelity of Perſons, there is great reaſon they ſhould lie under the ſeverity of Laws.* Which Mr. *Creſſy* always ſuppoſes, and only complains of their hardſhip upon the offers he makes of their *Fidelity*. And this muſt hold as to all ſorts of Perſons who may be dangerous to Government, although they may pretend never ſo much *exemption* by their *Function*, or being employed in *Offices* not immediately relating to *Civil Government*.

From theſe conceſſions it will be no difficult task to clear our *Penal Laws* from *injuſtice*, and to vindicate the whole *Kingdom* from the *guilt of innocent Blood*, if I can prove theſe following aſſertions.

1. That the ſame *Reaſons* which juſtifie the ancient *Statutes* of *England*, and the *Laws* of *Catholick Princes* abroad, do vindicate our *Penal Laws* from the charge of *Injuſtice* and *Cruelty*.

2. That *Laws* originally made upon the account of acknowledged *treaſonable Practices*, do continue juſt upon all thoſe who do not give ſufficient ſecurity againſt the *principles* leading to thoſe *Practices*.

1. That the ſame Reaſons which juſtifie the ancient *Statutes* of *England*, and the *Laws* of *Catholick Princes* abroad, do vindicate our *Penal Laws* from the charge of *Injuſtice* and *Cruelty*. For if the *Penalties* do bear no greater proportion to the nature of the *Offence*; if the *Power* be as *great* and as *juſt* in our *Law-makers*; if the *Occaſions* were of as high a Nature, and the *Pleas* in behalf of the Perſons *equal*, then there can be no *reaſon* aſſigned why thoſe *Laws* ſhould be juſt and lawful, and not ours. And the making out of theſe things is my preſent buſineſs.

1. I begin with the *ancient Laws and Statutes of England*. And I hope no one dares queſtion, but that the *Power* of making *Laws* is as good and juſt in *England* ſince the *Reformation*, as ever it was before: For if there be the leaſt diminution of *Power* by virtue of the cutting off the *Pope's Authority*, then ſo much of the *Civil Power* as was loſt by it, was derived from the *Pope*: And this is in plain terms to make the *Pope* our *Temporal Soveraign*, and the whole Kingdom to be only *Feudatary* to him; which is aſſerting his *Temporal Power* with a vengeance; and contains in it a Doctrine that none but very *Self-denying Princes* can ever give the leaſt Countenance to, becauſe it ſtrikes at the very Root of their Authority, and makes them only *precarious Princes*, (and in a much more proper Senſe than the *Popes* uſe that Title, *The Servants of Servants*.) Suppoſing then the *Legiſlative* and *Civil Power* to be equal ſince the *Reformation* and *before*; our Work is to compare the other Circumſtances together; and if it appear, that the *Plea* of *Conſcience* and *Religion* did equally hold then, and notwithſtanding that the *Penalties* were as great, upon the ſame or far leſs occaſions. I hope our *Laws* will at leaſt appear as *juſt* and *reaſonable* as thoſe were.

§. 4. To make this out, I muſt give an account of the *State* of thoſe Times, and the *Reaſons* and *Occaſions* which moved the *Law-makers* to enact thoſe *Penal Statutes*; in which I ſhall ſhew theſe two things, 1. That they began upon a Controverſie of *Religion*; and that the *Penal Laws* were made againſt thoſe Perſons who pleaded Religion. 2. That the Reaſons and Occaſions of the *Penal Laws* ſince the *Reformation* were at leaſt as great as thoſe.

1. That the ancient *Penal Laws* were made upon a *Controverſie* of *Religion*: And to give a clear Account of the Riſe and Occaſion of of them, I muſt begin from the *Norman Conqueſt*; for then thoſe Foundations were laid of all the following Controverſies, which happened between the *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical Power*. On the behalf of the *Eccleſiaſtical Power* was the Plea of *Conſcience* and *Religion*, on the behalf of the *Civil Power* nothing but the *juſt Rights of Princes*, and the neceſſary preſervation of their own and the publick Safety. And this Controverſie between the *Two Powers* was managed with ſo much zeal, and ſuch pretences of *Conſcience* on the behalf of the *Eccleſiaſtical Power*, that the *Civil Power*, notwithſtanding the Courage

rage of ſome Princes, and the Reſolution of Parliaments, had much ado to ſtand its Ground, or to be able to preſerve it ſelf from the Encroachments and Uſurpations of the other. So that to ſee Princes give any Countenance to the ſame Pretences, would be almoſt as ſtrange, as to ſee them turn Common-wealths-men. I know there were good *Laws* frequently made to ſtrengthen the *Civil Power*; but the very frequency of them ſhewed how ineffectual they were: For what need many Laws to the ſame purpoſe, if the firſt had any force at all? and the multiplication of Laws for the ſame thing, is a certain ſign of defect in the *Government*. To undeceive therefore all thoſe who judge of the State of Affairs by the *Book* of *Statutes*, I ſhall deduce the Hiſtory of this great *Controverſie* between the *Eccleſiaſtical* and *Civil Power* in *England*, ſo far as to ſhew the neceſſity there was found of putting an iſſue to it, by caſting out the *Pope's* pretended *Power* and *Juriſdiction* in this *Nation*.

The two firſt who began this Diſpute, were both Men of great Spirits, and reſolute in their Undertakings; I mean *William the Conqueror* and *Gregory* VII. who was the firſt *Pope* that durſt ſpeak out, and he very freely declares his Mind about the ſubjection of the *Civil Power* to the *Eccleſiaſtical*, and the exemption of all *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons* and *Things* from the *Civil Power*. In his Epiſtle to *Hertmanus* Biſhop of *Metz*, about the *Excommunication of* Henry IV. and *abſolving his Subjects from their Allegiance*; he thus expreſſes himſelf, *Shall not that Power which was firſt found out by Men who knew not God, be ſubject to that which God himſelf hath appointed for his own Honour in the World, and the Head of which is the Son of God? Who knows not that Kings and Dukes had their beginnings from Men who gained their Authority over their Equals by blind Ambition and intolerable Preſumption, by Rapines and Murders, by Perfidiouſneſs and all manner of Wickedneſs?* Is not this a very pretty Account of the *Original* of *Civil Power* by the *Head* of the *Church*? But this is not all, for he adds, *While Princes make God's Prieſts to be ſubject to them, to whom may we better compare them than to him, who is the Head over all the Sons of Pride, who tempted the Son of God with promiſing him all the Kingdoms of the World, if he would fall down and worſhip him?* This is better and better; it ſeems it is as bad as the Sin of *Lucifer*, for *Princes not to be ſubject to the Pope*; and it is like the *Devil's tempting Chriſt*, to offer to make *Prieſts ſubject to the Civil Power. Who doubts*, ſaith he, *that Chriſts Prieſts are to be accounted the Fathers and Maſters of Kings and Princes, and all the Faithful? Now*, ſaith he, *is it not a lamentable madneſs, if the Son ſhould offer to make the Father ſubject to him*, (but one of his Succeſſors did not think ſo, that ſet up *Henry* V. againſt his own *Father*) *or the Scholar his Maſter, or to think to bind him on Earth, by whom he expects to be looſed in Heaven?* Theſe were the *Demonſtrations* of that *Age*, and the main ſupports of the Cauſe; and in his Epiſtle to *William*, King of *England*, he tells him, *that God had appointed two kinds of Government for Mankind, the Apoſtolical and Regal* (that is much, that the ſame Government ſhould come *only from the Sins of Men, and yet be from the appointment of God*: But we are to conſider he writ this to a King whom he hoped to perſwade, and therefore would not tell him the worſt of his Thoughts about the beginnings of *Civil Power*) *but*, ſaith he, *theſe two Powers, like the Sun and Moon, have that inequality by the Chriſtian Religion, that the Royal Power next under God*

Greg. 7. Epiſt. l. 8. Ep. 21.

Greg. 7. Epiſt. l. 7. Ep. 25.

is to be under the care and management of the Apoſtolical. And ſince the Apoſtolical See is to give an account to God of the miſcarriages of Princes, his Wiſdom ought to conſider, whether he ought not without farther delay take an Oath of Fealty to him. For no leſs than that would content him: But *William* was not ſo *meek* a *Prince* to be eaſily brought to this, as *Robert* of *Sicily*, *Richard* of *Capua*, *Bertram* of *Provence*, *Rodulphus*, and ſeveral others were, whoſe *Oaths* of *Fealty* to him are extant in the *Collection* or *Regiſter* of his *Epiſtles*. But *William* gives him a reſolute Anſwer, which is extant among the *Epiſtles* of *Lanfranc, that for the Oath of Fealty, he had not done it, neither would he, becauſe he never promiſed it, neither did he find that ever his Predeceſſors had done it to* Gregory's *Predeceſſors*. The *Pope* ſtorms at this, and writes a chiding Letter to *Lanfranc*, Arch-biſhop of *Canterbury*, who like a better Subject to the *Pope* than to the *King*, writes an humble Excuſe for himſelf to the *Pope*, and tells him, *he had done his endeavour to perſwade the King, but could not prevail with him* : And *Cardinal Baronius* ſaith, *the Pope took it very ill at his Hands, conſidering the kindneſs he had received from the Papal See.* For *Alexander* II. favoured his Cauſe againſt *Harold*, and ſent him a *conſecrated Banner* ; and if we may believe *Henricus de Silgrave*, the *Pope gave him his Title to the Crown of* England, *on condition that he ſhould hold it in Fee from the Papal See :* But I find no ſuch thing mentioned by *Ingulphus*, or *Gulielmus Pictavienſis*, who underſtood the *Conqueror's* Affairs as well as any, being about him at that time; neither would *Gregory* VII. have omitted it: But however *Bertholdus Conſtantienſis*, or rather *Bernaldus* an Author of that time, and the *Pope's Pœnitentiary*, affirms confidently, that *William King* of *England made this whole Nation Tributary to the Pope* ; which there is no pretence for, but only that he, after ſome demur, cauſed the ancient *Eleemoſynary Peter-pence* to be ſent to *Rome*. So careful had Princes need to be, of the continuance of *Gifts* to *Rome*, which in time are look'd on as a *Tribute* ; and that *Tribute* an acknowledgement of *Fealty*; and that *Fealty* proves a *Subjection* in *Temporals*. But this was not the only Diſpute between theſe *two Conquerors* ; for *Gregory* VII. at the ſame time that he ſent *Hubert* his *Legate* to *England* about the Oath of *Fealty*, he ſent *Hugo* to keep a Council in *France* againſt the *Inveſtitures of Biſhops by Lay-hands*, and afterwards in a Council at *Rome*, ſolemnly condemned them ; and threatned *depoſition to all that received them, and the Vengeance of God upon thoſe that gave them.* The bottom of which lay not in the pretence of *Simony*, but becauſe it was too great a Token of their Subjection to the *Civil Power*; and *Gregory* VII. was, as *Bertholdus* ſaith, *a moſt Zealous Defender of Eccleſiaſtical Liberty, i. e.* the total exemption of *Eccleſiaſtical* Perſons from Subjection to the *Civil Power* ; and *Eadmerus* ſaith, *that the Biſhops made their Homage to the King before they received Inveſtiture by the Staff and the Ring.* But notwithſtanding all theſe Decrees and Threatnings, *William* the *Conqueror*, as that *Author* tells us, *would never part with the Rights of the Crown in this Matter ; And he declares, that he would not only keep the ancient* Saxon *Cuſtom of Inveſtiture,* (as *Ingulphus* and other Authors ſhew it to have been) *but all the ancient Cuſtoms of his Predeceſſors in* Normandy, *relating to Eccleſiaſtical Affairs :* So that all *Eccleſiaſtical as well as Civil things*, ſaith *Eadmerus*, *were under his Command.* These Cuſtoms were, 1. *That none ſhould be acknowledg'd Pope, but whom the King pleaſed.*

Epiſt. l. 1. *c.* 21. *L.* 9. 3. 12. *Lanfranc. Ep.* 7.

Lanfranc. Ep. 8. *Annal. Eccleſiaſt. A.* 1079. *n.* 25. *Henr. de Silgrave Chronic. MS. in Biblioth. Cotton. Berthold. Conſtant. Append. ad Hern. Contr. A.* 1084.

Baron. A. D. 1080. *n.* 3.

Greg. 7. *ep. l.* 7. *ep.* 14.

Berthold. Conſt. A. D. 1085.

Eadmer. Præf. p. 2.

Selden. not. ad Eadm. p. 142. *Eadmer. p.* 6.

2. *That no Bulls ſhould be received, but ſuch as were approved by the King.* 3. *That nothing ſhould be decreed in Provincial Councils, but by his Approbation.* 4. *That no Perſons about the King ſhould be excommunicated without his knowledge:* But beſides, Pope *Gregory* charged him with two more Enormities, *viz.* 5. *Hindring all Appeals to* Rome *of Biſhops and Arch-biſhops; which was ſuch a thing,* he ſaith, *that a Heathen would not have done it.* Greg. Regiſtr. l. 7. ep. 1. 6. *Seizing upon the Perſon of his Brother* Odo, *being a Biſhop, and Impriſoning him,* which he ſaid was plainly againſt Scripture, *Qui vos tangit tangit pupillam oculi mei; & Nolite tangere Chriſtos meos;* which no doubt were underſtood of the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of the *Patriarchal* and *Jewiſh* Church. L. 11. ep. 2. But I do not find that King *William* did at all recede from the Rights of his Crown, although the Pope, according to his Skill, quoted Scripture againſt them; although the Biſhop of *Baieux* was clapt up on the account of Treaſon, as our Hiſtorians agree, yet in Pope *Gregory*'s Opinion he ſuffered for Religion and the preſervation of Divine Laws: And ſuch Men as Mr. *Creſſy* might have compared ſuch Laws with thoſe of *Nero* and *Domitian*; but I think they durſt not have done it in the Conqueror's time; who at the Council of *Illebon* in *Normandy,* Order. Vital. Eccleſ. hiſtor. l. 5. p. 554. declared his Reſolutions to maintain the Cuſtoms of his Predeceſſors relating to Eccleſiaſtical Affairs.

§. 5. After the Death of *Gregory* VII. there was no Pope acknowledg'd in *England* for Eleven Years, becauſe of the *Schiſm* between *Urban* and *Clement*; and our King had declared for neither of them: Florent. Wigorn. A. 1091. And *William Rufus* told *Anſelm,* who would fain have gone to *Urban* II. for his *Pall, that he had not yet acknowledg'd him for Pope, and therefore he ſhould not go.* " And, ſaith he, if you own him without my Eadmer. p. 26.
" Authority, you break your Faith to me, and diſpleaſe me as much as
" if you did endeavour to take away my Crown. *Anſelm* however
" ſtands upon it, " That himſelf had own'd him for Pope, and
" would do ſo whatever came of it; and would not depart from his
" Obedience for an hour. A Parliament being called at *Rockingham* upon this occaſion, the Nobility and Biſhops all adviſed him to ſubmit to the King. *Anſelm* notwithſtanding cries, *Tu es Petrus & ſuper hanc Petram,* &c. *& qui vos tangit tangit pupillam oculi,* as *Gregory* VII. P. 27. had done before him, and to as much purpoſe; *but no ſuch things,* ſaith he, *are ſaid of Kings or Princes, or Dukes or Earls*; and therefore he reſolved to adhere to the Pope: The King being acquainted P. 28. with his Anſwer, ſends ſome of the Nobles and Biſhops to him to let him know, " That the whole Kingdom was againſt him, and that
" hereby he endeavour'd to take away one of the Flowers of his
" Crown from him, by depriving him of one of the ancient Rights
" of it: And withal that he acted contrary *to his Oath to the King.* *Anſelm* (if we may believe *Eadmerus,* who lived in his time, and was P. 24. his conſtant Companion) ſtood upon his Privilege, " That an Archbi-
" ſhop of *Canterbury* could be judged by none but the Pope: And ſo
" by that means was wholly exempt from the Royal Power: And
" he bore all the Affronts he met with patiently out of his firm De-
" votion to the Papal See. The Biſhop of *Durham,* whoſe Advice the King asked in this Matter, told him, that *Anſelm* had the *Word of God and Authority of St.* Peter *of his ſide. The King* ſaid, *he would never endure one equal to himſelf in his Kingdom*: And therefore took

P. 30, 31. off his protection from him, and commands the Nobility and Biſhops
to diſown him ; and baniſhes his Counſellors, and gives him time
for a final Anſwer. The mean while the King tries by ſeveral Arts
P. 32, 33. to gain him, *viz.* by ſending to *Urban* ſecretly for the *Pall*, and acknowledging
him to be Pope, and at laſt they brought it to this
iſſue, that he ſhould receive the *Pall* at the King's Hands, which he
P. 34. utterly refuſed to do, and would take it no otherwiſe but off from the
Altar of *Canterbury*. After this, he deſires leave to go to the Pope,
the King denies, he perſiſts in his Intreaty, the King abſolutely denies
P. 38. it ; he reſolves to go however, *becauſe*, ſaith he, *it is better to obey God
than Man*. As though God had commanded him to diſobey the
the King in this Matter. When the Biſhops had diſſwaded him from
it, and told him they would keep their Fidelity to the King : *Go*,
P. 39. ſaith he, *then to your Lord, and I will hold to my God*. Did he mean
the ſame God which the Gloſs upon the *Canon Law* ſpeaks of, *our
Lord God the Pope ?* And it is hard to conceive any other could be
meant in this caſe. The King ſends ſome of the Biſhops and Barons
to him, to put him in mind of his Oath to obſerve the Laws and Cuſtoms
P. 40. of the Realm ; he told him they were to be underſtood with
the reſervation of *being according to God*, and that it was not ſo, to
keep him from going to the Pope, and therefore he would not obſerve
it ; and ſo takes his leave of the King to be gone ; and the King after
his going, ſeizes upon all his Profits. I deſire to know of ſuch
as Mr. *Creſſy*, whether the King or *Anſelm* were in the right in all
this Affair ? And if the King had uſed greater ſeverity to him, whether
Anſelm had ſuffered on the Account of *Religion* or *Treaſon ?* But
P. 43. he complains to the Pope, *that the Law of God, and Authority of the
Pope and Canons were overwhelmed by the Cuſtoms of the Realm* ; and
therefore he reſigns his *Archbiſhoprick to him, and deſires the Pope to
put one into it*, which was contrary to the ancient Rights of the
King : The Pope in a Council at *Rome* ſolemnly Excommunicates all
P. 53. *Lay-Perſons that gave Inveſtitures of Churches, ond all that received them,
and all Eccleſiaſtical Perſons that paid Homage to Princes, ſaying it
was very unfit that they who made their God, ſhould put their Hands into
the obſcene and cruel Hands of Princes :* as *Eadmerus* relates it, who was
preſent in the Council.

P. 56. §. 6. After the Death of *Rufus*, *Anſelm* returns for *England*, the
new King *Henry* I. demands the *accuſtomed Homage* from him, he denies
it, and gives the late *Council* at *Rome* for his Reaſon, adding
further, *if the King would ſubmit to the Decrees of that Council, there
would be Peace between them, otherwiſe he would be gone again.* The *King*
was very unwilling to part with the *Rights* of his *Predeceſſors* in the
Inveſtiture and *Homage* of *Biſhops* ; for ſaith *Eadmerus*, *it ſeemed to him
as much as to loſe half his Kingdom :* And yet was afraid to let *Anſelm*
go, leſt by his means the Pope ſhould have ſet up his Brother
Robert's Title againſt him ; the King being in this ſtrait, endeavours
to gain time, and ſends Ambaſſadors to the Pope, to try, if he could
procure his conſent, *to let him enjoy his own Rights :* Pope *Paſchal* II.
Ead. p. 60. in his long Epiſtle to *Henry*, abſolutely condemns them, as *inconſiſtent
with God, with Juſtice, or with Salvation* : And adds, that to the Wit
of his Predeceſſors, *that it was a monſtrous thing for a Son to beget a Father,
or a Man to make a God* ; (but *Urban* gave that, as a reaſon againſt

againſt it, becauſe Prieſts *were Men that did make a God*) *now Prieſts*, ſaith he, *in Scripture are called Gods*; and are not *Princes* or *Secular Powers?* The King not at all moved with this *Bull*, requires from *Anſelm* either to pay him *Homage*, and to conſecrate thoſe that had received *Inveſtitures* from him, or immediately to be gone out of the Kingdom: And withal declares, that he would preſerve the Rights of his *Predeceſſors*, *nor would endure any in his Kingdom that would not do him Homage*; the *Nobility* and the reſt of the *Biſhops* joyn with the *King*, and uſed all perſwaſions to keep him from ſubmitting to the *Pope*. The King hoping to compoſe this matter, ſends three Biſhops to the Pope to let him know, ſaith *Eadmerus*, *that if the King did not enjoy his Rights, he would baniſh* Anſelm, *and renounce the Pope.* P. 61. But *Brompton* hath the ſmart Letter the King ſent upon this occaſion, wherein he tells him, *he would not fail of that reſpect and obedience which his Predeceſſors had ſhewn to the Popes, on condition that all the Honours, Uſes and Cuſtoms which his Father had in his Predeceſſors times might be freely enjoyed by him; and that by the help of God none of them ſhould be leſſened in his time*; *and if*, ſaith he, *which God forbid, I ſhould be ſo baſe to let them go*; *yet my Nobility, nay, the whole People would by no means ſuffer it.* Brom. Chro. P. 999. The Pope told them, *he would not yield to the King in this matter to ſave his Life*; and writes Word to the King *that by the Judgment of the Holy Ghoſt he had forbidden all Inveſtitures by Princes*; and encourages *Anſelm* in his oppoſition to the *King*, with ſome impertinent *Texts* of *Scripture*. P. 63. (For of all Men, the Popes, notwithſtanding their pretence to Infallibility, have been very unhappy in applying *Scripture* in their *Bulls*; and it would be one of the ſtrangeſt Commentaries that ever the World ſaw, to ſet down the *Places* of *Scripture* produced by them with their *Interpretations* of them; but that is not my preſent buſineſs.) The King called together the Great Men of the Nation in Council at *London*, and ſends ſome of them to *Anſelm*, to know, *whether he would obſerve the Cuſtoms of his Predeceſſors, or be gone?* P. 65. The *Biſhops* pretending private Inſtructions contrary to the Pope's Bulls, *Anſelm* deſires time to know the Pope's Mind, and ſtill ſtands to the Pope's Letters; upon which the King told him, *he would bear theſe Delays no longer*; *Quid mihi de meis cum Papa*, *what have I to do with the Pope about my own Subjects? What Rights my Predeceſſors had, are mine too: Whoſoever would take them away from me is my Enemy, and every one that is my Friend knows it.* P. 70. *Anſelm* tells him, *that to ſave his Life he would not contradict the Pope's Decrees, unleſs he were abſolved by him.* The King would not ſo much as hear of the Pope's Bulls, nor ſuffer others to do it, which grieved *Anſelm* much, and away he goes again to receive *Comfort* from the *Pope*. The King ſends an Ambaſſador to the Pope, who told him *his Maſter would loſe his Kingdom rather than the Inveſtiture of Biſhops*; the Pope very graciouſly replyed, *Before God I will loſe my Head rather than he ſhall quietly enjoy them.* P. 73. But at laſt, the Pope was content he ſhould enjoy other Cuſtoms, excepting this of Inveſtitures; the King was not at all ſatisfied with this, but ſends Word to *Anſelm* he muſt not ſet Foot on *Engliſh Ground* unleſs he would promiſe to obſerve the *former Cuſtoms of the Realm*; P. 76. which he ſtill refuſed to do, and after ſeveral Endeavours to compoſe this difference, the King was at laſt forced to yield up the *ancient Right of Inveſtiture*, and retain only *Homage*, which the Pope and *Anſelm* were

P. 87, 91. *Mat. Paris A.* 1107. *p.* 65. *Petr. de Marca de Concord. Sacerd. & Imp. l.* 8. *c.* 20. *n.* 2. *Florent. Wigorn. A. D.* 1111. *Malmesb. de geſt. Reg. Angl. l.* 5. *Mat. Paris A.* 1113. *p.* 65. *Mat. Weſtminſt. A.* 1113. *Eadm. l.* 5. *p.* 115. 118. *Malmesb. de Henr.* 1. *p.* 95.

at preſent contented with; but this Agreement held not long; for notwithſtanding the Pope did lay ſo much weight on this Buſineſs of *Inveſtitures*, (as beſides what is mentioned already, he ſaid, *that Chriſt died in vain if Lay-Inveſtitures were allowed*) yet the King was certainly informed, that this ſame Pope had yielded Inveſtitures to the Emperor *Henry* V. as *Florentius Wigornienſis* and *Malmesbury* report, and therefore *Anſelm* writes to the Pope, *that the King would receive his too*: And it is evident he did ſo, for *Matth. Paris* and *Weſtminſter* ſay expreſly, *that the King inveſted the next Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *with a Staff and a Ring after the ancient Cuſtom*: Which was after the *Lateran Council*, wherein the Pope again revoked the *Emperors Privilege about Inveſtitures, which*, he ſaith, *is contrary to the Holy Ghoſt and the Canonical Inſtitution.* But where was the *Holy Ghoſt* then when he granted this *Privilege?* After this, the Pope complains of the King for retaining the other *ancient Rights, of hindering Appeals to* Rome, *and not receiving Legates*, but at laſt Pope *Calixtus* yielded to the King the enjoyment of the *Cuſtoms which his Father had in* England *and* Normandy. Was not this Pope very kind to the King, who ſo patiently yielded to thoſe *Cuſtoms* which his *Predeceſſors* had condemned as *contrary to Religion*, and *making Chriſts Death to no purpoſe?* The ſame *Calixtus* II. in the Council of *Lateran*, *A. D.* MCXXII. put an end to the Controverſie of *Inveſtitures* in the *Roman Empire*; yielding to the Emperor *the Right of Inveſtitures* ſo it were performed without *Simony*, and by a *Scepter*, and not *by a Staff and a Ring*; becauſe, forſooth, if it had been done by a *Ring*, it made it a kind of *Marriage*, and ſo made a *Spiritual Adultery* between the *Biſhop* and *his Church*, as the former Popes very learnedly proved in their *Epiſtles* againſt *Inveſtitures*.

Petr. de Marca de Concord. Sacerd. & Imper. l. 8. *c.* 21. *n.* 4.

§. 7. This Controverſie being at an end, the Popes bethought themſelves of a more ſubtle way of effecting their Deſign, which was by engaging the *Biſhops* by *Oaths of Fidelity* and *Obedience* to *themſelves*, as well as taking away their *Homages* and *Fealty* to *Princes*, that ſo with leſs Noiſe and more Security, they might compaſs the deſign of *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty* or rather *Slavery* to the Pope. *Gregory* VII. *Urban* II. and *Paſchal* II. did all forbid *Clergy-men to give any Homage to Princes*, as *Petrus de Marca* proves from the *Authentick Acts* of their ſeveral *Councils*; inſtead of which they required an *Oath* of *Fealty* to themſelves. For it was not a bare *Oath* of *Canonical Obedience*, which the Popes required, but as much an *Oath* of *Fealty* and *Allegiance*, as ever Princes require from their other *Subjects*; which will be made appear by comparing the *Oaths* together. The moſt ancient form of Allegiance I meet with, is that preſcribed in the *Capitular* of *Charles the Great*, which is contained in very few Words.

Conſtit. Caroli Magni c. 2. *p.* 263. *Hiſtor. Franc. Scriptores ed. ab An. Du Cheſn. Tom.* 2. *p.* 186.

Promitto ego partibus Domini mei Caroli Regis & filiorum ejus, quia fidelis ſum & ero diebus vitæ meæ ſine fraude vel malo ingenio, as it is in the old Edition of the Conſtitutions; but in the latter out of *Sirmondus* his Copy it is ſomewhat larger.

Promitto ego quod ab iſto die in antea fidelis ſum Domino Carolo piiſſimo Imperatori pura mente abſq; fraude & malo ingenio de meâ parte ad ſuam partem & ad honorem regni ſui, ſicut per drictam debet eſſe homo Domino ſuo. The ancient *Form* uſed in this Nation ran thus, *Tu jurabis quod ab iſta die in antea eris fidelis & legalis Domino noſtro Regi & ſuis hæredibus ; & fidelitatem & legalitatem ei portabis de vita & de membro & de terreno honore, & quod tu eorum malum aut damnum nec noveris nec audiveris, quod non defendes pro poſſe tuo, ita te Deus adjuvet :* Now let us compare theſe with the Oath made to the Pope ; I ſhall take that form which is publiſhed out of the *Vatican* MS. by *Odoricus Raynaldus*, which was taken by *Edmund* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*.

Spelm. in Gloſſa. v. Fidelitas.

Ego Edmundus, &c. *ab hac hora in antea fidelis & obediens ero S. Petro & S. R. E. & D. Papæ Gregorio ſuiſq; ſucceſſoribus canonicè intrantibus. Non ero in facto neq; in conſilio, aut conſenſu ut vitam perdant, aut membrum, aut capiantur malâ captione. Conſilium vero quod mihi credituri ſunt per ſe, aut per nuntios ſuos ſive per literas ad eorum damnum, neſciente nemini pandam. Papatum Romanum & Regalia Sancti Petri adjutor eis ero ad retinendum & defendendum ſalvo meo ordine contra omnem hominem*, &c. This is enough to ſhew, that if the other were properly Oaths of *Allegiance* to *Princes*, this is ſo to the Pope, and thereby they are bound to the very ſame *Obedience* to the Pope as their Soveraign, as any Men are to their own Princes. For here is no exception at all of the Rights of Prince and the Duty they owe to them; not the leaſt notice being taken of them, as though they did owe them any Allegiance : Which we plainly ſee was never intended ſhould be paid by thoſe who firſt impoſed this Oath. That Learned Gentleman Sir *Roger Twiſden* ſuppoſes this Oath to have been framed by *Paſchal* II. and it is certain, that *Rodulphus* being made Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* in his time, is the firſt we read among us, that took an Oath of Fidelity to the Pope, with that of Canonical Obedience : After whoſe time we frequently meet with it, but not before; but in truth, it is the very ſame Oath, only applying it to Church-men, which *Richard* of *Capua* took by way of Fealty to *Gregory* VII. as may appear to any one that compares them together ; where there are the ſame Expreſſions Word for Word : By which we may ſee the ſtricteſt Allegiance to the Pope is underſtood by it, without the leaſt reſervation of any other Prince s Rights. And conſidering the Doctrine and Deſign of the firſt impoſers of it, it cannot be queſtioned but their intention was hereby to exempt the takers of it from all Allegiance to any other than the Pope. But leſt this deſign ſhould be too eaſily ſuſpected, at firſt it went only along with the *Pall* to Archbiſhops, then it came to Biſhops, and at laſt, as the Gloſs upon the *Canon Law* tells us, to *all that receive any Dignity, Conſecration or Confirmation from the Pope* ; and now the Oath in the *Pontifical* is much larger than it was, and by it the takers are bound to *obſerve and defend the Papal Reſervations, Proviſions and Mandates, and to perſecute to the utmoſt of their Power, all Hereticks, Schiſmaticks and Rebels to the Pope.* Much kindneſs then is to be expected from all who are ſworn to Perſecution, and much Allegiance to Princes from thoſe who own the Pope to be their Soveraign in as expreſs terms as any Subjects can do their Princes : And ſo *Caſſender* takes notice, *that ſeveral paſſages in this Oath relate to meer civil Obedience, which we owe to Princes and not to the Pope* : And for what relates to the Papacy, *if by it be underſtood the Papal Tyranny*, as no doubt it is, *he utterly condemns it as an unlawful Oath* ; and I extreamly wonder at thoſe who make ſo many Scruples about Oaths of Allegiance

Odoric Raynald. Annal Eccleſiaſt. A. 1233. n. 65.

Hiſtorical Vindicat. Chap. 3. n. 50.

Eadmer. l. 5. p. 113.
Rad. de Diceto p. 534.
Gervaſ. Dorobern. p. 1307.
Mat. Paris p. 414.
vit. Abbat. p. 140.
Thorn. p. 1899.

Decretal. de jure jurand. l. 2. tit. 24. c. 4.

Pontifical. Roman. p. 86, to 97. Antw. 1627.

Epiſtolæ ſelect. cent. 1. ep. 21. p. 94, 97.

to Princes, that they make none at all about this, which, as far as I can ſee, leaves no room of Allegiance to them, any more than a Perſon who hath already ſworn Allegiance to one Prince, hath liberty to ſwear the ſame thing to another; which it is impoſſible he ſhould keep to both.

The firſt Contriver of this Oath to the Pope, was no other than *Gregory* VII. who could not be thought to underſtand leſs than the ſtricteſt Allegiance by it, ſince he required Fealty from Temporal Princes, and forbad all Clergy-men paying Homage to them. In the Council held by him at *Rome*, *A. D.* 1079. the Archbiſhop of *Aquileia* took an Oath in the ſame form with that publiſhed by *Raynaldus* out of the *Vatican* MS. and therein he is ſworn, *to defend the* Roman *Papacy and the Royalties of St.* Peter; which makes me wonder how the form extant in the *Canon Law* ſhould have it *Regulas Sanctorum Patrum* inſtead of *Regalia Sancti Petri*, for we are not to imagine that *Gregory* IX. had any ſuch thought to bring down the *Royalties of St.* Peter to the *ancient Canons*; and the Oath which was taken had the *Regalia ſancti Petri* always in it from *Gregory* VII's. time; unleſs they hoped to deceive the Simple by this means, for we find that even *Caſſander* himſelf thought there had been no other Form beſides that in the *Canon Law*, till the Biſhop of *Munſter* ſent him the Form he was to take; wherein were the *Regalia ſancti Petri*, as they are now in the *Pontifical.* But if the ſtricteſt Allegiance to the Pope as their Soveraign, were not intended by this *Oath*, why could not the Popes be contented with the former Oath of *Canonical Obedience*, which from the time of *Boniface* was required by the Pope of all *Metropolitans* together with the *Pall*, although many refuſed to ſubmit their Necks to that Yoke. Before *A. D.* 450. *Petrus de Marca* obſerves, no ſuch thing as an Oath of *Canonical Obedience* from Biſhops to the *Metropolitan* was uſed in the Church; and therefore *Leo* I. reproves *Anaſtaſius* of *Theſſalonica* for requiring it from *Atticus* a Biſhop under him; but afterwards by degrees it came into uſe, as appears by the Words of the Biſhops of *Aquileia* in *Baronius* to the Emperor *Mauricius*, and the Profeſſion made by *Adelbertus* to *Hincmarus* his *Metropolitan.* Whereas the *Metropolitans* themſelves made only a bare Profeſſion of their Faith, and a promiſe to their *Suffragan Biſhops* to obſerve the *Canons* of the Church. But when *Gregory* ſent *Boniface* as his Miſſionary into *Germany*, he made him take an Oath over the *Reliques of St.* Peter in the *Vatican*, to be true and faithful to the intereſts of the *Roman See*, but ſtill it was within the compaſs of the Catholick Faith and the ancient *Canons*: and this *Boniface* being a very faithful Servant to the Papal See, makes it his Buſineſs to perſwade the Biſhops of *Germany* and *France*, to profeſs Subjection to the Biſhop of *Rome*; and all the *Metropolitans* to receive *Palls* from thence, and to give *Canonical Obedience to the Pope's Decrees*: Theſe things went very hardly down with the Biſhops; for two Years after, *A. D.* 744. *Boniface* complains to Pope *Zachary*, *That he was afraid they would not keep their Words, but he aſſures the Pope it was none of his Fault*: but at laſt they were wheedled into it under this pretence that it was only a mark of Honour to receive the Pall, and not a Badge of Subjection; and *Hincmarus* told *Nicolaus*, 1. *That he could receive no more power by it, than the Canons had given to Metropolitans already*; but when they were brought to receive the Pall the *promiſe*

Concil. General. To. 11. *p.* 2. *p.* 379.

De Concord Sacerd. & Imper. l. 6. *c.* 3. *n.* 13.

Baron. ad A. 590. *n.* 42.

Formal. antiquæ promot. in append. ad Tom. 2. *Concil. Gall. form.* 12.

Serrar. Rerum Moguntiac. l. 3. *c.* 19.

Bonifac. Epiſtol. p. 163.

Bonifacii epiſt. 105. *p.* 144.

Bonifac. ep. 141. *p.* 211.

Hincmar. ep. 26. *p.* 310. *Tom.* 2.

promiſe of Subjection went down with it: The Form of which is extant among the ancient *Formulæ* publiſhed by *Sirmondus*, wherein they promiſe to the Pope only *debitam ſubjectionem & obedientiam*, which is properly *Canonical Obedience*. Now if *Gregory* VII. had underſtood no more than that, why did he alter the Oath, and put in ſo many expreſſions which properly imply the ſame Fealty which Vaſſals owe to their Lords, or Subjects to their Princes? I know not how it came to paſs that ſo jealous a Prince of his own *Rights* as *Henry* I. came to ſuffer the new Archbiſhop to take this Oath to the Pope; but this is certain that it was extreamly diſguſted in other Countries. For *Baronius* tells us, that the Kings and Nobility of *Sicily* and *Poland* were very much offended at it, as a thing there was no Ground for in the ancient Councils; as though ſaith *Paſchal* II. in anſwer to them, *the Councils could ſet bounds to the Pope's Authority*: Which was bravely ſaid and like a Prince that endeavoured to make the greateſt Biſhops his Vaſſals; but I cannot imagine what ſatisfaction this could give to *Secular Princes*, who might eaſily diſcern how much their own Power was leſſened by theſe manifeſt encroachments upon it, by the exacting Oaths of Allegiance from ſome of the moſt conſiderable of their Subjects, to a Foreign Power.

Formul. antiq. 13. *append. ad To.* 2. *Concil. Gall. p.* 656.

Baron. A. 1102 *n.* 5, 8.

§. 8. After the Death of *Henry* I. the *Papal Power* got more ground in the troubleſome Reign of *King Stephen*, than ever it had done before; for his Title being very bad, he ſaw it was the more neceſſary for him to ſtrengthen it by the Pope's Authority. To which end, after his Conſecration by *William* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, who together with *Stephen* had before ſworn Allegiance to *Maud* the Empreſs, he ſends to the Pope for a Confirmation of his Title, which the Pope very amply ſends him; and the Bull is extant among our Hiſtorians, wherein among other things he takes notice, *that on the Day of his Conſecration* (as the Pope calls it) *he promiſed Obedience and Reverence to St.* Peter; which no doubt went very far in his Title: and the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* his Brother, told him (as *Malmesbury* relates who lived in that time) *that he came to the Crown not by any Military Power, but by the Churches Favour, and therefore he ought to be kind to it*; and ſo he was, it ſeems, at firſt, for he yielded to their own Terms, as *Gul. Newburgenſis* ſaith, and the Biſhops did ſwear only a *conditional Allegiance* to him, viz. *as long as he preſerved the Liberty of the Church*. To give them therefore all the ſatisfaction they deſired, he made that *Oath* extant in *Malmesbury*, wherein *he put all Eccleſiaſtical Perſons and Things under their own Juriſdiction*; and when afterwards he violated this Liberty, his own Brother being then the Popes Legate, preſumed to ſummon him to appear before his *Eccleſiaſtical High Court of Juſtice*, and to give him an Account of what he had done in daring to impriſon the Biſhops of *Salisbury* and *Lincoln*: *For*, ſaid he, *if the Biſhops do any thing amiſs, the King hath nothing to do to judge them, but they muſt be left to the Canons*; and withal he adds, *that the King was bound to give them an account of what he had done*; But the King ſent them Word, that he appealed to *Rome*, and ſo the Buſineſs fell. Thus we ſee how much he advanced the Popes Power by yielding to a *Legatine Power* here, to hear Cauſes, and ſuffering himſelf to be called to an Account before it; by which Example,

Richard. Prior. Hagulſtad. inter 10. *Script. p.* 313.

Malmesb. hiſt. Novell. l. 2. *p.* 103.

Gul. Newburg. l. 1. *c.* 4.

Malmesb. l. 1. *p.* 101.

ample, Appeals grew very frequent and troubleſome in his Time, as our Hiſtorians ſadly complain; and the Biſhops and Monks went commonly over to *Rome* upon *Appeals*; nay, *Theobald* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, went to the *Pope*, then in *France*, expreſly againſt the King's Command, and the Pope ſuſpended the reſt that did not come; and *William*, Archbiſhop of *York*, was depoſed by the Pope, meerly becauſe nominated by the King, and another put into his Room without the King's Conſent or Approbation: The Right of Inveſtitures was condemned in a Council held at *Weſtminſter*, and the infringers of Eccleſiaſtical Liberty puniſhed with *Excommunication, not to be taken off but by the Pope himſelf*; and after the reconciliation between *Stephen* and *Henry* II. the effect of it, ſaith *Radulphus de Diceto*, was, *that the Churches Dominion was exalted by it.*

Radulph. de Diceto. p. 509. *Chron. Gervaſ. Doroborn.* p. 1363. *Richard. Hagulſt.* 326. *Hoveden.* A. 1143. *Radulph. de Diceto. Imag. hiſt.* p. 528.

§. 9. This was the ſtate of things here, when *Henry* II. came to the poſſeſſion of the Crown; all the Cuſtoms of his Anceſtors, which they accounted Rights of the Crown, were loſt during the Uſurpation of *Stephen*, and ſtrange Inſolences and Villanies were committed under the pretence of *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty*, or the unaccountableneſs of Eccleſiaſtical Perſons for their Actions to Civil Juſtice: Which made the Judges complain to the King of the *Thefts, Rapines and Murders* frequently committed by *Clergy-men*, over whom they had then no Juriſdiction; and as *Gulielmus Newburgenſis* ſaith, *the Biſhops were more concerned to defend their Privileges, than to puniſh Offenders, and thought they did God and the Church ſervice in protecting them from the Hands of Juſtice.* By which means things were come to that height between the *Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Power*, that one or the other muſt yield; the *Eccleſiaſtical Power* being in the Hands of *Thomas Becket*, a Man after the Pope's own Heart, and in whom the very Soul of *Gregory* VII. ſeemed to have come into the World again; and the *Civil Power* in the management of *Henry* II. a Prince of a high Spirit and great Courage, and that could not eaſily bear the leaſt diminution of his Power. And where there was ſo much matter prepared, and ſuch heat on both ſides, it was no great difficulty to foretell a Storm, when the Clouds that hovered in the Air ſhould clap together, or fall upon each other. This was foreſeen by the more diſcerning Men of that time, when they found the King bent upon making him Archbiſhop after the Death of *Theobald*: For however *Becket* himſelf boaſted *of the freedom of his Election and the conſent of the Clergy and Kingdom in it*, yet in the *Epiſtle* ſent to him by the *Biſhops* and *Clergy* of the *whole Province*, they plainly tell him, *the Kings Mother diſſwaded him from it, the whole Kingdom was againſt it, and the Clergy ſighed and groaned as much as they durſt; but the King would have it ſo.* For the King being then in *Normandy*, ſent over his great Miniſter *Richard de Lucy* on purpoſe to let the Suffragan Biſhops and the Monks of *Canterbury* underſtand his Pleaſure, *that he would have* Becket *choſen Archbiſhop.* Which the Biſhop of *London* in his excellent Epiſtle to *Becket* (which gives a more true Account of the Intrigues of the whole Quarrel than any thing yet extant, and which *Baronius* could not but ſee in the *Codex Vaticanus*, although he takes no notice at all of it) tells him, *was a greater invaſion of the Churches Liberties, than any of thoſe things he made ſuch ado about. You,* ſaith he, *now tell us that we ought to obey God rather than Men; would*

Gul. Newburgenſ. l. 2. *c.* 16.

Cod. Cotton. l. 1. *Ep.* 125.

Codex Cotton. Epiſtol. l. 1. *Ep.* 123. *Hoveden. Ann. part. poſt. p.* 292. *Baron. A.* 1167. *n.* 32.

Gilb. Lond. Epiſt. Tho. Cantuar. l. 1. *Ep.* 126. *in Cod. Cotton. MS.*

to God we had done ſo then; but becauſe we had not the Courage to do it then, therefore we now ſuffer Shame and Confuſion for it, and the Tears run down our Cheeks for the Calamities that are come upon us. By which we may judge of the truth of the Quadripartite Hiſtory, written by *Thomas* his own Diſciples, as *Baronius* confeſſeth, for therein *Herebertus* and *Joh. Sariſburienſis* tell of *Thomas* his *proteſting againſt his being* Archbiſhop *to the King,* and *his being hardly perſwaded to it by the Pope's Legate*; whereas the Biſhop of *London* proves to *Becket* himſelf, *that during* Theobald'*s Life, he had his Eye upon it, and made all the Intereſt he could to obtain it upon his Death, that he gave ſeveral thouſand Marks to the King to be Chancellor, hoping by that means to come the eaſier into the See of* Canterbury; *that being in* Normandy *at* Theobald'*s Death, he poſted over, and the King's Favourite brought his Command for his Election.* And it is likewiſe confeſſed by *Fitz-Stephen* in the MS. Hiſtory of *Becket*'s Life, *that the whole Clergy knew it was the King's Pleaſure he ſhould be made Archbiſhop*; *and that* Gilbert, *then only Biſhop of* Hereford (*afterwards of London*) *diſſwaded all that he could from his Election*; *and after ſaid, that the King had done a ſtrange thing, viz. he had made a Soldier Archbiſhop of* Canterbury; for but a little before he had been in Arms with the King at *Tholouſe.* And this oppoſition of his, *he calls not only God to witneſs, was not out of any ambitious deſire to have been in his Room,* (as *Thomas* and the Monks charge him with) *but* Becket *himſelf, for no Man could attempt any ſuch thing, but he muſt know it, his Favour being ſo great with the King then.* But it ſeems, the wiſer Men among the Biſhops thought, that by reaſon of his inſolent, raſh and inflexible Temper, (which even his Friends complained of in him) he would bring all things into Confuſion. When he was ſummoned at *Northampton* to appear before the King, he would needs carry the Croſs with his own Hands into the Court; upon which the Biſhop of *London* told him, *he behaved himſelf as if he had a mind to diſturb the whole Kingdom*; *You carry the Croſs,* ſaith he, *and what if the King ſhould take his Sword? But,* ſaid he to one that ſtood by, *he always was a Fool, and ever will be one.* Theſe things I only mention, to let Men ſee what apprehenſions the more prudent Men of that Time had of the likelihood of great diſturbances coming to the Church by his ill management, although by the raſhneſs of others added to his, he hath had the Fortune to be accounted a *Saint* and a *Martyr.*

Baron. A. 1162. *n.* 11.

Vit. S. Thomæ Cant. MS. in bibliot. Cotton p. 10.

Joh. Sariſbur. l. 1. *ep.* 85. *l* 2. *ep.* 28, 29.

Fitz-Stephen. vit. Tho. Cant. p. 25. *Codex Cotton p.* 10.

§. 10. But my buſineſs is not, to write a particular Account of all the Paſſages between the King and him, after the difference between them; which hath been ſo largely done by *Baronius,* and our own Hiſtorians; but I ſhall ſhew, that the Controverſie between them was about *Gregory* VII's Principles, and if he died a Martyr for any thing, it was in defence of theſe. Which I ſhall the rather do, ſince I find his Life very lately publiſhed in *French* with a high Character of him, and dedicated to the King of *France*; but eſpecially becauſe I find, that thoſe among us of that Religion, who diſown *Gregory* VII's Principles, are willing to believe him a Martyr upon other Grounds, viz. *That his Quarrel with the King was upon the account of the ancient Municipal Laws of* England, *which had a reſpect to the immunities of Clergy-men.*

La Vie de S. Thomas de Canterbury. A Paris 1674.

Hiſtory of the Iriſh Remonſtrance, from p. 397. *to* 462.

I

I ſhall therefore prove, 1. That the matters in Diſpute between the King and *Becket*, were the very ſame that *Gregory* VII. and his Succeſſors contended about, with *Chriſtian Princes.* 2. That the Pleas made uſe of by *Becket* and his Party, were no other than thoſe which *Gregory* VII. and his Succeſſors uſed, ſo that they had no relation at all to the *Municipal Laws*, but to the Controverſie then on Foot between the *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical Power*. In both which I hope to make ſome Paſſages clearer than they have yet been, having had the advantage of peruſing ſeveral MSS. relating to this matter, and eſpecially that *Volume* of *Epiſtles*, which *Baronius* accounts *an unvaluable Treaſure*; and as far as I can perceive, the *Cotton MS.* is more compleat than the *Vatican*, which *Baronius* made uſe of.

Baron. A. 11(2. *n.* 21.

1. For the Matters in Diſpute between them. The whole Controverſie might be reduced to two Heads. 1. Whether Eccleſiaſtical Perſons were unaccountable to the *Civil Power* for any Miſdemeanours committed by them? 2. Whether the Pope had the *Soveraign Power* over Princes and all under them, ſo that he might contradict the *King's Laws and Cuſtoms*, and command his Subjects againſt his conſent to come to him? And whether the *King's Subjects* in ſuch Caſes were not bound to obey the Pope, let the King command what he pleaſe? Theſe, in truth, were the Points in Debate, and the moſt weighty Particulars in the Cuſtoms of *Clarendon* were but as ſo many Branches of theſe. In that Copy of them which is extant in the *Cotton MS.* and was drawn up by the King's own Order, the occaſion of them is ſet down, *to have been the differences which had happened between the Clergy and the King's Juſtices and the Barons of the Kingdom about the Cuſtoms and Dignities of the Crown*; the moſt conſiderable of thoſe which the Pope condemned, were concerning, 1. *The Tryal of Titles of Advowſons and Preſentations in the King's Courts.* 2. *The Tryal of Clergy-men before the King's Judges; and the Churches not defending them after Conviction or Confeſſion.* 3. *That neither Archbiſhops, Biſhops or others, ſhould go out of the Kingdom, without the King's conſent, and giving ſecurity to the King, that in going, ſtaying, or returning, they will do nothing to the prejudice either of the King or Kingdom.* 4. *The Profits of Eccleſiaſtical Courts upon Abſolution*, for they demanded not barely Perſonal Security of all excommunicated Perſons, to ſtand to the Church's Judgments, but *Vadium ad remanens* as the Law Term was then, which implies real Security, or ſo much Money laid down, which was to come to the Court, if they did not perform the Conditions expreſſed. For it was one of the things the King's Ambaſſador complained of to his Mother the Empreſs, *That the Matters in Controverſie were not things of Advantage to Men's Souls, but to their own Purſes; and that the Faults of Offenders were not puniſhed in the Eccleſiaſtical Courts by the injoyning of Penance, but by the giving of Money.* And the Empreſs her ſelf in her Diſcourſe with *Nicholas de Monte* the Archbiſhop's Friend, inſiſted on *theſe Pecuniary Mulcts for Sins as one of the great occaſions of the Troubles*; which made People ſuſpect this pretence of *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty* to be only a Cloak for their own Profits. But however the good Pope, whether he underſtood this *Vadium ad remanens* or no, at all Adventures condemned it. For what ſhould the Court of *Rome* do without exchanging *Money* for *Sins?* 5. *That no Perſon who held of the King* in Capite, *or belonged to him, ſhould be excommunicated, or have his Land interdicted without*

Cod. Cotton. l. 1. *l.* 12.

Cod. Cotton. l. 1. *ep.* 49.

without making the King acquainted with it, or his Juſtice in his abſence. 6. That in matters of Appeal, they were to proceed from the Arch-deacon to the Biſhop, from the Biſhop to the Archbiſhop, and from thence to the King, and not to proceed further without his expreſs leave. Theſe were the main things in Diſpute; and what do they all amount to, but the very ſame Rights of the Crown which the King's Predeceſſors did inſiſt upon? And what could be the ſenſe of *Becket* in oppoſing them, but that Clergy-men were not accountable for their Faults to the Civil Power, and in caſe of the Pope's Command, whether upon Appeal or otherwiſe, Biſhops and others were to go to his Court in ſpight of the King? as *Anſelm* and *Theobald* had done before. It is agreed by *Baronius* himſelf, that the Quarrel brake out, upon the Archbiſhops denying to deliver up the Clergy-man that was accuſed and convicted of Murder after *Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure* to the *Secular Power*; which the King earneſtly deſired, and *Becket* as peremptorily denyed. And upon what Principle could this be done; but the higheſt pretence of *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty*, that ever *Gregory* VII. or any other aſſerted? And it is plain by this, that the King did not deny the *Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction*, nor hindered the proper *Cenſures* of the Church upon Offenders; but the Queſtion was meerly this; Whether *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons* having committed Crimes againſt the Publick Peace, were only to be puniſhed with *Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures*, and never to be delivered over to *Civil Juſtice*? Which was the main Hinge of the Cauſe, and which *Becket* ſtood to, to the laſt. And that this was the true State of the Controverſie, appears by the Repreſentation made of it to *Alexander* III. by the whole Clergy of the Province of *Canterbury*: *Who confeſs that the Peace of the Kingdom was very much diſturbed by the inſolence and Crimes of ſome of the Clergy* (for upon the account of this exemption, any Villains were ſafe, if they could but get into any kind of Orders;) *the King, for the ſafety of his People, preſſed the Biſhops after their Cenſures, to give ſuch guilty Parſons up to the Laws, becauſe bare degrading was by no means ſufficient puniſhment for wilful Murder, which was all the Churches Cenſures reached to.* This all the Biſhops at firſt oppoſed as derogatory to the *Church's Liberty*, but afterwards (*Becket* excepted) the reſt ſaw a neceſſity of yielding at preſent; for, as they confeſs themſelves, *this liberty was extended even to a Lector or Acolythus*; and the Empreſs *Matildis* ſaid, *that the Biſhops gave Orders very looſely without Titles*; by which we may eaſily imagine what a miſerable ſtate the whole Kingdom might be in, if theſe things were ſuffered. So that we ſee the Plea inſiſted upon at the beginning of the Quarrel was, that no Perſons in any *Eccleſiaſtical Orders*, upon any Crime whatſoever, were to be delivered over to be puniſhed by the *Secular Power*. And what could ſuch a Pretence ariſe from, but only from *Gregory* VII's. Principles of Government? viz. *That the Civil Power had nothing at all to do with Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, and that all the Subjection and Obedience they owed was only to the Pope as their Soveraign; and that this was the Liberty which Chriſt purchaſed for his Church with his own Blood*, as *Paſchal* II. anſwered the Emperor's Ambaſſadors, and as *Becket* very frequently expreſſes it in his Epiſtles. A bleſſed Liberty! and worthy the purchaſe of the Blood of Chriſt, *viz.* a Liberty to Sin without fear of Puniſhment, or at leaſt any Puniſhment which ſuch Perſons would be afraid of; for the ut-

Baron. A. 1163. n. 19

Cod. Cotton l. 1. ep. 127.

Cod. Cotton. l. 1. ep. 49.

Suger. vit. Ludor.

moſt *Becket* could be perſwaded to in the caſe of the Canon of *Bedford* convicted of Murder, was only to confine him to a *Monaſtery* for a time, which was a very eaſie expiation of *Murder*: So that the Benefit of Clergy was a mighty thing in thoſe Days. But it is impoſſible to give any tolerable account of *Becket*'s Actions, unleſs we ſuppoſe this to have been his *Ground* and *Principle*, *that God had exempted by his Law all Clergy-men, by vertue of being ſuch, from any ſubjection to Civil Power:* For if they owe any ſubjection, they are accountable for their breaches of the *Laws* to that power to which they are ſubject; if they are not accountable for any Crimes, they muſt be ſuppoſed to be wholly independent on the Civil Government.

§. 11. Neither is there any ground for ſuch an exemption by the ancient *Municipal Laws* of *England*, either in the *Saxon* or *Norman times*: And I cannot but wonder to ſee the Laws of Princes concerning Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, brought to prove their total exemption from the power of *Princes*, which was that Eccleſiaſtical Liberty which *Becket* did plead for. For according to his Principles, neither *Alured*, nor *Edward*, nor *Canutus*, nor any other Prince had any thing to do to appoint the puniſhments of *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons*; but their Judgment was to be wholly left to their own *Superiours*. And ſuppoſing there had been ſuch Laws among the *Saxons*, *Becket* would not have valued them at all, but rather have thought them a prejudice to his Cauſe, and an encouragement to *Henry* II. to have repealed thoſe, and made others in their Place. For why ſhould not the Power of this King be as good as the *Saxons* to make and alter Eccleſiaſtical Laws as they ſaw convenient? but *Becket* underſtood his Buſineſs Better than ſo. He would not upon any terms be brought to the Tryal, whether they were ancient Cuſtoms or no which the King contended for? The King offered it very frequently, and by any fair ways of Tryal, and declared he would renounce them if they did not appear to be ſo, he appealed often to the Judgment of the *Church* of *England* about it, and would ſtand and fall by it; and none of theſe things would be accepted of: By which it is evident that either there were no Laws could juſtifie *Becket*, or he thought the producing them would be hurtful to his Cauſe; for not one of all the Cuſtoms he excepted againſt, was in his Opinion ſo bad, as for Princes to take upon themſelves to determine *Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes*, and to appoint the *Puniſhments* of *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons*. For then he knew the King need not to ſtand upon the proof of his other Cuſtoms, this one *Right* of the *Crown* would put an end to the whole Diſpute. *Ailred. de Genealog. Reg. Angl. p.* 360. For if *Henry* II. had the ſame Power that *Edgar* had, when he ſaid, *that the Tryal of the manners of Eccleſiaſtical Perſons belonged to him*, and therefore gave Authority to *Dunſtan* and the reſt, to *expel criminal Clergy-men* out of *Churches* and *Monaſteries*, why might not he puniſh *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons?* And then to what purpoſe had *Becket* contended with the King, if he had allowed him as much power as the *Saxon* Kings did make uſe of? And what if the *Saxon Laws* did appoint the *Biſhops* to examine *Clergy-men*, and paſs Sentence upon them in *Criminal Cauſes?* Was not the Puniſhment already eſtabliſhed by the King's Laws, and the Biſhop only the Miniſter of the Kings Juſtice upon *Eccleſiaſtical Delinquents?* And even in the

Laws of *Edward the Confeſſor, in caſe of Default in Eccleſiaſtical Courts, a is allowed of going to other Courts*; and in the Laws of the Elder *Edward, any one in Orders is appointed to make compenſation according to the nature of his Crime, and without Sureties he was to go into Priſon*; *but in caſe of a capital Offence, he was to be taken, that he might undergo Penance from the Biſhop for his Fault.* Where, by *capital Offence* we are not to underſtand ſuch as were puniſhed with Death, but the Penitential Canons of *Egbert* tell us, by *capital Crimes* were underſtood *Pride*, *Envy*, *Fornication*, *Adultery*, *Perjury*, &c. But the Laws of *Canutus* appoint *Degradation for Murder by a Clergy-man*; *and Compenſation and Baniſhment* withal, which were *Civil Puniſhments* after *Degradation*, the very thing which *Becket* denied, *and in caſe this Compenſation were not undertaken within thirteen Days, then the Perſon was to be Out-law'd*, which to be ſure was a *Civil Puniſhment*. By the Laws of King *Alured*, *if a Prieſt killed a Man he was to loſe his Privileges, and the Biſhop was to expel him out of the Temple, being already degraded, unleſs due Compenſation were made*, *i. e.* if he did not undergo the *Civil Puniſhment*: For then the greateſt Crimes, (excepting *Murder* of a *Prince* or *Lord by a Subject or Vaſſal*, or *killing any in a Sacred Place*, or *Treaſon*) might be expiated by *pecuniary Mulcts* and *Eccleſiaſtical Penance*, according to the *Penitential Canons*. For it appears by the old *Penitential Canons of* Theodore *and* Egbert, that *Murder had ſo many Years Penance appointed for its expiation*, which had been a vain thing, if it had been puniſhed with *Death*; now in this caſe it was but reaſonable that the guilty Perſon ſhould be delivered to the Biſhop to receive his *Penance*; whether he were a *Clergy-man* or *Lay-man*: And the Laws of Princes did inforce them to ſubmit to *Eccleſiaſtical Penance*. So King *Alured* commands in caſe of *Perjury*, *that the Perſon be taken into the Kings Cuſtody for forty Days, that he might undergo the Penance which the Biſhop ſhall impoſe upon him*; *and if he eſcaped he was not only to be anathematized, but put out of all protection of the Law*: And by the Laws of King *Edmund*, *any Perſon guilty of Murder was not to come into the Kings Preſence till he had undergone the Penance enjoyned him by the Biſhop*: And from hence I ſuppoſe it was, that in the *Saxon Times*, *the Biſhop and the Sheriff ſate together in the ſame Court*, as appears by the Laws of *Edgar* and *Canutus*, not barely to *inſtruct the People in the Laws of God and Man*; but as the *Sheriff* was to appoint the *Civil Penalty*, ſo the *Biſhop* was to enjoyn *Penance* according to the nature of the Fault: And one of theſe did not exclude the other, but, he that did pay ſuch a pecuniary Mulct to the *Sheriff*, did undergo ſo many Years Penance beſides. Therefore the Laws which mention *Perſons being delivered to the Biſhop for Penance*, do by no means imply, that they were excuſed from any Civil Penalty either before or after it; as might be proved from the Laws of the *Empire*, and the *Capitulars*, if it were needful. So that in the *Saxon* Times, *if a Clergy-man were guilty of wilful Murder, the Penitential Canons impoſed ten Years Penance upon him, of which ſeven were to be ſpent in Baniſhment*; but beſides this, the *legal Compenſation* was to be made, as is evident by the Laws of *Edward* and *Canutus*: From whence it appears, how very ſlender the pretence is of *Becket*'s contending for the ancient *Saxon Laws*, when he denied *the giving up a Clergy-man convicted of Murder to the Secular Power after Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures*. But where is there the leaſt Foundation in the *Saxon*

Leg. Edw. Confeſſ. c. 5.
Leg. Edw. Sen. c. 3.
Egbert. Penit. Excerpt. c. 5.
Leg. Canuti. c. 38.
Leg. Alured. c. 21.
Theod. Canon. Penit. c. 9.
Egb. Canon. Penitent. c. 3.
Leg. Alured. c. 1.
Leg. Edm. c. 3, 4.
Leg. Edgar. c. 5.
Legis Canut. c. 17.
Egb. Canon. Penit. c. 7.

Times, for ſuch open defiance of the *Civil Power*, as to the puniſhment of Offenders of what Degree or Order ſoever? And that was the Caſe of *Becket*, the King only deſired that Juſtice might be executed indifferently on all Perſons, and the ancient Cuſtoms reviv'd; but he would not yield as to either of theſe, not upon the pretence of former Laws, but the repugnancy he ſuppoſed to be in them to that *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty*, which he ſaid, *Chriſt had purchaſed with his Blood.*

§. 12. After the *Norman Conqueſt*, the *Eccleſiaſtical* and *Civil Courts* were firſt ſeparated, as appears by the Grant of *William the Conqueror* to *Remigius* Biſhop of *Lincoln*, and many others to the ſame purpoſe; but I find no particular exemption of a *Criminal Clergy-man* from the *Civil Power* eſtabliſhed. The main plea is from the confirmation of the *Saxon Laws*, but to how little purpoſe that is, is already ſhewed. By the Laws of *Henry* I. *if a Biſhop committed Murder, he was to be depoſed, and undergo twelve Years Penance, ſeven of which were to be with Bread and Water: If a Prieſt or Monk, he was to loſe his Order, and to undergo ten Years Penance; if a Deacon, to loſe his Orders and to have ſeven Years Penance; if a Clerk only (i. e.* in inferior Orders) *ſix Years Penance*; and then it follows, *if a Lay-man, five Years Penance*; which was very prudently left out with an *&c.* by *P. W.* becauſe it marrs all the reſt; for if according to theſe Laws, Clergymen had an exemption from *Civil Juſtice*, ſo had the *Laity* too; and upon better terms, for their *Penance* is but *half* that of a *Prieſt*, or a *Monk*, and not *half* of a *Biſhop*. But after *Henry* I. the *Penance* was turned into a *pecuniary Mulct*, as King *Henry* II. complained, and Men committed the greateſt Crimes at a certain rate, by which means abundance of Villanies, and Murders, and Rapines were daily committed; and in *Henry* II. his time, the Kings Juſtices complains of it to the King, who commands *to puniſh all Offenders ſeverely*; and if any *Clergy-men were convicted, they were to be delivered to the Biſhop to be Degraded by him in the preſence of the Kings Juſtice, and ſo to be returned to the Court to be puniſhed*; but in the caſe of the Canon of *Bedford*, *Becket* utterly denies the delivering him up to the *Kings Juſtice* after *Degrading*. *Fitz Stephen* gives more inſtances, which exaſperated the King, one whereof was, *of a Perſon who had defloured the Daughter, and murdered the Father*, whom *Henry* II. would have puniſhed according to Law, *but the Archbiſhop would not ſuffer him to be delivered up to the Kings Juſtice.* (Yet methinks it might bear a Diſpute how far a Perſon *degraded* is capable of *Eccleſiaſtial Immunities*; but *Becket*, it ſeems, extended them to all that were or had been ſuch; or it may be, the *indelible Character* preſerved ſtill ſome Title to a legal impunity in Sinning.) The King apprehending the very bad Conſequences of ſuch an exemption of all ſorts of *Clergy-men* from Civil Puniſhments, and not knowing what the late Encroachments upon the *Civil Power* by the *Eccleſiaſtical* might come to (for ſo *Fitz Stephen* ſaith, *ſome about the King told him, if theſe things were ſuffered, and the Archbiſhop let alone, his Royal Authority would come to nothing, and the Clergy would make whom they pleaſed King*, as they had ſhewed their Power and Will already, in the caſe of King *Stephen*) therefore the King reſolves to reſume all the *Rights* of his *Anceſtors*, and to have a ſolemn *recognition* made of them in *Parlia-*

Selden. not. ad Eadm. p. 167.

Henrici I. *Leg. c.* 73.

Fitz Steph. vit. S. Tho. p. 15.

Radulph. de Diceto Imag. hiſt. p. 536.

Fitz Steph. vit. Thom. p. 19.

Fitz Steph. vit. Thom. p. 14.

Parliament. But firſt he treats with all the Biſhops at *Weſtminſter*, to know whether they would obſerve the *Ancient Cuſtoms?* They gave him a ſhuffling Anſwer, that they would do it *ſalvo ordine ſuo & jure Eccleſiæ*; which the King took for a denial, and was extremely inraged at it. The Biſhop of *London* confeſſes, *that they all agreed in the denial*, and gave this as the reaſon, *becauſe their yielding to thoſe Cuſtoms was repugnant to the Liberty of the Church, and the Fidelity they owed to the Pope:* Which was a plain Confeſſion of the true ſtate of the *Controverſie*, whether the King or the Pope were to be obeyed in thoſe matters? *Baronius* tells us, *that* Becket *ſent over an Expreſs to the Pope* (being then at *Sens*) *to know what they were to do in the ſtraits they were in, the Pope encourages them to ſtand up for Eccleſiaſtical Liberty to the utmoſt*; notwithſtanding this, the King reſolves to have a *recognition* of theſe *Cuſtoms* at *Clarendon*, where the Authors of the *Quadripartite Hiſtory* ſay, *the whole Kingdom was preſent*, and they confeſs, *that* Becket *with the reſt of the Biſhops did promiſe the King to obſerve them* Bona Fide: Which they parallel with St. *Peter's* fall *in denying Chriſt:* But the Biſhop of *London*, in his Epiſtle to *Becket* gives a more particular account of it, which is worth our notice: *Three Days*, he ſays, *all the Biſhops withſtood the Kings deſire, and no Threats could move them, but they reſolved rather than to yield to die upon the ſpot for Chriſt and his Church*, (as he ſpeaks) *at laſt* Becket *withdrew from them, and coming in again, uſed theſe Words to them, It is the Kings pleaſure I ſhould forſwear my ſelf at preſent, and I will do it, and repent afterwards*; (were not theſe brave *Heroick* Words for a *Saint* and a *Martyr?*) *at the hearing of them*, he ſaith, *they were all aſtoniſhed, and their Hearts failed them; and ſo they all promiſed* in verbo veritatis *to obſerve the ancient Cuſtoms. Thus*, ſaith he, *was the Controverſie then ended between the Kingdom and Prieſthood, and ſo* Iſrael *deſcended into* Egypt. But notwithſtanding this ſolemn Promiſe, in a few Days *Becket* breaks his Word, and attempts to go beyond Sea without the Kings leave: “ At which the King was extreamly troubled, and
“ as the Biſhop of *London* ſaith, had rather he had wounded his Bo-
“ dy than his Reputation by ſuch an eſcape into Foreign Parts,
“ where he was ſure to be repreſented as a Tyrant and Perſecutor
“ of the Church. *Becket* was driven back by a Tempeſt, the King
“ takes no notice of it, uſes him kindly, and bids him take care of
“ his Church. Not long after, a Controverſie happened about ſome
“ Lands, which *Becket* challenged as belonging to his Church,
“ the King ſends to him to do Juſtice to the Perſon concerned in it;
“ notwithſtanding Complaints are brought to the King for want of
“ it, the King ſends a Summons to him to appear before him, that
“ he might have the hearing of the Cauſe. *Becket* refuſes to obey
“ the Summons, and ſends the King Word he would not obey him
“ in this matter; at which ſaucy Anſwer the King was juſtly pro-
“ voked, as a great diſparagement to his Royal Authority. Upon
“ this he calls the Parliament at *Northampton*, where the People met
“ as one Man; the King repreſents his Caſe, with becoming Mo-
“ deſty and Eloquence: However, he conſented that his Fault ſhould
“ be expiated by a pecuniary Mulct: After this, the King exhibi-
“ ted a Complaint againſt him for a great Sum of Money received by
“ him, during his Chancellorſhip which he had never given account
“ for: (it was 44000 Marks, as the Biſhop of *London* told the Car-
“ dinals

Gilb rt. London. Epiſt. l. 1. ep. 126.

Baron. A. 1163. n. 23, 26.

A. 1164. n. 3.

Cod. Cotton. l. 2. ep. 7. -- ep. 38.

Joh. Sariſbur. in Cod. Cotton l. 2 ep. 64.

Codex Cotton l. 1. ep 63. l. 2. ep. 111, 112.

“ dinals who were ſent by the Pope afterwards to end the Controverſie) *Becket* pleaded that he was diſcharged by his Promotion, (as though, as the Biſhop of *London* ſaid, Promotion were like Baptiſm that wiped away all Scores.) But this being a meer Civil Cauſe, as the Biſhop tells *Becket*, *yet he denyed to give anſwer to the King and appealed to the Pope, as the Judge of all Men living*, ſaith *Sariſburienſis*; and ſoon after in a diſguiſe he ſlips over the Sea, and haſtens to the Pope; who received him with great kindneſs, and then he reſigns his Archbiſhoprick into the Pope's Hands, as our Hiſtorians generally agree, becauſe he received Inveſtiture from the King, and takes it again from the Pope. This is the juſt and trueſt account of the ſtate of the Controverſie, as it is delivered by one of the ſame time, that knew all the Intrigues, and which he writes to *Becket* himſelf, who never anſwer'd it that I can find, nor any of his Party; and by one, who was a Perſon of great Reputation with the Pope himſelf, for his Learning, Piety and the Severity of his Life. And is it now poſſible to ſuppoſe that *Gregory* VII. if he had been in *Becket*'s Place, could have managed his Cauſe with more contempt of Civil Government than he did? When he refuſed to obey the King's Summons, declined his Judicature in a *Civil Cauſe*, and broke his Laws againſt his own Solemn Promiſe, and perjured himſelf for the Pope's Honour. If this be only defending ancient Privileges of the Church, I may expect to ſee ſome other moderate Men of the *Roman Church* plead for *Gregory* VII. as only a ſtout defender of the ancient *Canons*, and an Enemy to the Pope's Temporal Power. But Men are to be pityed when they meet with untoward Objections (ſuch as that from *Becket's Saintſhip* and *Martyrdom* is to prove the Doctrine of *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty* and the Pope's *Temporal Power* to be the ſenſe of their Church) if they cannot find that they endeavour to make a way to eſcape; and I hope the Perſons I now deal with, have more ingenuity than to think this new pretence any ſatisfactory Plea for *Becket*'s Cauſe. And as the Biſhop of *London* tells *Becket*, *It is not the Suffering, but the Cauſe which makes a Martyr: To ſuffer hardſhip with a good Mind is Honour to a Man; but to ſuffer in a bad Cauſe and obſtinately is a reproach; and in this Diſpute*, he ſaith, *the whole weight of it lay upon the King's Power, and ſome Cuſtoms of his Anceſtors, and the King would not quit the Rights of his Crown, which were confirmed by Antiquity, and the long uſage of the Kingdom: This is the cauſe why you draw your Sword againſt the Sacred Perſon of the King, in which it is of great conſequence to conſider that the King doth not pretend to make new Laws, but as the whole Kingdom bears him witneſs, ſuch as were practiſed by his Anceſtors.* And although it appears, that he wiſhed well to the main of *Becket*'s Cauſe; yet he blames him exceedingly for raſhneſs, indiſcretion and inſolency in the management of it; and bids him remember, *That Chriſt never entered* Zacchæus *his Houſe till he came down from the Sycamore Tree, and that the way of Humility did far better become him, and was likely to prevail more with the King, than that which he took.*

§. 13. But *Becket* being out of the King's reach, and backed by the King of *France*, and favour'd by the Court of *Rome*, made nothing of charging the King with *Tyranny*; as he and his Party do very frequently in the Volume of Epiſtles ; and becauſe the Empreſs his Mother pleaded for ſome of the *Cuſtoms*, as *ancient Rights of the Crown*, ſhe is ſaid to *be of the Race of Tyrants too*. The King finding himſelf thus beſet with a ſwarm of Hornets, makes uſe of his own Power to ſecure himſelf from farther Attempts upon his Crown and *Royal Authority*, which was expoſed to ſuch publick Ignominy in Foreign Parts ; and therefore ſends this Precept to all the Biſhops, to ſuſpend the Profits of all ſuch Clergy-men as adhered to him.

Cod. Cott. l.2. ep.41, 52, 54, 61, 63, 4. L.1. ep.49.

Noſti quam male Thomas Cantuarienſis Archiepiſcopus operatus eſt adverſus me & Regnum meum, & quam male receſſerit, & ideo mando tibi quod Clerici ſui qui circa ipſum fuerint poſt fugam ſuam, & alii Clerici qui detraxerunt honori meo & honori Regni, non percipiant aliquid de redditibus illis quos habuerant in Epiſcopatu tuo niſi per me, nec habeant aliquod auxilium nec conſilium a Te, Teſte Richardo de Luci apud Marlebergam.

Cod. Cott. p. 26. b.

After this, the King commands the *Sheriffs to impriſon every one that appealed to the Court of* Rome, *and to keep them in hold till his Pleaſure were known: And he cauſes all the Ports to be watched, to prevent any Letters of Interdict from the Pope ; and if any Regular brought them, he was to have his Feet cut off ; if in Orders, he was to loſe his Eyes and ſomething elſe ; and if he were a Lay-man, he was to be hanged.* Accordingly the Pope's Nuntio was taken with *Letters of the Pope's coming over for* England, *and impriſoned by the King's Order.* But the difference ſtill growing higher, and the King being threatned with Excommunication, and the Kingdom with an *Interdict* ; the King commands an Oath to be taken againſt *receiving Bulls from the Pope, or obeying him, or the Archbiſhop, and the Penalty no leſs than that of Treaſon* ; which is ſo remarkable a thing, I ſhall give it in the Words of the MS.

Ib.

Cod. Cott. l.1. ep.40.

A. D. MCLXIX. *Rex Henricus jurare facit omnem Angliam a laico duodenni vel quindecem annorum, contra Dom. Papam Alexandrum & B. Thomam Archiepiſcopum, quod eorum non recipient literas, neque obedient mandatis. Et ſi quis inventus foret literas eorum deferens, traderetur poteſtatibus tanquam Coronæ Regis capitalis inimicus.*

Cod. Cott. l.4. ep.54.

Here we ſee an Oath of Supremacy made ſo long ago by *Henry* II. and thoſe who out of Zeal, or whatſoever motive brought over Bulls of the Popes, made lyable to the charge of Treaſon: But the Archbiſhop, by virtue of his *Legatine Power*, took upon him to ſend Perſons privately into *England*, *and to abſolve them from this Oath*, as is there expreſſed.

The ſame Year, the King being in *Normandy* ſent over theſe Articles to be ſworn and obſerved by the Nobles and People of *England*.

1. *If any one be found carrying Letters from the Pope, or any Mandate from the Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *containing an Interdict of Religion in* England, *let him be taken, and without delay let Juſtice paſs upon him, as upon a* Traytor *to the King and Kingdom.*

Cod. Cott. l. 1. p. 27

2. *No Clergy-man, or Monk, or Lay-Brother may be ſuffered to croſs the Seas, or return into* England, *unleſs he have a Paſs from the King's Juſtice for his going out, and of the King himſelf for his return ; if any one be found doing otherwiſe, let him be taken and Impriſoned.*

3. *No Man may appeal either to the Pope or Archbiſhop ; and no Plea ſhall be held, of the Mandates of the Pope or Archbiſhop, nor any of them*

them be received by any Perſon in England; *if any one be taken doing otherwiſe, let him be impriſoned.*

4. *No Man ought to carry any Mandate either of Clergy-man or Laick, to either of them on the ſame Penalty.*

5. *If any Biſhops, Clergy-men, Abbots or Laicks will obſerve the Pope's Interdict, let them be forthwith baniſhed the Realm, and all their Kindred; and let them carry no Chattels along with them.*

6. *That all the Goods and Chattels of thoſe who favour the Pope or Archbiſhop, and all their Poſſeſſions of whatſoever Rank, Order, Sex or Condition they be, be ſeized into the King's Hand and confiſcated.*

7. *That all Clergy-men having Revenues in* England, *be ſummoned through every County, that they return to their Places within three Months or their Revenues to be ſeized into the King's Hands.*

8. *That Peter-pence be no longer paid to the Pope; but let them be gathered and kept in the King's Treaſury, and laid out according to his Command.*

9. *That the Biſhops of* London *and* Norwich *be in the King's Mercy, and be ſummoned by Sheriffs and Bailiffs to appear before the King's Juſtices to anſwer for their breach of the Statutes of* Clarendon *in the interdicting the Land, and excommunicating the Perſon of Earl* Hugh, *by virtue of the Pope's Mandate, and publiſhing this Excommunication without Licenſe from the King's Juſtices.*

I hope theſe Particulars will give full Satisfaction, that the Controverſie between King *Henry* II. and *Becket*, was not about ſome ancient *Saxon Laws*, but the very ſame Principles which *Gregory* VII. firſt openly defended of the Pope's *Temporal Power over Princes*, and the total exemption of *Eccleſiaſtical Perſons* from *Civil Judicatures*.

§. 14. 2. This will yet more appear, if we conſider that the Pleas uſed by *Becket* and his Party, were the very ſame which were uſed by *Gregory* VII. and his Succeſſors. The beginning of the Quarrel we have ſeen, was about the *total exemption of Men in any kind of Eccleſiaſtical Orders from civil Puniſhments*, which was the known and avowed Principle of *Gregory* VII. and his Succeſſors; and it ſeems by *Fitz Stephen*, that ſeveral of the Biſhops were for yeilding them up to the *Secular Power* after deprivation; and ſaid, *That both Law and Reaſon and Scripture were for it*: But *Becket* ſtood to it, "That it "was againſt God and the Canons; and by this means the Churches "Liberty would be deſtroyed, for which in imitation of their High "Prieſt, they were bound to lay down their Lives: And bravely "adds, That it was not greater Merit of old for the Biſhops to "found the Church of Chriſt with their Blood, than in their times "to lay down their Lives for this bleſſed Liberty of the Church: "And if an Angel from Heaven ſhould perſwade him to comply "with the King in this Matter, he ſhould be accurſed. By which we ſee what Apprehenſion *Becket* had of the nature of his Cauſe from the beginning of it; for this was before he inſiſted on the reviving the *ancient Cuſtoms* at *Clarendon*. Where it ſeems *Becket's* Heart failed, which the *Monks* and *Baronius* parallel with St. *Peter's* denying Chriſt; but it ſeems the Cock that brought him to Repentance, was his Croſs-bearer: Who told him, "That the Civil Au-"thority diſturbed all: That Wickedneſs raged againſt Chriſt him-"ſelf;

Fitz Steph. vit. S. Thom. MS. *Cotton p.* 16.

Baron. A. 1194. *n.* 5. *Cod. Cott.* p. 8.

“ ſelf; that the Synagogue of Satan had profaned the Lord's Sanctuary; that the Princes had ſat and combined together againſt the “ Lord's Chriſt; that this Tempeſt had ſhaken the Pillars of the “ Church, and while the Shepherd withdrew, the Sheep were under the Power of the Wolf. A very Loyal Repreſentation of the King, and all that adhered to his Rights! After this, he ſpoke plainly to him, and told him, “ He had loſt both his Conſcience and his “ Honour, in conſpiring with the Devil's Inſtruments in ſwearing “ to thoſe curſed Cuſtoms, which tended to the overthrow of the “ Church's Liberty. At which he ſighed deeply, and immediately ſuſpends himſelf from all Offices of his Function, till he ſhould be abſolved by the Pope; which was ſoon granted him. The Pope writes to the King very ſharply, “ For offering to uſurp the things “ of Jeſus Chriſt, and to oppreſs the poor of Chriſt by his Laws “ and Cuſtoms, and threatens him to be judged in the ſame manner at the Day of Judgment; and tells him of *Saul*, and *Ozias*, “ and *Rehoboam*, and parallels his *Sin* with theirs, and bids him have “ a care of their Puniſhments. And was all this Zeal of the Pope only for the good old *Saxon Laws*? When the Biſhop of *Exeter* begged the Archbiſhop at *Northampton*, *to have regard to his own ſafety and theirs too*, he told him, *he did not ſavour the things of God*: He had ſpoken much more pertinently according to *P. W.* if he had told him, *he did not underſtand the Saxon Laws*. When the Earl of *Leiceſter* came to him, to tell him, *He muſt come and hear his Sentence*; he told him, *That as much as his Soul was better than his Body, ſo much more was he bound to obey God and Him, than an earthly King: And for his part he declared he would not ſubmit to the King's Judgment or theirs, in as much as he was their Father, and that he was only under God, to be judged by the Pope*; and ſo appealed to him. Which being an Appeal to the Pope in a *Civil Cauſe* about Accounts between the King and him, it does plainly ſhew, that he did not think the King had any Authority over him, but that the Pope had a *Temporal Power* over Princes to hear and determine Cauſes between them and their Subjects. And in his Letter to the Pope upon this Appeal, he ſaith, *That he was called as a Laick to anſwer before the King, and that he inſiſted upon this Plea, that he was not to be judged there, nor by them: For what would that have been, but to have betrayed your Rights? and to have ſubmitted Spiritual things to Temporal; and if he ſhould have yielded to the King, it would have made him not a King but a Tyrant.* And whereas the Biſhops pleaded *Obedience* to the King, he ſaith, *They were bound Corporally to the King, but Spiritually to himſelf.* What in oppoſition to the King about his own Rights? Which were ſo plain in this Caſe at *Northampton*, that the Biſhop of *Chicheſter* charged him both with Perjury and Treaſon, *becauſe theſe things related to the King's Temporal Honour and Dignity; and therefore the Biſhops were not bound to obey their Archbiſhop. The Pope applauds* Becket *for what he had done, and nulls the Sentence againſt him*, which was ſtill taking more upon him the Exerciſe of a Temporal Power over the King. But *Fitz Stephen*, who ſaith he was preſent at *Northampton* with *Becket*, ſaith, that when the Biſhop of *Chicheſter* charged him with his Oath at *Clarendon*, he replyed, *That what was againſt the Faith of the Church and the Law of God, could not lawfully be kept.* Now theſe *Cuſtoms* were never ſuppoſed to be againſt the Faith of the Church, till *Gre-*

Baron. A. 1164. *n.* 12. *Cod. Cott. l.* 1. *ep.* 42.

Baron. A. 1164. *n.* 24. *Cod. Cott. l.* 1. *ep.* 26.

Vit. S. Tho. p. 31.

gory VII. had very ſubtilly found out the *Henrician Hereſie*, *i. e.* the *Hereſie of Princes defending their own Rights againſt the Papal Uſurpations*: and he particularly inſiſted on this, *That the Pope had condemned thoſe Cuſtoms*; and he adds, *that we ought to receive what the* Roman *Church receives* (for he knew no difference between the Court and Church of *Rome*) and *to reject what that rejects*: And concludes all with this, *that his Oath at* Clarendon *was an unlawful Oath, and could not bind him*. But what Pretence were there for this, if he had only contended for the ancient *Municipal Laws*? What unlawfulneſs could there be in ſwearing to obſerve the King's Laws, although different from former Laws? So that the only way to excuſe him from manifeſt Perjury, is to ſuppoſe, that he looked on the Cuſtoms of *Clarendon* as repugnant to the Pope's Decrees, and therefore not to be kept by him: And the Pope tells him, *That God had reſerved him to this time* Cod. Cott. l. 1. ep. 13. *of Tryal for the Confirmation of Catholick and Chriſtian Truth*; in which it muſt be implyed, that which *Becket* defended againſt the King, L. 1. ep. 30. was a part of the *Catholick Faith* in the Pope's Judgment. In his Epiſtle to *Robert* Earl of *Leiceſter*, he pleads for the Liberty of the Church, which Chriſt hath purchaſed with his Blood; who then, ſaith he, dares bring her into Slavery? Who art thou that judgeſt another Man's Servant, to his own Maſter he ought to ſtand or fall; And all that he adviſeth to for making up the Breach, is their Repentance and Satisfaction for the Injuries done to Chriſt and his Church. And whereas the Biſhop of *London* had told him, *that the King was willing to ſubmit to the Judgment of his Kingdom about his an-* L. 1. ep. 124. *cient Rights*: *Becket* replies, *Who is there in Earth or Heaven that dares judge of what God hath determined? Humane things may be judged, but* L. 1. ep. 125. *Divine muſt be left as they are.* In his Epiſtle to all the Clergy of *England*, he ſaith, *That at* Northampton *Chriſt was judged again in his Perſon before the Tribunal of* Pilate (for him he underſtands by the Name of Preſident). In his Epiſtle to the King, he pleads, *that the Liberty of the Church* (which he contended for) *was purchaſed by Chriſt's own Blood*; and adds further, to the very Hearts deſire of *Gregory* VII. L. 1. ep. 60. *that it was certain that Kings did receive their Power from the Church, and not the Church from them, but only from Chriſt*: From whence he infers, *that the King could not draw Clergy-men to Secular Tribunals, or eſtabliſh the Cuſtoms in diſpute between them.* I do not ſay as *Hoveden* Hoved. Annal. p. 285. doth, *That theſe Words were ſpoke in a Conference at* Chinun; for they are a part of the Epiſtle ſent to the King, not long after his Baniſhment; and written in Juſtification of his oppoſition to the Rights which the King challenged. Therefore I deſire to know what theſe Words can ſignifie to his purpoſe, unleſs they do imply ſuch a derivation of Civil Power from the Church, that the Church may take Cognizance of Male-adminiſtration, or of the Civil Authorities taking to it ſelf any of the Privileges belonging to the Church? For if all this related only to the Ceremonies of Coronation, it were to no more purpoſe than for an Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* to plead now, that the King's Power is derived from the Church, becauſe the Ceremony of Inauguration is performed by him. Who would not ſmile at ſuch a Conſequence? But we know that the Pope's Temporal Power over Princes was never more aſſerted than in that Age, that *Alexander* III. at that time challenged and exerciſed it over the Emperor and other Princes, and that no Man was more ſtiff in the Pope's Cauſe,

nor more eager for the exerciſe of his Power over our King than *Becket* was, and his Actions diſcovered this to be his opinion, why then ſhould Men ſtudy to find Evaſions for theſe Words, which neither agree with the courſe of his Actions, nor with the Doctrine of that Age? Doth not *Becket* himſelf magnifie the Pope's Power to the greateſt height? In his Epiſtle to the Biſhop of *London*, he *L.* 1. *ep.* 117. ſaith, *That none but an Infidel or Heretick, or Schiſmatick dares diſpute Obedience to the Pope's Commands*; *that no one under the Sun can pluck out of his Hands.* And in one of his Epiſtles to the Pope, he makes very profane Addreſſes to him, applying what the Scripture ſaith only of God and Chriſt to him. *Exurge Domine, & noli tardare ſuper nos*: L. 2. *ep.* 51. *Illumina faciam tuam ſuper nos, & fac nobiſcum ſecundum miſericordiam tuam. Salva nos quia perimus*: And immediately adds, *Let not our Adverſaries triumph over us*; yea, the *Adverſaries of Chriſt and his Church*; *quia nomen tuum invocavimus ſuper nos.* And leſt any ſhould think theſe were Addreſſes to God, although contain'd in a Letter to the Pope; it follows, *Non nobis Domine, non nobis, ſed in nomine Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti fac tibi grande nomen, repara gloriam tuam.* For at this time the King's Ambaſſadors promiſed themſelves great things in the Court of *Rome*, and boaſted of the Favour they had, which put *Becket* into ſuch a Conſternation, that in the very Agony of his Soul he poured out theſe Prayers to the Pope. And we may judge of *Becket*'s Opinion in this Matter, by that of his great Friend Cardinal *Gratianus*, for when the King ſaw himſelf deluded by the Pope, he expreſſed his Reſentment in ſome threatning Words, upon which the Cardinal ſaid, *Sir do not threaten, we fear* L. 3. *ep.* 6. *no threatnings*; *for we are of that Court, which hath been wont to command Emperors and Kings.* And becauſe *Becket* ſuſpected the Cardinal of *Pavia* a former Legat, to be too favourable to the King, he begins his Letters to him, with wiſhing him Health and Courage L. 2. *ep.* 11, 12, 13, 20. againſt the inſolence of Princes: And ſaith, *That the Church gained her ſtrength by oppoſition to Princes.* We have no reaſon therefore to queſtion *Becket*'s meaning in the former expreſſion, to be according to the ſenſe of *Gregory* VII. it being not only moſt agreeable to the natural ſenſe of the Words, but to the courſe of his Actions, and nature of his Quarrel, and his Expreſſions at other times.
In another of his Epiſtles to the King he complains, " That in his *L.* 1. *ep.* 39.
" Kingdom, the Daughter of *Sion* was held Captive, and the Spouſe
" of the great King was oppreſſed, and beſeeches him to ſet her free,
" and to ſuffer her to reign together with her Spouſe; otherwiſe, *L.* 1. *ep.* 40.
" *he ſaith*, the moſt Mighty would come with a ſtrong Hand to de-
" liver her; (as one of his Friends writ to him, that the Church
" could not have Peace but with a ſtrong Hand and ſtretched out *L.* 1. *ep.* 6.
" Arm.) Again, he tells the King, that his Royal Power ought
" not to intermeddle with the Churches Liberties, for Prieſts ought
" only to judge Prieſts, and that the Secular Power had nothing to
" do to puniſh them, if they did not offend againſt Faith. It ſeems then in caſe of *Hereſie* only the *Secular Arm* is to be called in for help, and is not this very agreeable to *Becket*'s Principle, *that Kings receive their Power from the Church?* For their aſſiſtance is only to be uſed for their own Intereſts, but by no means in caſe of Treaſon, or Murder, or any other Crimes; but if Princes have an inherent Right or Power in themſelves, methinks they might be allowed to

take care of their own and publick Safety againſt all Offenders. *It is the Office*, ſaith he, *of a good and Religious Prince, to repair old and decayed Churches, and to build new ones*, (it ſeems the King was only to be *Surveyor General*) *and to honour the Prieſts, and to defend them with all Reverence. But that they had nothing to do with the judgment of them, he endeavours to prove after his faſhion*; and he makes uſe of the very ſame Arguments the Pope had done before in his Grandfathers time; and almoſt in the ſame Words, about the Relations of *Fathers* and *Children*, *Maſters* and *Scholars*, and the power of *binding* and *looſing*. Nay, he doth not let go, *Qui vos odit me odit*; *qui vos tangit, tangit pupillam oculi mei*: which were *Gregory* VII's beloved Places, and ſerved him upon all occaſions. And then after his exact Method, he thunders out the Examples of *Saul*, *Ozias*, *Ahaz* and *Vzza*; and again ſaith, “That Secular Powers have nothing to do in the Affairs of the Church; but that if they be faithful, God would have them be ſubject to the Prieſts of his Church: And yet further, Chriſtian Kings ought to ſubmit their Acts to the Governors of the Church, and not ſet them above them: For it is written, none but the Church ought to judge of Prieſts; and no Human Laws ought to paſs Sentence upon ſuch; and that Princes ought to ſubmit to the Biſhops, and not to ſit as Judges over them. Which he thinks he cannot repeat too often; and after all uſes the very ſame Argument to *Henry* II. which *Gregory* VII. had done to *William the Conqueror*, “That Princes ought to be ſubject to the Prieſts, becauſe they are to give an account of them to God: And therefore he ought to underſtand, that Princes are to be governed by them; and not they brought to the Wills of Princes: For, *ſaith he*, ſome of the Popes have excommunicated Kings, and ſome Emperors. I do not think that ever the *Hildebrandine Doctrine* (as ſome call it) was delivered in plainer terms, and pleaded for by more Arguments (ſuch as they were) than by *Becket* and his *Party*, as appears by the *Whole Volume* of *Epiſtles* relating to his Quarrel, out of which I have ſelected theſe Paſſages. It would be endleſs to reckon up all the Places, wherein they declare *it was the Cauſe of God and his Church* which they defended; that *however ancient the Cuſtoms were, they ought not to be obſerved, becauſe contrary to Gods Law*; *that they were not only unlawful, but heretical Pravities, that thoſe who defended them were Henricians*, and not *Chriſtians*; that they were *Balaamites*, *Ægyptians*, *Samaritans*, nay, *Satanites*, and what not? And that themſelves were the *Poor of Chriſt*, and the *perſecuted ones*, and ſuch *as waited for the Kingdom of God*. And if theſe things will not ſatisfie Men, that the Controverſie between *Henry* II. and *Becket* was not about ancient *Municipal Laws*, but about the *Gregorian Principles* of *Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Government*, I know not what can ever do it.

Cod. Cott. l. 1. *ep.* 49. 82, 93, 124, 125, 133, 140, 143, 144, 161. *L.* 2. *ep.* 9. 12, 32, 37, 42, 45, 52, 54. 55, 64, 72, 103, 104 *L.* 4. *ep.* 57. 63. *L.* 5. *ep* 18, 22, 46, 68, 69, 77.

§. 15. But it is ſtill pleaded on his behalf, (or rather on their own who allow him to be a *Saint* and a *Martyr*, and yet deny the *Gregorian Principles*) *that thoſe Principles were not the immediate motive of his Death*; *but only his refuſal of giving abſolution from Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures*, (*but upon a certain condition*) *to ſome Biſhops after the King was reconciled to him*. It is no doubt a great piece of ſubtilty to find out another cauſe of his Death than he thought of himſelf; for he declared,

clared, *that he died for God, and Juſtice, and the Liberty of the Church,* *i. e.* in proſecution of the ſame Cauſe, which he had undertaken from the beginning. For *Becket* knew well enough, there never was a perfect reconciliation between the King and him, and that only the neceſſity of his Affairs, and the fears of being ſerved as the Emperor was by the Pope, *i. e. deprived* of his *Kingdom* by *Excommunication*, (which *Becket* preſſed with the greateſt vehemency) and the jealouſie he had of the reſt of the *Biſhops*, ſeveral of whom kept great correſpondency now with *Becket*, and the favour of the *People* to his Cauſe, forced the King to thoſe ſhews of reconciliation; for that they were no more on either ſide, is manifeſt by this, that the main Controverſie was not taken notice of about the *ancient Cuſtoms*, each Party hoping for better Circumſtances: Afterwards all that the King conſented to, was laying aſide any perſonal Diſpleaſure againſt *Becket* for what was paſſed, and allowing him freely to return to his *Church* in expectation of a better behaviour towards him for the future. All which appears from *Becket*'s own Letters to the *Pope*, upon and after this reconciliation; for, he ſaith expreſly, *the Cuſtoms were not once mentioned between them, and that the apprehenſions of the Popes Interdict and* Frederick's *condition was that which moved him to this reconciliation.* The *King* indeed failed in no point of Complement to the Archbiſhop, as he very punctually tells the Pope, *how he ſaluted him at firſt bare-headed, and ran into his Embraces, how he bare his Rebukes patiently, and held his Stirrup at his getting upon his Horſe,* (if he had but trampled on the Kings Neck too, he had been equal to the Pope himſelf, and it might have raiſed ſome jealouſie between them.) But for all this reconciliation, *Becket* ſuppoſing himſelf the *Conqueror*, reſolved not to abate one jot of his Rigour againſt thoſe who had ſworn to the *ancient Cuſtoms*; and therefore procures Power from the *Pope* to Excommunicate the Biſhops that had done it, and to return to their Excommunication thoſe already abſolved, and to abſolve none without taking an Oath to ſtand to the *Pope*'s Command. This the *King*'s *Officers* upon his return into *England* told him was againſt the Cuſtoms of the Realm; but they promiſed, *they ſhould take an Oath to obey the Law,* ſalvo honore Regni: *Becket* at firſt ſaid, *it was not in his Power to reſcind the Pope*'s *Sentence*; which he knew to be falſe, for the *Pope* had given him power to do it; and he immediately adds, *that he could abſolve the Biſhops of* London *and* Salisbury *if they took the common Oath which was in the* Cotton MS. *ſe juri parituros*, but it is interlined *ſe veſtro mandato parituros*, as the *Vatican Copy* in *Baronius* hath it. But the Archbiſhop of *York* told the other Biſhops, *that the taking ſuch an Oath, without the King's Conſent, was againſt the King's Honour, and the Cuſtoms of the Realm.* And it is obſervable, that the ſame time he was ſo zealous for the Biſhops taking this Oath to the *Pope*, he peremptorily refuſed ſuffering thoſe of his Retinue though required to do it by the *King's Officers*, to take an Oath of Allegiance to the *King*, to ſtand by him againſt all Perſons, *nec vos accipientes nec alium*, ſaith he to the *Pope*, *neither excepting you nor any other*; as the *Cotton MS.* hath it very plainly, but *Baronius* hath printed it *Nos*, whether agreeably to the *Vatican MS.* I know not, but I am ſure not to *Becket*'s Senſe; for he gives this reaſon of his refuſing it, *leſt by that Example the Clergy of the Kingdom ſhould be drawn to ſuch an Oath*; *which would be much to the prejudice*

L. 5. ep. 46, 53, 77.

Baron. A. 1170. n. 41.

dice of the Apoſtolical See; for by this means the Pope's Authority would be diſcarded or very much abated in England. Judge now, Reader, whether *Becket* did not remain firm to the *Gregorian* Principles to the laſt? And whether the immediate motive of his Death did not ariſe from them? for upon the Oath required of the Biſhops, they with the Archbiſhop of *York* went over to the King in *Normandy*, upon the hearing of which Complaint the *King* ſpake thoſe haſty Words, from whence thoſe four Perſons took the occaſion to go over to *Canterbury*, and there after Expoſtulations about this matter, they did moſt inhumanely Butcher him as he was going to *Veſpers* in the Church: Upon which *Joh. Sarisburienſis*, who was his Secretary and preſent at his Murder, ſaith, *that he died an Aſſertor of the Churches Liberty, and* L.5.ep.82. *for defending the Law of God, againſt the Abuſes of ancient Tyrants.* But what need we mention his Judgment, when the Pope in his Bull of *Canonization*, and the *Roman Church* in his *Office* do ſay, *that he died* Baron. A. 1173.n.7. *for the Cauſe of Chriſt?* And what can be more plain from hence, than that to this Day, all thoſe who acknowledge him to be a *Saint* and a *Martyr*, cannot with any conſiſtency to themſelves reject thoſe Principles for which he ſuffered; any more than *they* can reaſonably be ſuppoſed to reject the *Republican Principles*, who cry up the *Regicides* for *Saints* and *Martyrs*? But this is a ſubject lately undertaken by another Hand, and therefore I fear any farther proſecution of it.

§. 16. After *Becket*'s Death the Royal Power loſt Ground conſiderably; L.5.ep.88. for to avoid the Interdict and Excommunication threatned the Kingdom, the King by his Ambaſſadors, and the Biſhops by their Meſſengers, did Swear in the Court of *Rome*, *that they would ſtand to the Pope's Judgment*; for among the terms of the King's Reconciliation by the Pope's Legates, this was one of the chief: Ep. 94. *That he ſhould utterly diſclaim the wicked Statutes of* Clarendon, *and all the evil Cuſtoms, which in his Days were brought into the Church; and if there were any Evil before, they ſhould be moderated according to the Pope's Command, and by the Advice of Religious Perſons.* Thus after ſo many Years Conteſt were the Rights of the Crown and the Cuſtoms of his Predeceſſors given up by this great Prince; ſo true was that ſaying of Petr. Bleſ. ep. 136. *Becket*, *that their Church had thriven by oppoſition to Princes.* And if *Petrus Bleſenſis* may be believed, this King ſtooped ſo low, upon the Rebellion of his Son, as to acknowledge *his Kingdom to be Feudatory to the Pope.* The Authority of which *Epiſtle* is made uſe of not only by *Baronius*, but by *Bellarmine* and others, to prove, that Baron. A. 1173.n.8. Bellarm. Apolog. 8. Torto c 3. Becan. cont. Anglic. q. 9. *the King of* England *is Feudatory to the Pope*, or that he holds his Crown of him upon paying certain Acknowledgments; which it is hardly poſſible to conceive a Prince that underſtood and valued his own *Rights* ſo well as *Henry* II. did, ſhould ever be brought ſo low to confeſs, without the leaſt ground for it. For when it was challenged by *Gregory* VII. it was utterly denyed by *William the Conqueror*, and never that we find ſo much as challenged afterwards of any *lawful Prince*, by way of *Fee* before his time, but only in regard of the Pope's Temporal Power over all Princes. Although a late *French* D'Acher. not. in Epiſtol. Lanfranc. 7. p. 347. *Monk* who publiſhed *Lanfranc*'s Epiſtles, wonders *it ſhould be denyed, becauſe of the Tribute anciently paid to* Rome, viz. *of the Peter-pence*, which were not ſo called becauſe paid to St. *Peter*'s pretended Succeſſors,

ceſſors, but becauſe payable on St. *Peter's* Day, as appears by the Law of *Canutus* to that purpoſe; and were only *Eleemoſinary* for the ſuſtenance of poor *Scholars* at *Rome*, as the late publiſher of *Petrus Bleſenſis* confeſſes: *Vit. Petr. Bleſ.* Who withal adds, that *Henry* II. denyed their Payment, but was perſwaded to it again by *Petrus Bleſenſis*; and him he acknowledges to have been the *Writer* of the foregoing Epiſtle. And we muſt conſider that he was always a ſecret Friend of *Becket* and his Cauſe in the whole Quarrel, and being employed by the King in his ſtraits to write to the Pope to Excommunicate his Son, he knowing very well the prevalent Arguments in the *Court* of *Rome* might ſtrain a Complement in the behalf of his Maſter to the Pope, for which he had little cauſe to thank him; although it may be, *Petrus Bleſenſis* expreſſed his own Mind, whether it were the Kings or no.

And we have no ground, that I can find, to imagine this to have been the King's Mind in the leaſt; for upon his ſubmiſſion a Clauſe was inſerted, *that he was no longer to own the Pope, than the Pope treated him as a Chriſtian and Catholiok King; and as the Pope's Predeceſſors had done his.* *L. 5. ep. 95. Hoveden. p. 303.* And after the Writing of that Letter and the reconciliation with his Son, *Radulphus de Diceto*, Dean of St. *Paul's* about that time, hath an *Authentick Epiſtle* of *Henry* II. to the Pope, wherein he acknowledges no more than the common obſervance which was uſual with all Princes in that Age, whereas *Feudatary Princes* write after another Form. *Radulph. de Diceto Imag. hiſt. p. 591.* So that I cannot but think it to be a meer Complement of *Petrus Bleſenſis* without the King's knowledge, or elſe a *Clauſe* inſerted ſince his time, by thoſe who knew where to put in convenient Paſſages for the advantage of the *Roman* See.

It is ſaid by ſome, that *Henry* II. A. D. 1176. *did revive the Statutes of* Clarendon *which the Pope and* Becket *oppoſed ſo much in the Parliament called at* Northampton. It is true that *Gervaſe* of *Canterbury* doth ſay, *that the King did renew the* Aſſize *of* Clarendon, *for whoſe execrable Statutes* Becket *ſuffered*; *Gervaſ. Dorobern. 1433.* but he doth not ſay, that he renewed thoſe Statutes; but others which are particularly enumerated by *Hoveden*, upon the diſtributing the Kingdom into ſix Circuits, and appointing the itinerant Judges, *Hoveden. p. 314.* who were made to ſwear that they would keep themſelves, and make others to obſerve the following Aſſizes, (as the Statutes were then called) but they all concerned Matters of Law and Civil Juſtice, without any mention of the other famous Statutes about *Eccleſiaſtical Matters.* Whereas at the ſame time it is ſaid that King *Henry* II. granted to the Pope's Legat, though againſt the Advice of his Great and Wiſe Men, *that Clergy-men ſhould not be ſummoned before Secular Tribunals, but only in caſe of the King's Foreſt, and of Lay-fees*; *Mat. Paris p. 133. Radulph. de Diceto p. 591.* which is directly contrary to the Statute of *Clarendon*: But ſome Men love to heap things together, without well conſidering how they agree with each other; and ſo make the King in the ſame Page to null and eſtabliſh the ſame Statutes.

But it is obſervable, that after all this Conteſt about the exemption of Clergy-men, and the Kings readineſs to yield it, they were made weary of it at laſt themſelves; for as *Richard* (*Becket's* Succeſſor in the *See* of *Canterbury*) ſaith, in his Letter to the three Biſhops, that were then three of the King's Juſtices, *the killing of a Clergy-man was more remiſly puniſhed, than the ſtealing of a Sheep*: *Pet. Bliſ. ep. 73.* And therefore the Archbiſhop perſwades them, *to call in the Secular Arm againſt Eccleſiaſtical Malefactors.* And now in his opinion the Canons and Councils are all for it, and *Becket*'s Arguments are ſlighted; and no regard had to the Cauſe he ſuffered for, when he found what Miſchief this impunity brought upon themſelves. But for this giving up their Liberties, the Monks revenge themſelves on the Memory of this Archbiſhop; as one that yielded up thoſe bleſſed Privileges which *Becket* had purchaſed with his Blood.

Notwithſtanding the Sufferings the King had undergone by his oppoſing the Eccleſiaſtical Encroachments, we may ſee what apprehenſion after all he had of the declenſion of his own Power, and the miſerable condition the Church was in by thoſe Privileges they had obtained, by that notable Diſcourſe which *Gervaſe* of *Canterbury* relates the King had with the Biſhops in the time of *Baldwin* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*; wherein with Tears he tells them, *That he* Gervaſ. Dorobern. p. 1595. *was a miſerable Man, and no King; or if a King, he had only the Name and not the Power of a King: That the Kingdom of* England *was once a rich and glorious Kingdom, but now a very ſmall ſhare of it was left to his Government.* And then gives a ſad account of the ſtrange degeneracy both of the Monks and Clergy; *and what,* ſaith he, *in the Day of Judgment ſhall we ſay to theſe things? Beſides, thoſe of* Rome *ſee our Weakneſs and domineer over us, they ſell their Letters to us, they do not ſeek Juſtice but Contentions, they multiply appeals, and draw Suits to* Rome, *and when they look only after Money, they confound Truth and overthrow Peace. What ſhall we ſay to theſe things? How ſhall we anſwer them at God's dreadful Judgment? Go and adviſe together about ſome effectual Courſe to prevent theſe Enormities.* Was this ſpoken like a *Feudatary* of the Pope's? and not rather like a wiſe and pious Prince, who not only ſaw the Miſeries that came upon the Kingdom and Church by theſe Encroachments of Eccleſiaſtical Power, but was yet willing to do his beſt to redreſs them, if the great Clergy would have concurred with him in it: Who were a little moved for the preſent with the King's Tears and Pathetical Speech, but the impreſſion did ſoon wear off from their Minds; and grew worſe and worſe, by the daily increaſe of Papal Tyranny. And when this great Prince was very near his end, ſome of the Monks of *Canterbury* were ſent over to him, who had been extreamly troubleſome to himſelf and the Kingdom, as well as to the Archbiſhop, by their continual Appeals to the Court of *Rome*; and they told the King, the *Convent of* Canterbury *ſaluted him as their Lord*; *I have been,* ſaid the Gervaſ. p. 1545. King, *and am and will be Your Lord, Ye wicked Traytors:* Upon which one of the Monks very loyally curſed him, and he dyed, ſaith *Gervaſe*, within ſeven days.

§. 17. Having thus far ſhewed that the Controverſie between the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Power, was accounted a Cauſe of Religion by the Managers of the Eccleſiaſtical Power, and that ſo far, that the great Defender of it is to this Day accounted a Saint and a Martyr, for ſuffering in it, I now come to ſhew that the ancient *Penal Laws* were made againſt that very Cauſe which *Becket* ſuffered for. After the Death of *Henry* II. *Becket*'s Cauſe triumphed much more than it had done before; for in the time of *Richard* I. the great Affairs of the Nation were managed by the Pope's Legats during the

King's abſence, and after his return ſcarce any oppoſition was made to the *Pope's Bulls*, which came over very frequently; (unleſs it were againſt one about the Canons of *Lambeth*, wherein the *King* and *Archbiſhop* were forced to ſubmit) no hindrance made to *Appeals*; and even in *Normandy* the Eccleſiaſtical Power got the better after long Conteſts. In the latter end of *Richard* the firſt, the Pope began to take upon him the diſpoſal of the beſt Eccleſiaſtical Preferments in *England*, either by Tranſlation, or Proviſion, or Collation; which *Fitz-Stephen* ſaith *that* Henry II. *told thoſe about him, (after the four Courtiers were gone for* England *to murder* Becket*) was the deſign* Becket *intended to carry on, viz. to take away all Right of Patronage from the King and all Lay-Perſons, and ſo bring the gift of all Church-preferments to the Pope, or others under him.* Upon the Agreement of King *John* with the Pope's Legate he renounced all Right of Patronage, and gave it to the Pope; but it is no wonder in him, who ſo meekly reſigned his Crown to the Pope's Legate, and did ſwear Homage to the Pope, declaring, *That he held the Kingdom in Fee* from him upon the Annual Payment of a thouſand Marks. And I deſire it may be obſerved that the Oath of Fealty extant in *Matthew Paris*, and the Records of the Tower and the *Vatican Regiſter*, which King *John* made to the Pope, hath no other Expreſſions in it, than are contained in the Oath, which all the Biſhops now take at their Conſecration, only with the variation of neceſſary Circumſtances. And although Sir *Thomas Moor* once denyed any ſuch thing as King *John*'s *Reſignation* of his *Crown*, yet the Matter is now paſt all Diſpute by the concurrence of the Records of the *Tower*, and the *Vatican Regiſter*, and the *Authentick Bull* of the Pope, and the Epiſtles of *Innocent* III. publiſhed out of MS. by *Boſquet* now a Biſhop in *France*; wherein the devout Pope *attributes this reſignation of his Crown to no leſs than the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*: And ſaith, *the Kingdom of* England *was then become a Royal Prieſthood*: And in another Bull he accepts of the *Reſignation*, and declares, *That whereas before theſe Provinces were ſubject to the* Roman *Church in Spirituals, they were now become a Subject in Temporals too: And from hence he requires an Oath of Fealty from himſelf, and all his Succeſſors, and charges all Perſons under ſevere Penalties not to dare to infringe this Charter.* And although the *Parliament*, 40 *Edw.* 3. did deny *the payment of the Pope's Tribute upon the invalidity of King* John's *Charter, not being done by the conſent of the Barons* (as the Pope ſaid it was) yet we are to conſider what *Gregory* VII. ſaid to the Princes of *Spain*, *that a Kingdom once belonging to the See of* Rome *can never be alienated from it, but although the uſe be diſcontinued, yet the Right ſtill continues*: So that although the thing be never ſo much null and vain in it ſelf, yet it ſtill ſerves for Pretence to uſurp the ſame Temporal Power over our Princes, when opportunity ſerves them. And it is certain that *Henry* III. did ſwear Homage and Fealty to the Pope at his *Coronation*, and promiſed to pay the Tribute; which was performed ſeveral times in his Reign, till the King and People proteſted againſt it in the Council of *Lyons*, *as a grievance of the Kingdom, which was extorted by the* Roman *Court unjuſtly in a time of War, and to which the Nobles had never conſented, and never would.* But whatever opinion the Nobles were of, the Pope had the Biſhops ſure to him; for upon his Meſſage to them, *they all ſet their Hands to King* John's *Charter of Reſignation*; which highly provoked the King,

Radulph. de Diceto. Imag hiſt. p. 657.

Fitz Steph. vit. S. Thom

Mat. Paris. p. 235, 236 237.

Odor. Raynald A. 1213. *n.* 77, 81.

Mat. Weſtminſt. ad A.D. 1213

Sir Tho. Moor's Supplication of Souls, p. 296.

Bull. Innocent. 3. *in Biblioth. Cotton.*

Innocent. 3. *Regeſt.* 16. *n.* 79.

Odor. Raynald. A. 1213. *n.* 88.

Regeſt. Innocent. 3. *l.* 16. *ep.* 131.

Greg. l. 1. *ep.* 7.

Mat. Paris A. 1216. *p.* 289.

Mat. Paris A. 1245. *p.* 666. *Ib. p.* 681.

and made him ſwear, *that he would ſtand for the Liberty of the Kingdom, and never pay the Tribute more while he breathed.* In the ſame Council the *Engliſh* complained, *that infinite numbers of* Italians *were beneficed among them, that more Money went out of* England *every Year into* Italy *than the King's Revenues came to, that the Pope's Legates grew more intolerable, and by Reſervations, and Proviſions, and one Trick or other, the Patrons were defrauded of their Right, and the Clergy impoveriſhed by unreaſonable Penſions; and whoever would not preſently ſubmit, his Soul was immediately put into the Devils Cuſtody by Excommunication.* Notwithſtanding all theſe Complaints, the Pope goes on in the ſame way with them, and reſolved to try how much the *Aſſes* Back would bear without kicking: The *Engliſh* Ambaſſadors go away highly incenſed from the Council, and reſolved to defend their own Mat. Paris A. 1231. p. 371. Rights; but they yet wanted a Prince of Spirit enough to head them. Before this time the Inſolence of the *Roman* Clergy was grown ſo intolerable to the Nation, that the Nobility and Commonalty joyned together in a Reſolution to free themſelves from this Yoke, and threatned the Biſhops to burn their Goods, if they went about to defend them; they ſent abroad their Letters to ſeveral Places, with a *Seal* with *two Swords*, between which were written *Ecce duo gladii hic*, in abuſe of the *Roman Court*; and it ſeems they deſtroyed the Goods of ſeveral *Roman* Clergy-men; but *Matt. Paris* ſaith, *they* Mat. Weſtminſt. 1232 p. 292. *were all excommunicated by the Biſhop of* London, *and ten Biſhops more:* Although *Matt. Weſtminſter* ſaith, *the Biſhop of* London *was cited to* Rome, *for favouring them, and having his Purſe well emptied, was ſent home again.* It ſeems the *Pope* was ſo nettled at the *Remonſtrance* of Mat. Paris A. 1242. p. 691. the *Engliſh Nobility* at the Council of *Lyons*, that he entred into a ſecret Conſultation with the *King* of *France* either to *depoſe* the *King* of *England*, or to bring him wholly to his Will, ſo that neither he nor his People ſhould ſo much as dare to mutter againſt the Oppreſſions of the *Roman* Court; and the *Pope* offered the utmoſt aſſiſtance of his Power for it, but the King of *France* declined the Employment. However the Pope goes on with his Work, and grants a Bull for raiſing ten thouſand Marks out of *vacant Benefices* in the *Province* of *Canterbury*, which ſo incenſed the King, that he made a Id. p. 693. Proclamation, *that whoſoever brought Bulls of Proviſion from* Rome, *ſhould be taken and impriſoned*; but this did little good, ſaith *Matth. Paris*, id. p. 696. becauſe of the uncertain Humour of the King. The ſame Year a *Parliament* was called about the *intolerable grievances* of the *Roman Court*, in which many of the Biſhops favoured the Pope's Party: but at the *Parliaments* meeting at *Wincheſter*, the Ambaſſadors were returned from the *Pope*, who gave a lamentable account of their Embaſſy, viz. *that inſtead of any Redreſs, the Pope told them, the King of* England *kicks and plays the* Frederick (whom he had depoſed from the *Empire* in the *Council* of *Lyons*) *he hath his Council, and I have mine, which I will follow*; and withal they ſay, *they were ſcorned and* id. p. 709. *deſpiſed as a Company of Schiſmaticks for daring to complain.* Upon this the King iſſues out another *Proclamation, that no Money ſhould be ſent out of* England *to the Pope.* At which the Pope was ſo enraged, that he ſent a ſevere Meſſage to the Biſhops of *England*, under pain of *Excommunication* and *Suſpenſion*, to ſee his Money punctually paid to his *Nuncio* by ſuch a Day in *London*; and the King, by the perſwaſion of the Biſhop of *Worceſter* and ſome others, fairly yields, and gives up the Cauſe to the *Pope*. After this the *Pope* ſends for a *third part* of the Profits of all Benefices from *Reſidents*, and *half* from *Non-Reſidents*, with an *Italian Gentleman* called *Non obſtante*, that had almoſt undone the Nation: The *Clergy* meet at *London* about it, and make a grievance Remonſtrance of their ſad Condition; declaring, *that the whole Kingdom could not ſatisfie the Popes Demands*; but it ſeems, the Biſhops brought the inferiour Clergy to it againſt the conſent of the *King and Parliament*. The next Year the Parliament made another *Remonſtrance* of the *grievances* of the *Clergy* and *People* of *England*, which they ſent to the *Pope* and *Cardinals*; wherein they declare, *that it was impoſſible for them to bear the Burthens laid upon them*; *that the King's neceſſities could not be ſupplied, nor the Kingdom preſerved if ſuch Payments were made*; *that the Goods of all the Clergy of* England *would not make up the Sum demanded*: But all the effect of this was only a promiſe, *that for the future the King's leave ſhould be deſired*; which, ſaith *Matthew Paris*, *came to as much as nothing*. By which we may judge of the miſerable condition of this Nation under the *intolerable Uſurpations* of the *Court* of *Rome*.

id. p. 716.

id. p. 719.

id. p. 721.

§. 18. After ſo long tryal of the *Court* of *Rome*, by *Embaſſies*, *Remonſtrances*, and all fair ways, and no ſucceſs at all by them, at laſt they reſolved upon making *ſevere Laws* (the *laſt Reaſon* of *Parliaments*) and to ſee what effect this would have upon the *Clergy* for the recovering the ancient *Rights* of the *Crown*. For, we are to conſider, that the *Controverſie* ſtill was carried on under the ſame pretence of the *Eccleſiaſtical* and *Civil Power*; and it is a fooliſh thing to judge of the Senſe of the *Ruling Clergy* at that time by the *Acts* of *Parliament* and *Statutes* of *Proviſors* and *Præmunire*. For by this time the Pope had them in ſuch firm dependance upon him, and they were fed by ſuch continual hopes from the *Court* of *Rome*, that they were very hardly brought to conſent to any reſtraints of the Papal Power; and in the *Parliament* 13 Rich. 2. *The Archbiſhops of* Canterbury *and* York *for them and the whole Clergy of their Provinces made their ſolemn Proteſtation in open Parliament that they in no wiſe meant, or would aſſent to any Statute or Law made in reſtraint of the Pope's Authority, but utterly withſtood the ſame*; *the which their Proteſtations at their Requeſts were enrolled*; as that learned *Antiquary* Sir *Robert Cotton* hath ſhewed out of the *Records* of the *Tower*. By which we ſee the whole *Body* of the *Clergy*, were for the moſt *exorbitant Power* of the *Pope*, and would not conſent to any *Statutes* made againſt it: So that what *Reformation* was made in theſe matters was *Parliamentary* even in that time, and I do not queſtion, but the Friends to the Papal Intereſt made the very ſame Objections then againſt thoſe *Penal Statutes* of *Proviſors* and *Præmunire*, that others ſince have done againſt the *Laws* made ſince the *Reformation*. And all that were ſincere for the Court of *Rome* did as much believe it to be meer *Uſurpation* in the *Parliament*, to make any Laws in theſe matters; “For was the King *Head* of the *Church*? Might he not as well adminiſter *Sacraments*, as make *Laws* in derogation of the *Pope's Authority* and *Juriſdiction*? What was this, but to make a *Parliamentary Religion*, to own the Pope's Sovereign Power no farther than they thought fit? If any thing were amiſs, they ought humbly to repreſent it to his *Holineſs*, and to wait his time for the Re-

Abridgment of the Records of the Tower, 13 R. 2. p. 332.

“ forming Abuſes ; and not upon their own *Heads*, and without ſo
“ much as the Conſent of their *Clergy* to make Laws about the reſtraint
“ of that Power which Chriſt hath ſet up in his *Church*. How
“ can this be done without judging what the Pope hath done to be
“ amiſs? And who dares ſay, that his *Holineſs* can ſo much err, *as*
“ *to aim at nothing but his own Profits, without any regard to the good*
“ *of the Church?* What! are they not all *Members*, and will they
“ dare take upon them to judge their *Head?* What! *Sons* riſe up
“ againſt their *Father*, and *Secular* Men take upon them to condemn
“ the things which Chriſt's *Vicar* upon Earth allows? What! and
“ after all the *Sufferings* and *Martyrdom* of St. *Thomas* of *Canterbury*,
“ that ever we ſhould live to ſee a *Parliament* of *England* make
“ *Laws* againſt that *good old Cauſe* for which he died? This is but to
“ increaſe the number of *Confeſſors* and *Martyrs*, as all thoſe will be,
“ who ſuffer by theſe Laws. For do they not plainly ſuffer for
“ *Conſcience* and *Religion*, although the *Parliament* may call it *Treaſon*?
“ What an honour it is rather to ſuffer than to betray the *Churches*
“ *Liberty for which Chriſt died?* Or to diſobey the *Head* of the *Church*
“ who commands thoſe things which the *Parliament* forbids? *And*
“ *muſt we not obey God rather than Men.*

After this manner we may reaſonably ſuppoſe the *Roman Clergy*, and their Adherents at that time to have argu'd: But it is well Mr. *Creſſy* at leaſt allows theſe *Statutes* of *Proviſors* and *Præmunire*, and boaſts of the *Loyalty* of thoſe *Anceſtors* that made them: But I fear he hath not well conſidered the occaſions and circumſtances of them, and what oppoſition the *Papal Clergy* made againſt them, or elſe I ſhould think he could not afterwards have declaimed ſo much againſt the injuſtice and cruelty of our *Penal Laws*. But even thoſe ancient *Statutes* were paſſed with ſo much difficulty, and executed with ſo little care, that they by no means proved a ſufficient Salve for the Sore they were intended for, as will appear by this true account of them.

§. 19. In the time of *Edward* I. who was a Prince both *wiſe* and *reſolute*, the *grievances* of the *Kingdom*, (by his connivance at the Papal Encroachments for a long time) grew to that height, that ſome effectual courſe was neceſſary to recover the ancient *Rights* of the *Crown*, which had now been ſo long buried, that they were almoſt forgotten; but an occaſion happened which for the time throughly awaked him to a conſideration of them. *Boniface* VIII. out of a deſire ſtill to advance *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty*, had made a Conſtitution, ſtrictly forbidding *any Clergy-man paying any Taxes whatſoever to Princes, without the Pope's conſent; and both the Payers and Receivers were to fall under Excommunication* ipſo facto *not to be taken off without immediate Authority from the Court of* Rome, *unleſs it were at the point of Death.* Not long after this, the *King* demands a ſupply in *Parliament*, the *Clergy* unanimouſly refuſe on account of the Pope's *Bull*, the King bids them adviſe better, and return a ſatisfactory Anſwer; at the time appointed *Winchelſea*, then Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, in the Name of the whole *Clergy* declares, *That they owed more obedience to the Pope than to the King, he being their Spiritual, and the King only a Temporal Soveraign; but to give ſatisfaction to both, they deſire leave to ſend to the Pope.* At which ſaucy Anſwer the *King* was ſo much

Knighton de event. Angl. l. 3. *c.* 5.

provoked, that he put the whole *Clergy* out of his Protection, and ſeized upon their Lands; for which an *Act* of *Parliament* was made to that purpoſe, ſaith *Thorn*. And although many of the *Clergy* ſubmitted and bought their Peace at dear rates, yet *Winchelſea* ſtood it out, *ready*, ſaith *Knighton*, *to die for the Church of Chriſt*: Which if he had done, there might have been a St. *Robert* as good a *Martyr*, as St. *Thomas* of *Canterbury*: For our Hiſtorians ſay, this *Conſtitution* of the *Pope* was procured by *Winchelſea*'s means; and he cauſed it to be publiſhed in all Cathedral Churches. After this, the King ſends a Prohibition to the Biſhops, *againſt doing any thing to the prejudice of himſelf or his Miniſters*: And another, *againſt all excommunications of thoſe who ſhould execute this Law*; and herein he declares, *that the doing ſuch a thing would be a notorious Injury to his Crown and Dignity, a great ſcandal to the People, the deſtruction of the Church, and it may be the ſubverſion of the whole Kingdom*; and therefore he charges them by virtue of their *Allegiance, that they ſhould forbear doing it.* At the ſame time he iſſued out Writs for apprehending and impriſoning all ſuch Perſons as ſhould preſume to excommunicate any of his Subjects on the account of this *Bull* of Pope *Boniface*: And our learned Lawyers mention out of their Books, *a Perſon condemned for Treaſon in this King's time for bringing a Bull of Excommunication againſt one of the King's Subjects*; but although they do not mention the time, it ſeems moſt probable to have been upon this occaſion. *Parſons* laughs at Sir *Edward Cook* for ſaying, *this was Treaſon by the ancient Common Law, before any Statutes were made*; but it doth ſufficiently appear by the foregoing Diſcourſe, that this was looked on as one of the *ancient Rights of the Crown, that no Foreign Authority ſhould exerciſe any Juriſdiction here without the King's Conſent.* Beſides, this King revived another of the ancient Cuſtoms, forbidding all *Perſons of the Clergy or Laity to go out of the Kingdom without his leave*, and ſo ſtopt the the freedom of Appeals to the Pope; and by the *Statute* of *Carliſle*, 35 Edw. 1. *All Religious Houſes were forbidden ſending any Moneys over to thoſe of their Order beyond Sea*, although required to do it by thoſe Superiours whom they thought themſelves bound in Conſcience to obey: And it appears by the *Statute* of *Proviſors*, 25 Edw. 3. that the firſt Statute of this kind was made in this King's Time, at the *Parliament* of *Carliſle*; notwithſtanding that the Pope challenged the liberty of *Proviſions* as a part of the *Plenitude of his Power*. But although this Statute were then made, yet it had the fortune of many good Laws, not to be executed: And therefore in *Edward* III's time the Commons earneſtly preſſed for the revival of it 17 *Edw.* 3. upon which they ſent for the Statute of *Carliſle*; and then, ſays the *Record*, *the Act of Proviſion was made by the common conſent, forbidding the bringing of Bulls or ſuch Trinkets from the Court of* Rome, and in the next *Parliament* it was enacted, *That whoſoever ſhould by proceſs in the Court of* Rome *ſeek to reverſe Judgment given in the King's Courts, that he ſhould be taken and brought to anſwer, and upon conviction to be baniſhed the Realm, or be under perpetual Impriſonment, or if not found to be outlawed.* But notwithſtanding theſe Laws, the *Commons*, 21 Edw. 3. complain ſtill, *that Proviſions went on in deſpight of the King: And Judgments were reverſed by Proceſs in the Court of* Rome; *and therefore they pray that Judgment may be executed upon delinquents; and this Matter brought into a perpetual Statute, as had been often deſired*: The King grants their deſire,

Chronic. W. Thorn. A. 1296. *p.* 1965.

Walſingh. A. 1298. *p.* 69.

Matt. Weſt. A. 1296, 1297.

Spelman. *Concil. Tom.* 2. *p.* 427.

Clauſ. 25. E. 1. *M.* 8.

Pat 25 E. 1. *M.* 12.

Davis *Caſe of Præm. Cooks Report. l.* 5.

Anſw. to Cooks Rep. 5. *part. p.* 267.

Clauſ. 25 *Ed.* 1. *M.* 25.

Clement. l. 2. *c.* 1. *ut lite pend.*

Abridgement of Records. p. 41.

Abridgment of Records, p. 64.

ib.

ſire, and the *Commons* bring in a Bill to that purpoſe, extant in the
Records, but the Statute of Proviſors did not paſs till 25 Edw. 3.
which is the common Statute in the printed Books: Yet ſoon after,
we find that the Commons pray for the execution of it; and the
P. 80. King's Anſwer was, *that he would have it new read and amended:* Then
27 Edw. 3. paſſed that other *Statute* of *Præmunire*, againſt *Appeals
in Civil Cauſes to the Court of* Rome; which we have ſeen *Becket*
made a conſiderable part of the *Church's Liberty which Chriſt had
purchaſed*, and practiſed it himſelf at *Northampton*, appealing from the
King and his Parliament to the Pope in a meer Civil Cauſe of Ac-
compts between the King and him. Yet after theſe Statutes, 38
Edw. 3. a Reinforcement of them was thought neceſſary in another
Statute made that Year againſt *Citations* to *Rome* and *Proviſions*;
P. 100. wherein are *grievous Complaints, that the good ancient Laws were ſtill
impeached, blemiſhed and confounded, the Crown of our Lord the King abated,
and his Perſon very hardly and falſly defamed, the Treaſure and Riches of
the Kingdom carried away, the Inhabitants and Subjects of the Realm
impoveriſhed and troubled, the Benefices of the Church waſted and
deſtroyed, Divine Services, Hoſpitalities, Alms-deeds, and other Works
of Charity withdrawn and ſet apart, the Great Men, Commons and
Subjects of the Realm in Body and Goods damnified:* And yet Sir *R. C.*
ſaith, *That in the Record are more biting Words*; a *Myſtery*, he
ſaith, *not to be known of all Men.* In 40 Edw. 3. It was decla-
red by *common conſent, that if the Pope ſhould attempt any thing,
againſt the King by Proceſs, or other Matters in deed, that the King with
P. 102. all his Subjects ſhould with all their Force and Power reſiſt the ſame.* Yet
ſtill ſo deep rooting had the Pope's Power gotten in this Nation,
P. 119. that 47 Edw. 3. *The Commons beg remedy ſtill againſt the Pope's Pro-
viſions, and complain that the Treaſure of the Realm was carried away,
which they cannot bear*; and 50 Edw. 3. *A long Bill was brought in a-
gainſt the Pope's Uſurpations, as being the Cauſe of all the Plagues, In-
P. 128. juries, Famine and Poverty of the Realm*; and there they complain, not-
P. 129. withſtanding all former Laws, *That the Pope's Collector kept his Court
in* London *as it were one of the King's Courts, tranſporting Yearly to
the Pope Twenty thouſand Marks, and commonly more: And that Cardi-
nals and other Aliens by reaſon of their Preferments here have ſent over
Yearly Twenty Thouſand Marks; and that the Pope to ranſom the King's
Enemies did at his Pleaſure levy a Subſidy of the Clergy of* England; *and
that to advance his gain, he did commonly make Tranſlations of Biſhopricks
and other Dignities within the Realm; and therefore again the Commons
pray the Statutes againſt Proviſors may be renewed*; which they repeat-
P. 147. ed, 51 Edw. 3. but all the Anſwer they could get was, *That the Pope
P. 151. had promiſed redreſs, the which if he do not, the Laws therein ſhall ſtand*:
But upon another Petition, Promiſe was made, *That the Statutes
P. 161. ſhould be obſerved.* In 1 R. 2. the Commons are at it again upon
the ſame Complaints: And it is declared to be one Cauſe of calling
P. 182. the Parliament 3 R. 2. and an Act then paſſed, wherein, as Sir *R. C.*
obſerves, *the Print makes no mention of the Pope's Abuſes, which the Re-
P. 186. cord expreſly ſets down, and that the Pope had broken promiſe with* Edward
III. *and granted Preferments in* England *to the King's Enemies.* 7. R. 2.
P. 295. another Statute was made againſt *Proviſions*, wherein the Print dif-
fers from the Record, as the ſame Perſon deſires it may be noted.
P. 324. 11. R. 2. the *Commons pray that thoſe that bring in the Pope's Bulls of*

Volumus *and* Imponimus *may be reputed for Traytors.* 13 *R.* 2. the *Statute* of *Proviſors* was again *confirmed,* notwithſtanding the *Proteſtations* P. 333. of the *Biſhops* in *Parliament againſt any Statute made in reſtraint of the Pope's Authority*: And a *Præmunire* added, *againſt thoſe that bring any Sentence of Excommunication againſt thoſe that execute it.* 15 *R.* 2. the *Archbiſhop* of *York* being *Chancellor,* told the Parliament, one of the Cauſes of calling them, was *the reſtoring to the Pope what be-* P. 341. *longed to him about Proviſions*; but in the ſame Parliament, Sir *William Brian* P. 343. was ſent to the *Tower, for bringing a Bull from* Rome *againſt ſome that had robbed him, which Bull being read, was judged prejudicial to the King, his Council, and in derogation to his Laws.* 16 *R.* P. 347. 2. the *Commons* grant to the *King, that by the Advice of his Lords and Commons, he ſhould have power to moderate the Statute of Proviſions to the Honour of God, ſaving the Rights of the Crown*; *ſo as the ſame be declared the next Parliament, to the end the Commons may then agree or no.* In this Parliament happened an extraordinary thing. *For* Wil- P. 348. liam Courtney, *Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *made his Proteſtation in open Parliament, ſaying, That the Pope ought not to excommunicate any Biſhop, or intermeddle for, or touching any preſentation to any Eccleſiaſtical Dignity recovered in any of the Kings Courts*; *He further proteſted, that the Pope ought to make no Tranſlations to any Biſhoprick within the Realm againſt the King's Will*: *For that the ſame was the deſtruction of the Realm and Crown of* England, *which hath always been ſo free, as the ſame hath had none Earthly Soveraign, but only ſubject to God in all things touching Regalities, and none other*; *the which his Proteſtation he prayed might be entred.* Then paſſed the famous *Statute* of *Præmunire* upon occaſion of the Pope's Bulls of *Excommunication* coming into *England* againſt *certain Biſhops,* who it ſeems at laſt, were brought to *obey the Laws*; and that which the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury* proteſted was a part of the *Statute,* wherein the *Commons* declared their reſolution *to live and die with the King in defence of the Liberties of the Crown againſt the Papal Uſurpations*; *but moreover they pray, and in Juſtice require, that he would examine all the Lords as well Spiritual as Temporal ſeverally, and all the States of the Parliament, how they think of the Caſes aforeſaid, which be ſo openly againſt the Kings Crown, and in derogation of his Regality, and how they will ſtand in the ſame Caſes with our Lord the King in upholding the Rights of the ſaid Crown and Regality.* By which it appears that the *Commons* had a great ſuſpicion of the *Spiritual Lords*; and it ſeems they had reaſon, for the *Temporal Lords* declared frankly their concurrence with the *Commons,* and that the *Caſes* mentioned *were clearly in derogation of the Crown, as it is well known and hath been a long time known.* Mr. *Creſſy* would make us believe *that all the Biſhops preſent, and the Procurators of the abſent unanimouſly aſſented*; Epiſt. Apol. but the very Words of the *Statute* ſay the contrary, for there it is P. 113. added, *that the Lords Spiritual did make their Proteſtation firſt, that it is not their Mind to deny or affirm that the Biſhop of* Rome *may not excommunicate Biſhops, nor that he may make tranſlation of Prelates after the Law of Holy Church*; (but it ſeems by the Records, the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* alone ſpoke plain to the Senſe of the *Parliament,* and entred his Proteſtation different from the reſt.) Neither do they declare their aſſent to the *freedom of the Crown of* England *from all earthly Subjection*; *and that it is immediately ſubject to God in all things touching the Regalities of the ſame, and not ſubject to the Pope*; (which they touch not upon) but only with ſeveral *clauſes* of *Reſervation* about *Proceſſes, Excommunications* and *Tranſlations, they declare in ſuch and ſuch Caſes, they are againſt the King and his Crown; and in theſe Caſes they would be with the King in maintaining of his Crown, and in all other Caſes touching his Crown and Regality, as they be bound by their Allegiance*; which are Words very ambiguous, and imply a ſecret Reſervation of *ſalvo Ordine ſuo, & jure Eccleſiæ*, or with a *ſalvo* to the Oath they had taken to the *Pope*. But however the *Act* paſſed, and a *Præmunire* by it lies *againſt all that procure or bring Bulls, or any other things whatſoever which touch the King againſt him, his Crown and Regality, or his Realm*. By this *Statute*, the *Parliament* 1 *H*. 4. declared, *that the Crown of* England *was freed from the Pope and all other Foreign Power*; and it was one of the Articles againſt *Richard* II. at his *Depoſition, that notwithſtanding the Statutes, he procured the Popes Excommunication on ſuch as brake the laſt Parliament in derogation of the Crown, Statutes, and Laws of the Realm*. And, yet we find new *Statutes* of *Proviſors* made 2 *H*. 4. *c*. 3, 4. 6 *H*. 4. *c*. 57. 7 *H*. 4. *c*. 6, 8. 9 *H*. 4. *c*. 8. In the 1 *H*. 5. it was again enacted, *that all Statutes made againſt Proviſors from* Rome *ſhould be obſerved*.

Abridgement of Records. p. 387.

§. 20. By which we ſee that although the *Parliament* ſhewed a very good Will towards the reſtraint of the *Pope's Uſurpations*, yet it all ſignified very little, as long as his *Authority* and *Supremacy* were acknowledged here; for what did Laws ſignifie, when the *Pope* could null them by a *Bull* from *Rome*? And it was in thoſe Days verily believed by thoſe who did acknowledge the *Pope's Supremacy*, and followed the *Church-men* in their opinions, that an *Act* of *Parliament* had no power at all upon *Conſcience*, i. e. as they then thought, to the *Pope's Decretals*. And we need not wonder at that, after the *Pope's Decretals* were digeſted into a *Body* of *Canon-Law*, and that looked upon by all the hearty Friends to the *Church* of *Rome*, as the *Rule* of *Conſcience* in what it determined. Which we need not at all to wonder at, ſince *Petrus de Marca* himſelf declares, *That the Conſtitutions of Princes are in themſelves null when they are repugnant to the Canons and received Decrees of Popes; and that Biſhops have always abſtained from the execution of them as much as they durſt*; by which we ſee that *Acts* of *Parliament* were no certain indications of the judgment of the Church, or the generality of the People in that time; but notwithſtanding all the *Statutes*, the good Trade of *Proviſors* went on ſtill, and the *Court* of *Rome* never wanted *Chapmen* for their *forbidden Wares*. For many of our Biſhops dying in the time of the *Council* of *Conſtance*, *Martin* V. as ſoon as he was well ſettled in his Place, put in ſeveral *Biſhops* by way of *Proviſion* at his own pleaſure; and nulled *Elections* made by *Chapters*; ſo that in two Years time he put in thirteen *Biſhops* in the *Province* of *Canterbury*, in ſpight of all the *Statutes* of *Proviſors*; and made his Nephew *Proſper Colonna* Arch-Deacon of *Canterbury* at fourteen Years of Age; who afterwards had as many Benefices granted him in *England* as came to five hundred *Marks*. Beſides, he granted *Appropriations, Diſpenſations*, &c. as he pleaſed, without regard to the *Engliſh Nation*. Theſe things the *Engliſh Ambaſſadors* complained of in the *Council* of *Conſtance*, and at laſt the Pope came to an Agreement with them, which were called the *Concordates* between *Martin* V. and the Church of *England*; in which no

Petr. de Marca Prolog. p. 51. *l.* 2. *c.* 11. *n.* 8.

Vita H. Chichele p. 54, 55, 56. *&c. ab A. Duck.*

manner of regard was had to the *Statutes* of *Proviſors* although ſo often repeated, only ſome Agreements were made between the *Pope* and the *Engliſh Biſhops*, about *Unions of Churches*, the *capacity of* Engliſh *Biſhops for any Offices of the Roman Court*, and ſuch like. But other *Ambaſſadors* who came a little after theſe, preſſed the matter ſomewhat harder upon the *Pope*, againſt *Proviſions* and *Aliens* and the *Kings Supplies* out of the *Moneys* raiſed for the Court of *Rome*; the *Pope* giving them no favourable Anſwer, they replyed, *unleſs he did preſently ſatisfie their Demands, the King would make uſe of his own Right, becauſe it was not Neceſſity but Reſpect that made them ſeek to him, and pray that they might enter this Proteſtation before the Cardinals by the Kings Command.* At the ſame time the *States* of *France renewed* their *Statutes* againſt the *Pope's Uſurpations*; and added, *that they would not acknowledge him Pope till he conſented to them; and the Rector of the Univerſity of* Paris *was proceeded againſt as a Traytor for appealing from the Kings Edicts to the Pope.* Notwithſtanding all this, the ſame *Pope* ſends his *Nuncio* into *England* to raiſe Moneys; who was called *Joh. Opizanus*, but he was caſt into Priſon for his pains, for which the *Pope* expoſtulated very ſharply with the Duke of *Bedford* about it, *Henry* V. being then dead. Archbiſhop *Chichele* was in that time no Friend to the *Pope's* continual Encroachments, upon which as appears by the *Records*, *he was cited to* Rome, *and the Commons make it their Requeſt to the King, that he would write to the Pope on his behalf:* But we are told by a conſiderable *Lawyer*, *that the Archbiſhop of* Canterbury *and the reſt of the Biſhops, offered the King a large ſupply, if he would conſent that all the Laws againſt Proviſors might be repealed; but it was rejected by* Humphry *Duke of* Glouceſter, *who had lately caſt the Pope's Bull into the Fire*, This is certain that *Cardinal Beaufort*, then Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, incurred the *Penalties* of the *Statutes* of *Proviſors* 10 *H.* 6. for which he was queſtioned in *Parliament*; but at laſt, *had his Pordon granted by the King, with the conſent of all the Eſtates:* By which we ſee, that not one of all the *Papal Encroachments* was ever cut off by the ſeverity of the *Penal Laws*, as long as the *Popes Supremacy* was allowed; for never any thing was more vigorouſly attempted, more frequently enacted, more ſeverely threatned than this Buſineſs of *Proviſors*, yet in deſpight of all the *Laws* it continued ſtill, as long as the Pope was allowed to have a Power above *Laws*, and that he could *null*, *abrogate* or *diſpenſe* with them as he pleaſed. And thus far I have given an impartial Account of the ancient *Pœnal Laws* of *England*: The like to which have been made in *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, *Flanders* and other parts of *Europe*, as might be eaſily proved if it were neceſſary; but I forbear that.

Abridgement of Records 6 H. 6. n. 16.

Sir J. Davis *Caſe of Præmunire*

§. 21. And come to compare the *ancient Pœnal Laws* of our own Nation with the *modern*, as to the *Reaſons* and *Occaſions* of them, that by them we may judge whether thoſe who allow the ancient *Laws* to be *juſt*, can have any ground to charge the preſent with *Injuſtice* and *Cruelty*, which can be only on one of theſe two grounds. 1. Either that the *Occaſions* of the preſent Laws were not ſo great. Or, 2. That the old Laws did not relate to the *Exerciſe* of their *Religion*, as the latter do. I ſhall conſider both of them.

1. For the *occaſions* of the preſent *Penal Laws*, Mr. *Creſſy* confeſſeth them *to have been Treaſons*; not conſequentially only, when an Act

may be declared to be Treaſon which in it ſelf is not ſo; but ſuch *Treaſons* as all Mankind acknowledge to be ſuch, *viz.* depriving Soveraign Princes of their Crown and Dignity, endeavouring by open Rebellions, and ſecret Conſpiracies to take away their Lives; if theſe be not *Treaſons* there are none in the World. And that theſe were the *Occaſions* of the preſent *Penal Laws,* I ſhall not produce the Teſtimony of the Lord *Burleigh* in his *Book* publiſhed on occaſion of the *Penal Laws,* called, *The Execution of Juſtice in* England, *not for Religion but for Treaſon,* imprinted at *London,* A. D. 1583. but I ſhall make uſe of the Teſtimony of Perſons leſs liable to the exception of our Adverſaries, *viz. The Secular Prieſts,* who printed their *Important Conſiderations,* A. D. 1601. wherein their whole deſign is to ſhew, *that the Penal Laws, conſidering the many Treaſons which were the occaſions of them, were very juſt and merciful.* For they acknowledge, 1. *That the State of Catholicks was free from Perſecution the firſt ten Years of Queen* Elizabeth; *and that* Parſons *and* Creſwel *confeſſed as much.* 2. *That themſelves were the true Cauſes of the Change that was made towards them; by* Pius V. *moving a Rebellion here by* Ridolphi, *exciting the* King *of* Spain *abroad to joyn his Forces, and denouncing a Bull of Excommunication againſt the Queen, and abſolving her Subjects from their Subjection, on purpoſe to foment their Rebellion for depriving her of her Kingdom; which they prove by particular circumſtances.* 3. *That they could hardly believe theſe things themſelves, till they ſaw them expreſſed and owned in the Life of* Pius Quintus, *printed and allowed.* 4. *That notwithſtanding theſe things, and the Rebellion breaking forth* 1569. *the Priſoners were only under greater reſtraint, but none were put to Death on that occaſion, but only ſuch who were in actual Rebellion; wherein they confeſs the Queen did no more, than any Prince in Chriſtendom would have done.* 5. *That upon theſe occaſions a Parliament was called* 1571. *and a Law made againſt the bringing any Bulls from* Rome, Agnus Dei's, *Croſſes, or Pardons; and againſt all Perſons that ſhould procure them to be brought hither; which Law although they think it to have been too rigorous, yet they cannot but confeſs that the State could not without the imputation of great careleſſneſs of its own ſafety have omitted the making ſome Laws againſt thoſe of their Religion. And although they were in their opinion too ſevere, yet they acknowledge,* 1. *That the occaſions were extraordinary, moſt outragious,* as they expreſſed it. 2. *That the execution of them was not ſo Tragical, as was repreſented.* 6. *They believe, that neither this Law nor any other would have been executed upon them, had there not been daily new provocations:* ſuch as, 1. Sanders *his Confeſſion in his Book* De viſibili Monarchia, *that the Pope had ſent two Prieſts,* Morton *and* Web *before the Northern Rebellion into the North to excite the Lords and Gentlemen to take up Arms; declaring to them that the Pope had excommunicated the Queen, and her Subjects were releaſed from Obedience to her; and that* Sanders *doth juſtifie the ſaid Rebellion, and imputes the miſcarriage of it to the over-late publiſhing the ſaid Bull; affirming that if it had been ſooner publiſhed, the Catholicks would undoubtedly ſo have riſen, as that they muſt have prevailed againſt the Queen, and had certainty executed the ſaid Sentence at that time, for her depoſition from the Crown.* 2. Sanders *his magnifying the Heads of that Rebellion, after they had been arraigned, condemned and executed by the ancient Laws of our Countrey for high Treaſon; which Courſe ſince that time was followed by* Parſons *and others,* 3. *The full diſcovery of* *the Plot of the Pope and King of* Spain *with the Rebels at home, for the depriving the Queen of her Kingdom.* 4. Stukely's *attempt in* Ireland, *aſſiſted by* Sanders *and others; which was afterwards encouraged by the Pope himſelf; when* Sanders *publickly appeared as the Ring-leader of the Pope's Forces to perſwade the Catholicks to joyn with the Rebels already in Arms.* 5. Gregory XIII. *renewing the* Bull *of* Pius V. *againſt Queen* Elizabeth. 6. *Upon this the Jeſuits coming into* England, *who were the chief inſtruments of all the Miſchiefs againſt the Queen; and of the Miſeries which they or any other Catholicks have upon theſe occaſions ſuſtained.* 7. Parſons *his endeavour to ſet the Queens Crown on another Head, as appeared by his Letter to a certain Earl.* 8. *In all the Plots, none were found to be more forward than the Prieſts; and the Laity, they ſay, if the Prieſts had oppoſed themſelves to their Deſigns, would have been over-ruled by them.* 9. *All which conſidered, they confeſs, that no King or Prince in the World, diſguſting the See of* Rome, *having either Force or Metal in him, would have endured the Prieſts, but rather have utterly rooted them out of their Territories, as Traytors and Rebels, both to him and his Country; and therefore they rejoyce unfeignedly, that God had bleſſed this Kingdom with ſo gracious and merciful a Soveraign, who hath not dealt in this ſort with them; and that all Catholicks deſerve no longer to live, than they hereafter ſhall Honour her from their Hearts, obey her in all things, ſo far as poſſibly they may, and pray for her proſperous Reign and long Life; and to their Powers defend her againſt all Enemies whatſoever.*

7. They ſay, *notwithſtanding all the former provocations from the time of the ſaid Rebellion and Parliament, there were few above Twelve, that in ten Years had been executed for their Conſciences (as we hold,* ſay they, *although our Adverſaries ſay for Treaſon) and of thoſe Twelve ſome perhaps can hardly be drawn within our Account, having been tainted with matters of Rebellion; and for the reſt, although themſelves knew them to be free from Seditions, her Majeſty and the State could not know it, and they had great Cauſe as politick Perſons to ſuſpect the worſt.* 8. They confeſs, *that a Parliament being called* A. 1570. *no Laws* were *made at that time againſt them: The ancient Priſoners that had been more narrowly reſtrained* A. 1570. *were, notwithſtanding the Rebellion in* Ireland, *again reſtored to their former Liberty, to continue with their Friends, as they had done before: And ſuch who were not ſuſpected to have been dealers or abetters in the ſaid Treaſonable Actions were uſed with that humanity, which could well be expected.* 9. *The State having notice of the ſecond Excommunication, and having found the bad effects of the former was concerned in Policy to prevent the like by the ſecond. And the Jealouſie was much increaſed by* Sherwin's *Anſwer upon Examination eight Months before the apprehenſion of* Campion. *For being aſked,* Whether the Queen was his lawful Sovereign, notwithſtanding any Sentence of the Pope's? *he refuſed to give any Anſwer. Then followed a greater reſtraint of Catholicks than at any time before; and in* Jan. 1581. *a Proclamation was made for calling home her Majeſty's Subjects beyond the Seas; eſpecially thoſe trained up in the Seminaries, pretending that they learned little there but diſloyalty. The ſame Month a Parliament enſued, wherein a Law was made agreeable to the Proclamation, but with a more ſevere puniſhment annexed,* viz. *the Penalty of Death, for any Jeſuit or Seminary Prieſt to repair into* England, &c. 10. *They confeſs, that if all the Seminary Prieſts then in* England, *or which ſhould come after, had been of the Mind of* Morton *and* Sanders, *or* Parſons, *the ſaid no Law, no doubt, had carried with it a far*

greater ſhew of Juſtice: But that was, ſay they, *the Error of the State,* (and yet themſelves ſay, *the State could not know the difference between them) and yet they add, that it was not altogether (for ought they knew) improbable, thoſe Times being ſo full of many dangerous Deſignments and Jeſuitical Practices.* 11. *This ſame Year* Campion *and other Prieſts were aprehended; whoſe Anſwers upon their Examinations agreeing in effect with* Sherwin's, *did greatly incenſe the State. For this being one of the Queſtions propounded,* If the Pope pronounce her Majeſty deprived, and her Subjects diſcharged of their obedience; and after either the Pope, or ſome by his Authority invade the Realm, which part would you take, or ought a good Subject to take? *To this, they ſay, ſome anſwered, that when the Caſe ſhould happen, they would then take Counſel what were beſt for them to do: Others, that when the Caſe happened they would Anſwer; another, that he was not reſolved what to do; and another, that if ſuch an Invaſion were made for any matter of his Faith, he thinketh he were bound to take part with the Pope. Now,* ſay they, *what King in the World would not in the ſame Circumſtances, juſtly repute ſuch Perſons Traytors, and deal with them accordingly?* 12. *After this, a new Plot was laid between his Holineſs, the King of* Spain, *and Duke of* Guiſe, *for a ſudden and deſperate deſignment againſt her Majeſty; at which time they confeſs, the Jeſuitical Humour had ſo poſſeſſed the Hearts of ſundry Catholicks, as they rue and are aſham'd at the remembrance of it. And here they give a particular account of the Treaſons of* Throckmorton, Arden, Somervile, Parry, Northumberland, Babington, Stanley, *defended by Cardinal* Allen, *who laid down this for a Maxim, That in all Wars which may happen for Religion, every Catholick is bound in Conſcience to imploy his Perſon and Forces by the Popes Direction,* viz. *how far, and where, either at home or abroad, he may and muſt break with his Temporal Soveraign. Theſe things,* they ſay, *are neceſſary to be known, to clear her Majeſty from the imputations of more than barbarous Cruelty towards them caſt upon her by the Jeſuits, when themſelves were the Cauſes of all the Calamities any of them had indured ſince her Majeſties Reign: And they think, all Circumſtances conſidered, few Princes living, of her Judgment, and ſo provoked, would have dealt more mildly with ſuch their Subjects, than ſhe hath done with them.* 13. *They confeſs the* Spaniſh Invaſion 1588, *to be an everlaſting Monument of Jeſuitical Treaſon and Cruelty. For it is apparent in a Treatiſe Penn'd by the Advice of Father* Parſons *altogether (as they do verily think) that the King of* Spain *was moved and drawn into that intended Miſchief, by the long and daily Solicitations of the Jeſuits and other* Engliſh *Catholicks, beyond the Seas, affected and altogether given to Jeſuitiſm; and that* Parſons, *as they imagine,* (though the Book went under a greater Name) *endeavoured with all his Rhetorick to perſwade the Catholicks in* England *to joyn with the* Spaniards: *But Cardinal* Allen *takes it upon himſelf, and ſaith, the Pope had made him Cardinal, intending to ſend him his Legate for the ſweeter managing this (forſooth) Godly and great Affair: And there he affirms that there were divers Prieſts in the King's Army, ready to ſerve every Man's neceſſity; and promiſes them the aſſiſtance of all the Saints and Angels, and of our bleſſed Saviour himſelf in the Soveraign Sacrament* (after a very inviſible manner) *and they do not at all deny, that the Pope did joyn and contribute towards this intended Invaſion.* 14. *That in theſe ten Years from* 1580. *to* 1590. *the Priſoners at* Wiſbich *lived together without any trouble, Colledge-like, without*

without any want; that of all ſorts, towards the number of fifty ſuffered Death, as they think moſt of them for Conſcience, but as their Adveſaries do ſtill affirm for Treaſon: That ſuch Prieſts as upon examination were found any thing moderate, were not ſo hardly dealt with; inſomuch, as fifty five that might by the Laws have been put to death, in one Year 1585. *and in a dangerous time, were only baniſhed; and that although ſome hard Courſes were taken againſt them, yet it was not by many degrees ſo extream, as the Jeſuits and that Crew have falſly reported and written of it.* 15. *That there being juſt apprehenſions of a new Invaſion, a Proclamation was ſet out* 1591. *againſt Seminary Prieſts, as being ſuſpected to be ſent hither to prepare a way for it; and* Parſon'*s did not only acknowledge ſuch a deſign, but ſaid the King of* Spain *had juſt cauſe to attempt again that Enterprize: But in the mean time they tryed a ſhorter courſe by the ſeveral Treaſons of* Heskett, Collen, both ſet on by Jeſuits, *Lopez, York, Williams* and *Squire, animated by* Walpole *the Jeſuit.* 16. *That* Parſon'*s at laſt ſet up the Title of the* Infanta *of* Spain, *and endeavour'd to get ſubſcriptions to it, and promiſes to perſwade the Catholicks of* England *to ſubmit to it; and that the Seminary Prieſts were to promote her Title againſt the Queen and her Lawful Succeſſors. From all which they confeſs, that the Jeſuitical Deſigns abroad, and the Rebellions and Traiterous Attempts of ſome Catholicks at home have been the Cauſes of ſuch Calamities and Troubles, as have happened unto them; great, (they confeſs) in themſelves: but far leſs (they think) than any Prince, living in her Majeſty's Caſe, and ſo provoked, would have inflicted upon us.* And what more need to be ſaid, for the Vindication of the *Penal Laws* from the charge of Injuſtice and Cruelty, than is here ſo ingenuouſly confeſſed by the Secular Prieſts, Men of the ſame Religion with thoſe who complain of them, Men that ſuffered themſelves in ſome Meaſure, Men that throughly underſtood the true Reaſons and Occaſions of the ſeveral Laws that were then made; and yet after all this, can Mr. *Creſſy* have the impudence to parallel theſe Laws with thoſe of *Nero, Domitian* and *Diocleſian*, and to ſay, *That they who ſuffered by them, ſuffered only on the account of Religion?* If the primitive Chriſtians had been guilty of ſo many horrible Treaſons and Conſpiracies, if they had attempted to deprive Emperors of their Crowns, and abſolved Subjects from their Allegiance to them, if they had joyned with their open and declared Enemies, and imployed Perſons time after time to aſſaſſinate them; what would the whole World have ſaid of their Sufferings? Would Men of any common Senſe have ſaid that they were Martyrs for Religion? No; but that they dyed juſtly and deſervedly for their Treaſons. And for all that I can ſee, all ſuch as ſuffered in thoſe days, for their Attempts on their Soveraign and Country, are no more to be ſaid to have ſuffered for Religion, than the late Regicides; who pleaded the Cauſe of God and Religion as well as they; and if the one be Martyrs, let the other be thought ſo too: But if notwithſtanding all their fair Pretences of Religion and Conſcience, the Regicides ſhall not be thought to ſuffer for their Religion, why then ſhould thoſe in Queen *Elizabeth*'s or King *James*'s time, who ſuffered on the account of actual Treaſons, as thoſe did who were engag'd in the Gunpowder Treaſon, as well as thoſe who ſuffered in the Queen's time? And if the ſuppoſition of Conſcience or Religion makes all Men Martyrs, the Regicides will put in their Plea for Martyrdom; if it be not, then there is no reaſon to ſay they ſuffered for

Religion, whom the Law condemned on the account of Treaſon. If it be then allowed, that the Laws muſt determine Treaſon, then it will follow that thoſe ſuffer for Treaſon who act directly againſt thoſe Laws which determine it to be Treaſon.

§. 22. But ſuppoſe the Law ſhould make it Treaſon for Men to ſerve God according to their Conſciences, as for *Roman* Prieſts to officiate, or ſay Maſs; can ſuch Men be ſaid to ſuffer for Treaſon if they be taken in the Fact, and not rather for their Religion? To this I anſwer, that a great regard is to be had to the occaſion of making ſuch a Law for the right Interpretation of it. For if plain and evident Treaſonable Actions were the firſt occaſion of making it, as it is confeſſed in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, then all thoſe Perſons liable to the Suſpicion of the State, may be ſeized upon in what way ſoever they diſcover themſelves; and in this Caſe, the performing Offices of their Function is not the motive of the Law or Reaſon of the Penalty, but meerly the Means of Diſcovery of the Perſons. For by reaſon of Diſguiſes and Equivocations, and Mental Reſervations being ſet on Foot by the Jeſuits to prevent Diſcovery, the Law had no certain way of finding them out, but by the Offices of their Function, in which the Magiſtrates are ſure they will not diſſemble ſo far as that a Man who is no Prieſt will not take upon him to ſay Maſs: And therefore the Law looks upon the Office of Religion, as only a certain *Criterion* of the Perſons, and not as the Reaſon of the Puniſhment; not as the thing that makes them guilty, but as the way of finding the guilty. As if we ſhould ſuppoſe upon the account of the Treaſons of many Years and frequent Rebellions and Conſpiracies for the deſtruction of the King and Kingdom, which any Sectaries among us ſhould be found guilty of (as for inſtance, I will put the caſe of Quakers as more eaſily differenced:) I deſire to know, whether if the Law made it Penal for Men not to put off their Hats, only out of conſideration of the Treaſonable Doctrines and Practices they were guilty of, ſhould that Man who were taken becauſe he did not put off his Hat, be ſaid to ſuffer on that account, and not rather upon the firſt Reaſon and Motive of the Law? In the Statute 23 *Eliz. c.* 1. the whole intent and deſign of the Law is expreſſed to be, "To keep Perſons from withdrawing her " Majeſty's Subjects from their Obedience to her; and becauſe the " Pope had engag'd himſelf in ſeveral Treaſons and Rebellions againſt " her, by giving aſſiſtance to them, and endeavouring what in him " lay to deprive the Queen of her Crown, therefore the drawing " any Perſons to promiſe Obedience to the Pope is adjudged Treaſon, as well as to any other Prince, State or Potentate. And where there is an equality of Reaſon, why ſhould there not be an equality in the Puniſhment? If any other Prince ſhould have engaged Perſons in the ſame Actions which the Pope did, there is no queſtion there had been Treaſonable Actions; the Queſtion this, Whether that which would be Treaſon if any other commands it, ceaſes to be Treaſon when the Pope allows or requires it? If it doth ſo, then the Pope muſt be acknowledg'd to have a ſupreme Temporal Power over Princes, and they are all but his Vaſſals, which is expreſly againſt the ancient Law of

16 *R.* 2.

16 *R.* 2. If it remains Treaſon, then thoſe may be juſtly executed for Treaſon who do no more than what the Pope requires them, and which they may think themſelves bound in Conſcience to do.

But on this account may not any act of Religion be made Treaſon, if the Law-makers think fit to make it ſo? By no means; for in this caſe, there was an apparent Tendency to Diſobedience and Treaſon in promiſing Obedience to the Pope; but there is no ſuch thing in any meer Act of Religion, conſidered as ſuch: But when Prieſts have been known to be the common Inſtruments of Treaſons, as they were then, by the Confeſſion of the *Secular Prieſts*; then thoſe Actions which are performed by ſuch Perſons, and are proper only to themſelves, are looked on in the Senſe of the Law, and according to the intention of it, but only as the certain means of knowing the Perſons whom the Law deſigns to puniſh. So that if we do allow, that the Law of the Land can declare Treaſon in any ſort of Perſons, and puniſh Perſons for being Guilty, and appoint a certain means of diſcovering the Guilty; then there is nothing in that ſevere Law 23 *Eliz. c.* 1. which is not according to Juſtice and Equity; always ſuppoſing, that ſome notorious Treaſonable Actions, and not the bare Acts of Religion were the firſt Occaſions or antecedent *Motives* of thoſe *Laws*, which is fully confeſſed and proved in this Caſe by the moſt impartial Witneſſes, viz. *the Secular Prieſts.* And the Preface to the Statute 27 *Eliz. c.* 2. gives the beſt Interpretation of the deſign of it, viz. *Whereas divers Perſons called or profeſſed Jeſuits, Seminary Prieſts, and other Prieſts which have been, and from time to time, are made in the parts beyond the Seas, by or according to the Order and Rites of the Romiſh Church, have of late come in and been ſent, and daily do come and are ſent into this Realm of* England *and other the Queen's Majeſty's Dominions of purpoſe, (as it hath appeared) as well by their own Examinations and Confeſſions, as divers other manifeſt Means and Proofs, not only to withdraw her Highneſs's Subjects from their due Obedience to her Majeſty, but alſo to ſtir up and move Sedition, Rebellion and open Hoſtility, within the ſame her Highneſs's Realms and Dominions, to the great endangering of the Safety of her moſt Royal Perſon, and to the utter ruine, deſolation and overthrow of the whole Realm if the ſame be not the ſooner by ſome good Means foreſeen and prevented. For Reformation whereof be it ordained,* &c. Can any thing be plainer from hence, than that the whole ſcope and deſign of this Law is only to prevent Treaſonable Attempts, though masked only under a pretence of Religion? If the deſign had been againſt their Religion, the Preface of the Law would have mentioned only the exerciſe of their Religion, which it doth not. But withal is there not a Proviſo in the ſame Act, *That it ſhall not in any wiſe extend to any Jeſuit or Prieſt that will take the Oath of Supremacy*; then it ſeems all the Religion they ſuffer for muſt be contained only in what is renounced by the *Oath of Supremacy.* And is this at laſt the *ſuffering for Religion* Mr. *Creſſy* talks of, *viz.* for the *Pope's Perſonal Authority and Juriſdiction here?* But who were the Men that firſt rejected that Authority and Juriſdiction here? Former Princes long before the Reformation did it as far as they thought fit; and made no ſcruple of reſtraining it, as far as they judg'd convenient; and upon the ſame Reaſons they went ſo far, *H.* 8. and other Princes might go much farther. For the Reaſon they went upon was, the repugnancy of what they oppoſed to the Rights of the Crown; and was there any other ground of the caſting out the *Pope's Supremacy*, when long Experience had taught Men, that it was to little purpoſe to cut off the Tail of the Serpent, while the Head and Body were ſound? But who were the zealous Men in *Henry* VIII's Days againſt the Pope's Authority and Juriſdiction? Were not *Stephen Gardner* and *Bonner* as fierce as any againſt it? And if they were not in good earneſt, they were notorious Hypocrites, as any one may ſee by reading *Gardner*'s Book of *True Obedience*, with *Bonner*'s Preface; wherein very ſmart things are ſaid, and with good Reaſon againſt making the *Supremacy* challenged by the *Pope* any part of *Catholick Religion*. Did not all the Biſhop's in *Henry* VIII's time, (*Fiſher* excepted) joyn in rejecting the *Pope's Supremacy?* And was there no *Catholick Religion* left in *England* when that was gone? It ſeems then the whole *Cauſe of Religion* is reduced to a very narrow compaſs, and hangs on [illegible] very ſlender Thread. If there be no more in Chriſtian Religion, than what is rejected by the *Oath* of *Supremacy*, it is a very earthly and quarrelſome thing; for it filled the World with perpetual Broils and Confuſions, and produced dreadful effects where ever it was entertained; and leaves a ſting behind where its power is cut off.

But the *Author* of the *Anſwer* to the *Execution of Juſtice in* England, *&c.* who is ſuppoſed to be *Cardinal Allen*, ſpeaks out in this matter, and ſaith plainly, *That it is a part of Catholick Doctrine, that Heretical Princes being excommunicated by the Pope, are to be deprived of their Kingdoms, and their Subjects immediately upon Excommunication are abſolved from the Allegiance; which he ſaith, is not only the Doctrine of* Aquinas *and* Tolet, *and of the* Canon Law, *but of the Council of* Lateran, and as he endeavours to prove, of *Scripture* too: *And that War for Religion is not only juſt but honourable; and for the depoſing of Princes, he brings ſeveral inſtances from* Gregory VII. *downwards; particularly King* John *and* Henry II. and ſaith, *that the promiſe of Obedience to Princes is only a conditional Contract, and if they fail of there Faith to God, they are free as to the Faith they promiſed them.* This I confeſs, is ſpeaking to the purpoſe, and the only way in appearance to make them *ſuffer for Religion*; for no doubt, theſe were the Principles, which led them to thoſe treaſonable Practices for which they ſuffered. But the main Queſtion remains ſtill, whether *Treaſon* be not *Treaſon*, becauſe a Man thinks himſelf bound in *Conſcience* to commit it? And whether *Magiſtrates* have not reaſon to make ſevere *Laws*, when ſuch dangerous and deſtructive Principles to Govern are embraced as a part of *Religion?* If there be any ſuch thing as *Civil Government* appointed by *God*, it muſt be ſuppoſed to have a juſt and natural *Right* and *Power* to preſerve it ſelf; but how can it maintain it ſelf without a juſt *Power* to puniſh thoſe that diſturb and overthrow it? If it have ſuch a *Power*, it muſt have *Authority* to judge of thoſe Actions which are pernicious and dangerous to do it ſelf; and if there be ſuch a natural inherent *Right*, *Power* and *Authority*, antecedently to any poſitive Laws of Religion, either we muſt ſuppoſe that *Religion* left *Civil Government* as it was, and then it hath the *Power* of judging all ſorts of Actions, ſo far as they have an influence on the Civil Government, ſo that no pretence of Religion can excuſe *Treaſonable Actions*; or we muſt aſſert that the Chriſtian Religion hath taken away the *natural Rights of Government*, which is very repugnant to the

Concert Cathol. Part. 3. *c.* 4, 5, 6.

the Doctrine of Chriſtianity, and all the Examples of the Primitive Church. The ſubſtance therefore, of what I ſay about *ſuffering for Religion*, or *for Treaſon* is this; that whatever Principles or Actions tend to the deſtruction of the Civil Government, are in themſelves Treaſonable antecedent to Laws; that Laws may juſtly determine the nature and degrees of Puniſhment, that thoſe who are guilty of ſuch Actions, let them be done out of what Principle ſoever, are juſtly liable to Puniſhment on the account of Treaſon; and in the judgment of the Law and Reaſon do ſuffer on that account, whatever private Opinions they may have who do theſe things, concerning the obligations of Conſcience to do them: And where there is juſt ſuſpicion of a number of Perſons not eaſily diſcerned, the Laws may make uſe of certain Marks to diſcover them, although it happens that thoſe Marks prove Actions of Religion; which Actions are not thereby made the *Cauſe* of their ſuffering, but thoſe Principles or Actions which were the firſt *Occaſions* and *Motives* of making thoſe Laws. From which it is, I ſuppoſe, evident, that if the ancient Penal Laws were juſt and reaſonable, our Modern Laws are ſo too, becauſe the *Occaſions* of making them were of as high a *Nature*, and the Guilt as proportionable to the Penalty; and that Men did no more ſuffer for *Religion* by theſe, than by the *ancient Penal Laws*.

§. 23. 2. But ſuppoſing theſe *Laws* were acknowledged to be *juſt* and *reaſonable*, as to the *Actors* of thoſe *Treaſons*, the Queſtion is, *Whether they continue juſt, as to other Perſons who cannot be proved actually guilty of thoſe Treaſons?* And here I confeſs, as to the Principles of natural Reaſon, the Caſe doth vary according to Circumſtances: For,

1. In a jealous and ſuſpicious time, when many *Treaſons* have been acted, and more are feared by virtue of bad Principles, the Government may juſtly proceed upon the Tryal of the Principles to the Conviction of Perſons who own them, without plain evidence of the particular guilt of the outward Actions of Treaſon. For the very deſigning of Treaſon is liable to the ſeverity of the Law, if it come to be diſcovered; and where the ſafety of the Publick is really in great danger, the greateſt caution is neceſſary for the prevention of evil; and ſome Actions are lawful for publick ſafety, which are not in particular Caſes. Eſpecially when ſufficient warning is given beforehand by the Law, and Men cannot come within the danger of it without palpable Diſobedience, as in the Caſe of *Seminary Prieſts coming into the Nation, when forbidden to do it under ſevere Penalties*; In which caſe the very contempt of the Law and Government, makes them juſtly obnoxious to the force of it. He that owns the Principles that lead him to Treaſon, wants only an opportunity to act them; and therefore in caſes of great danger, the not renouncing the Principles may juſtly expoſe Men to the Sentence of the Law. And if it be lawful to make any Principles or declared Opinions or Words treaſonable, it cannot be unjuſt to make Men ſuffer for them.

2. In quiet times when the apprehenſion of preſent Danger is not great, it hath been the Wiſdom of our Government to ſuffer the courſe of Law to proceed, but not to a rigorous Execution. For the Law being in its force, keeps Perſons of dangerous Principles more in awe, who will be very cautious of broaching and maintaining

thoſe Principles which they hold; and conſequently cannot have ſo bad effects, as when they have full liberty to vent them; but in caſe Perſons have been ſeized upon by the legal ways of Diſcovery, who yet have not been actually ſeditious, it hath been the excellent moderation of our Government, not to proceed to any great ſeverities.

3. There can be no ſufficient Reaſon given for the total repeal of Laws at firſt made upon good Grounds, where there is not ſufficient ſecurity given that all thoſe, for whom they were intended, have renounced thoſe Principles which were the firſt occaſions of making them. Theſe things I yield to be reaſonable.

1. That where there is a real difference in Principles, the Government ſhould make a difference; becauſe the reaſon of the Law, is the danger of thoſe Principles; which if ſome heartily renounce, there ſeems to be no ground, that they ſhould ſuffer equally with thoſe who will not; but ſince the Law is already in being, and it is eaſier to preſerve old Laws, than to make new ones, whether the difference ſhould be by *Law* or by *Privilege*, becomes the Wiſdom of our Law-makers to determine.

2. That ſuch who enjoy ſuch a *Privilege*, ſhould give the greateſt ſatiſfaction as to their *ſincerity* in renouncing theſe Principles; for if there be ſtill ground to ſuſpect their ſincerity in renouncing, by reaſon of *ambiguous Phraſes, equivocations in Words, or reſervations in their Minds*, they give inſtead of real ſatiſfaction, greater cauſe of jealouſie, becauſe of the abuſe they put thereby upon the Government. For if Men do *equivocate* in *renouncing Equivocation* (which it is very poſſible for Men that hold that Doctrine to do) they thereby forfeit their Credit to ſo high a degree, that they cannot be ſafely truſted in any Oaths or Proteſtations. This therefore ought to be made ſure, that Men uſe the greateſt ſincerity in what they do, or elſe there is no ground to grant any favour upon their offers of ſatiſfaction.

3. Where there is ſufficient ground to believe, that the much greater number will not give ſufficient ſatiſfaction as to the renouncing the dangerous Principles to Civil Government, there is no reaſon for a total repeal of the *Penal Laws* already eſtabliſhed. For if the *Reaſon* of the *Laws* was juſt at firſt, and the ſame Reaſon continues, it becomes not the Wiſdom of a Nation to take off the curb it hath upon a dangerous and growing Party: And however cautious and reſerved many may ſeem, while the Laws are in force, no Man knows how much thoſe Principles may more openly ſhew themſelves; and what Practices may follow upon them, when impunity tempts them. I do not plead for *ſanguinary Laws* towards innocent and peaceable minded Men (whatever their Opinions be; and how hardly ſoever my Adverſaries think and ſpeak of me, I would ſhew my Religion to be better than theirs by having more Charity and Kindneſs towards them, than I fear they would ſhew me were I in their Cirrcumſtances) but I find that even ſome of themſelves think fit not to have thoſe Laws taken off from Men of the *Jeſuitical Principles*; as appeas by a *Diſcourſe* written to that purpoſe, ſince his Majeſty's Return, by one of their own Religion. Wherein he ſhews,

The Jeſuits Reaſons unreaſonable. 1662.

1. *That the Jeſuitical Party by their unjuſt and wicked Practices provoked the Magiſtrates to enact thoſe Laws; and that their ſeditious Principles are too deeply guilty of the Blood of Prieſts and Catholicks ſhed in the Kingdom ever ſince they came into it: And that it is their Principle to ma-*

nage Religion, not by Perſwaſion, but by Command and Force; and then reckons up the ſeveral Treaſons in Queen Elizabeth's *time, the Jeſuitical deſign of excluding the* Scotiſh *Succeſſion and Title of our Soveraign; the Gunpowder Treaſon; which if it were not their Invention, he confeſſes they were highly acceſſary to it, by Prayers before hand, and publick teſtifications after the Fact was diſcovered; nay, many Years after they did, and peradventure to this very Day ſtill do pertinaciouſly adhere to it.* 2. *That their Practices of uſurping Juriſdiction, making Colleges and Provinces in and for* England; *poſſeſſing themſelves of great Sums of Money for ſuch ends, are againſt the ancient Laws of the Land even in Catholick times; it being the Law of* England *that no Eccleſiaſtical Community may ſettle here, unleſs admitted by the Civil Power; and thoſe that entertain them are ſubject to the Penalties ordained by the ancient Laws.* 3. *That it is no evidence of their Loyalty, that any of them have been of the King's ſide, it being a Maxim or Practice of their Society in Quarrels of Princes and Great Men to have ſome of their Fathers on one part, and others for the contrary; which is a manifeſt ſign they are faithful to neither.* 4. *That there is no ground to truſt them, becauſe of their Doctrine of Probability; and their General can make what Doctrine he pleaſes probable, for the Opinion of three Divines is ſufficient to make a Doctrine probable, and whatever is ſo, muſt be done by them when commanded by their Superiours; ſo that the tenderneſs of their Conſciences is only about doing, or doing what their Superiours orders them: Beſides, their Doctrines about depoſing Princes, Equivocations, mental Reſervations, and divers other juggles.* 5. *That they have never yet renounced the Doctrine of the Pope's depoſing Princes; that their Generals Order againſt teaching this Doctrine was a meer trick, and never pretended to reach* England, *that* Santarellus *his Book was printed ten Years after it, teaching the power of depoſing in all latitude; and why ſhould the Peace of Kingdoms have no better ſecurity than their Generals Order? Who knows how ſoon that may alter, when good Circumſtances happen? And then it will be a mortal Sin not to teach this Doctrine; that the Jeſuits have never ſpoken one unkind Word againſt this Power of depoſing Princes; that when the Pope ſhall think fit to attempt depoſing a King of* England, *no doubt their Generals Order will be releaſed.* 6. *That by their particular Vow of Obedience to the Pope, they are bound to do whatever he commands them; as for Example, if the Pope ſhould excommunicate or depoſe the Prince, and command them to move Catholicks to take up Arms, they are bound by their Vow to do it.* 7. *That they make themſelves Soveraigns over the King's Subjects, by uſurping a Power of Life and Death over thoſe of their Order for pretended Crimes committed in* England, *which is High Treaſon; for their Subjects have other Soveraigns beſides the King.* 8. *That there can be no ſufficient ſecurity given by them, who hold the Pope's perſonal Infallibility; for whatever Proteſtations, or Renunciations they may make at preſent, they will be obliged to the contrary whenſoever the Pope declares his Judgment ſo: And therefore no hearty Allegiance can be expected from thoſe who hold it, but ſuch as muſt waver with every blaſt from* Rome. 9. *That they not only renounce the Doctrines of Equivocation and Mental Reſervation, without which all other Proteſtations afford very little Security; but Men ought to be aſſured that they do not practiſe them, when they do renounce them; and he deſires them to find out ſome way for this, which it ſeems came not into his Head.* 10. *That without renouncing thoſe Doctrines which are dangerous to the Civil Government, there is no reaſon to expect favour from it; for Temporal*

poral Subjection to Princes is the main ground of the Peace and good Government of the Common-wealth, and what is againſt that is againſt the Law of God and Nature.

§. 24. I now come in the laſt Place to conſider the Propoſals made by Mr. *Creſſy* for ſatisfaction to the Government and the repeal of the *Penal Laws*: Which are of two kinds, 1. *Subſcribing the Cenſures of the Faculty of* Paris 1663. *and* 1626. 2. *Taking the Oath of Allegiance, if the Word* Heretical *were turned into Repugnant to the word of God.*

But, 1. It were worth knowing what *Authority* Mr. *Creſſy* had to make theſe *Propoſals* in behalf of *all the Roman Catholicks of* England: He ſaith indeed, *that his Book is publiſhed* Permiſſu Superiorum, *and what he writes, is not the inconſiderable opinion of one particular Perſon only*: And what then? It may be two or three more may be of his Mind, it may be his Superiours are, it may be ſeveral Gentlemen not govern'd by the *Jeſuitical Party* are: but is the *State* of *Affairs* ſo mightily changed among them ſince 1662? Will not the ſame Reaſons hold good ſtill, that the *Jeſuitical* Party is not to be truſted in theſe Matters? Have they made any Renunciation ſince, of any of thoſe Doctrines which were thought ſo dangerous then? or are they quite gone from us, and to uſe Mr. *Creſſy*'s own Compariſon, *like Rats have forſaken a ſinking Ship*? It would be great Joy to the whole Nation to hear we were ſo well rid of them? But which way went they? In what Storm were they carried? Was it in the late great *Hurrican*? Or were they conveyed inviſibly thro' ſome Paſſage under Ground? But they are ſubtle Men, they ſay, and full of Tricks, and therefore may ſeem to be gone, even as they pleaſe. Mr. *Creſſy* it ſeems hath a Power beyond Proclamations, for he can ſend away the whole *Fry* in a trice; but a turn of his Hand, and not a *Jeſuit* or a Man of his *Principles* appears more in *England*. But for all this, neither the *Benedictines*, nor *Secular Prieſts*, can get rid of them ſo eaſily; they ſwarm and govern too much for their Intereſts; they have too many Colleges in *England* to forſake them ſo eaſily, and too rich a *Bank* to run away and leave it behind them: It may be, ſome of the Poorer Orders would fain be fingering of it, and therefore repreſent the poor harmleſs *Jeſuits*, as the *only dangerous Perſons to the Civil Government*, whereas they think themſelves as honeſt as their *Neighbours*, and ſay, *they hold no Doctrines but what other Divines hold as well as they, and if they underſtood themſelves they would find to be the Doctrine of the Catholick Church for ſix hundred Years; only a few temporizing Secular Prieſts, and ſome others out of ſpight to them, and hopes to get a better Harveſt to themſelves when they are gone, would lay all the blame upon the Jeſuits: Whereas the Doctrine they own was the general Doctrine of their Church, and received here in* England, (the Council of *Lateran* which decrees the Pope's Power over Princes having been received here by the Council at *Oxford* A. 1222.) *and what ado is made now with the Jeſuits, as though they had been the firſt Broachers and only Maintainers of the Doctrine of the Pope's Power of depoſing Princes, which hath been decreed in Councils, accepted by Churches, and only oppoſed by ſome, out of the Paſſions of Fear or Hopes from Temporal Princes?* What *do ye tell us*, ſay they, *of the Sorbon, a Club of State Divines, that act as if they believed the King of* France's *Infallibility, though they* *will not own the Pope's? What Matter is it what ſome few Men ſay that are over-awed by Secular Princes? Shew us the Divines at* Rome, *where Men may ſpeak freely, that hold otherwiſe: Was the Pope's* Nuncio *that appeared ſo bravely for the* Catholick *Cauſe in the Head of an Army in* Ireland, *a Jeſuit? or were his Adherents that caſt off the King's Authority there Jeſuits? Are all the Anti-Remonſtrants in* Ireland *Jeſuits?* And what think we, are not all thoſe who oppoſed the *Iriſh Remonſtrance*, very ready to give full ſatisfaction in theſe Matters? Nay, in the good Humour Mr. *Creſſy* found all *Engliſh Roman Catholicks*, it was pity, he had not gone farther; and who knows, but in ſo lucky a Day, the Pope and Cardinal *Barbarine* might have ſubſcribed the *Cenſures* of the *Faculty* of *Paris?* But well fare the honeſt *Apologiſt* for the *Jeſuits* who anſwered *the Reaſons unreaſonable*, and declares *that he is no Jeſuit*, yet he ſaith plainly, *it would be a temerarious Oath to forſwear in general Terms a depoſing Power in the Pope, but to deteſt it as an Hereſie would be abſolutely Schiſmatical*: But he gives very foolish Reaſons, *why the effect of that Power need not be feared in* England; *becauſe*, forſooth, Conſtantine *left out* England *in his Donation to the Pope*; did he ſo indeed? it was a great kindneſs to the Place of his Nativity. But withal he adds, *though there be much talk of King* John's *Reſignation of his Crown to the Pope, yet the Deed of Conveyance lies ſo dormant in the Vatican, that it could never be awaked or produced on any provocation.* And is this the ſecurity the Pope will never exerciſe his depoſing Power in *England?* But do not you think the Pope makes too much of it, to ſhow it to all comers? And yet this *Apologiſt* need not have gone to the *Vatican*, to have ſeen that very *Bull* of the Pope, wherein King *John*'s *Reſignation* is contained; for it was lately to be ſeen in *England*. But ſuppoſe King *John*'s *Original* were burnt at *Lyons*, as our Hiſtorians think, hath the Pope never challenged any Power over Princes, but where they were Feudatary to him? Alas for his Ignorance! the Pope for a need hath a threefold Claim to this Power, and he can make uſe of which he thinks beſt; the *Feudatary*, the *direct Temporal*, and *the indirect Temporal.* The *Feudatary* is by *voluntary Reſignation*; the *direct Temporal* by the *Canon Law*, and the *Indirect* by the *Sins of Princes*; for thoſe, if they happen to be of a right kind, as *Hereſie*, *Apoſtaſie*, *Miſ-government*, &c. give the Pope a notable Title to their Crowns, for then they fall to him by way of *Eſcheat* as the Principal Lord: But ſuppoſe the Pope ſhould, to ſave Quarrels, quit the *Feudatary Claim*, what ſecurity is there againſt the two other, that may do as much Miſchief as the firſt?

A Letter concerning the Jeſuits. p. 8. 1662.

For all that I can ſee then, Mr. *Creſſy* had not ſufficient Letter of *Attorney* to declare in behalf of all the *Roman Catholicks*, that they would ſubſcribe the *Cenſures* of the *Sorbon*; for the Pope's depoſing Power is yet good Doctrine among many of them. But why did Mr. *Creſſy* take no Notice of any difference among them about theſe Points? Muſt we Proteſtants be ſtill thought ſuch pitiful Animals, as not to know that which hath been publickly canvaſed among them about the full Age of a Man, *viz.* near ſeventy Years! Alas for us! We never heard of *Blackwell*, and *Barclay*, and *Widdrington* of one ſide; nor of *Bellarmin*, and *Singleton*, and *Fitzherbert* of the other: We have only a little *Grammar Learning*, and can make a ſhift to underſtand the *Greek Teſtament*, and read *Calvin's Inſtitutions*, or *Danæus* upon *Peter Lombard*; but for theſe deep Points, it is well we have ever ſeen thoſe that have heard others ſay, they have ſeen the Books that handle them. But why ſhould Mr. *Creſſy* ſo ſlily paſs over the buſineſs of the *Nuntio* in *Ireland?* was that nothing to the purpoſe? Did not the *Perſon* of *Honour* mention it ſeveral times, that he could not avoid ſeeing it? But we muſt forget all thoſe things; and *Cardinal Barbarin*'s Letters about the *Iriſh Remonſtrance*, and whatever is material, if it cannot be anſwered, better is let ſlip. Yet, is it poſſible for us to believe that all *Roman Catholicks* are ſo willing now to renounce the dangerous Doctrines; when there hath been ſo late, ſo numerous, ſo vehement, (nay, I had almoſt ſaid) ſo *Catholick*, an oppoſition to the *Iriſh Remonſtrance?* Not, as Mr. *Creſſy* would have it believed, *out of indignation at a particular perſon*, (who had much greater *Authority* for what he did on the behalf of the reſt by his *Procuratorium* than Mr. *Creſſy* doth appear to have) nor *a quarrel at phraſes*, but at the very ſubſtance of the doctrine contained in it. Was it only about *ſome phraſes*, that the *Popes Internuntio* at *Bruſſels de Vechiis* condemned it; when he ſaid, *it contained in it propoſitions agreeing with thoſe already reprobated by* Paul *the fifth, and* Innocent *the tenth*, and this he expreſſed as the mind of the Pope. *Hiſtory of the Iriſh Remonſtr. p.* 16. Was it only *about phraſes*, when he ſaid the Remonſtrance would do more hurt than all the former Perſecutions of Hereticks? Was it only about Phraſes, when *Cardinal Barbarin* charged the Remonſtrants with corrupting Faith under a Pretence of Allegiance to the King: *P.* 18. And he adds too, *That the Propoſitions were condemned before by the Apoſtolical See; and that his Holineſs was troubled to the very heart about it?* Methinks, a few Phraſes only, ſhould not have given his Holineſs ſo much diſturbance. *P.* 49. Was it only for ſome Phraſes, that the *Dominicans* oppoſed it, as contrary to the Doctrine of *Thomas Aquinas*, who roundly aſſerts the Pope's Power of depoſing Heretical Princes? and they pleaded, they were ſworn to maintain his Doctrine. It ſeems then, they can give no ſecurity to the State without Perjury; and I ſuppoſe there were ſome of theſe among Mr. *Creſſy*'s *Roman Catholicks*, who were ſo ready to renounce this Doctrine. *P.* 112. Was it only for a few Phraſes, that the *Lovain Divines* condemned it, as wholly unlawful and deteſtable; and containing things contrary to *Catholick Religion?* The true Grounds of which, were the taking away the Pope's Power over Princes, and the great *Diana* of *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty*. If Mr. *Creſſy* accounts theſe but Phraſes, the Court of *Rome* owes him but little thanks for it. But this is ſo ridiculous a Pretence, that all the Quarrels about the *Iriſh Remonſtrance* were only about a few Phraſes, that either he looks on the Parties as extreamly Quarrelſome, or it muſt be ſome greater Matter which he confeſſes was the occaſion of ſo many Commotions, Diſſentions, and ſcandalous Invectives on both ſides. Since then, there hath ſo long been, and we have reaſon ſtill to believe there is ſuch a difference among them about theſe Matters, how can Mr. *Creſſy* undertake ſo boldly as he doth on the behalf of *Engliſh Catholicks* for the ſubſcribing the *Cenſures* of the *Faculty* of *Paris?* But of all ſorts of Men, I am apt to miſtruſt great Undertakers.

§. 25. 2. But ſuppoſing they ſhould ſubſcribe the *Sorbon Cenſures*, we may yet queſtion, whether hereby they would give full ſatisfaction in theſe Matters. *Epiſt. Apol. p.* 118. Mr. *Creſſy* is of Opinion, *That this would be a* *more full and ſatisfactory Teſtimony of their Fidelity, than can be given by taking the Oath of Allegiance*; which makes me very much wonder, why they ſhould refuſe the leſs ſatisfactory, and chooſe that which is more. But Men had need to have faſt hold, that are to handle ſuch ſlippery Points as theſe are; for when we think we have them ſafe, they ſlip through our Fingers and eſcape. Thoſe who have not conſidered all their Arts and Evaſions in theſe Matters, would think they offer as fair things as any Men in the World; but when it comes home to the Point, there is ſome ſly Diſtinction or Mental Reſervation, by which they get through all, and are as much at liberty as ever. That alone which in our Age and Kingdom can give ſatisfaction, 1. *Muſt reach our own Caſe*, and not that of the King of *France*; *i. e.* 1. Of a King not of the ſame Profeſſion of Religion with thoſe who make the Profeſſion of Fidelity. 2. Of a King or Kingdom already under Cenſure of Excommunication, as *Cardinal Barbarin* declared. 3. Of a King, not barely conſidered as a King, *i. e.* while he remains ſuch, and the Pope doth not declare him not to be a King; but ſo as to declare it, not to be in the Pope's Power, to make him no King. For Men may ſubſcribe the Cenſures of *Sorbon*, underſtanding them of Kings of their own Religion, not excommunicated by the Pope, and while the Pope doth not declare them to be no Kings. 2. What gives ſatisfaction in our caſe, muſt exclude all manner of Equivocation and Mental Reſervation: For where that is not excluded, there can be no ſecurity at all given; it being impoſſible to bring Equivocations and Reſervations within any Bounds; nay, thoſe who hold it lawful to uſe them, may deny it, and do it in denying it; therefore the Matter of Equivocation muſt be ſtated, how far, and upon what Terms, and in what Caſes they allow it; and yet there may be Equivocation in all this. So that as Equivocation hath all the Advantages of Lying, it hath the diſadvantage too, *viz.* that thoſe who uſe it, cannot ſafely be truſted, though they do not uſe it; becauſe though it be poſſible they may not, no Man can be well aſſured that they do not. But the *Sorbon Cenſures* never mention Equivocation at all, and therefore I do not wonder to ſee ſuch as Mr. *Creſſy* ready to bring in thoſe, inſtead of the Oath of Allegiance, becauſe although himſelf and ſome others may diſown the Doctrine of Equivocation, yet if that be not expreſly excluded, they know the very *Jeſuits* will ſwallow a *Camel*, let them but have the dreſſing of him. They know ſo many Tricks of *Legerdemain*, that I do not ſee why a very cunning *Jeſuit* may not think himſelf a fit Match for the Devil himſelf; for let him make never ſo many Promiſes in Words, he would have ſuch a ſecret Reſervation in his Mind, as ſhould make his Words to ſignifie nothing. But it is not ſafe for them to play ſuch Tricks with ſo old a *Sophiſter*, that firſt found out the way of Equivocation. 3. What gives ſatisfaction in our Caſe, *muſt exclude abſolutely all Power of Diſpenſing in the Pope*; for if that be reſerved, they are ſafe enough; they know how to get out preſently, for they have one ready that can knock off all their Shackles, and ſet them as free as ever; nay, they have yet another fetch concerning the Pope's Power, for he can null an Oath before-hand, and make it ſtand for nothing, as well as abſolve them from it afterwards. But now then can the *Sorbon Cenſures* be ſo ſatisfactory in our Caſe, when they never ſo much as mention the *Pope's Power of diſpenſing*, much leſs diſclaim it ſo plainly as it ought to be done, to give ſatisfaction? So that we ſee, it is not without reaſon Mr. *Creſſy* would ſo willingly have the *Oath* of *Allegiance* changed for the *Sorbon Cenſures*: and I do not at all wonder that fourteen *Jeſuits* in *France* offered to ſubſcribe the *Sorbon cenſures* 1626. which Mr. *Creſſy* offers, as the moſt ſatisfactory Form, who never yet could well ſwallow the Oath of Allegiance; for they very well knew whatever they did ſwear in *France* could be diſpenſed with at *Rome*.

§. 26. 3. But farther, *he declares their readineſs to take the Oath of Allegiance it ſelf, if the Word Heretical were left out.* Whoſe readineſs doth he mean? *All Roman Catholicks, Jeſuits* and all? And hath this indeed been the only Bone of Contention thus many Years? Did *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, *Leſſius*, *Fitz-herbert*, and the reſt of the Oppoſers of this *Oath*, find no other Fault with it, but only that a Doctrine was declared *Heretical*, which was never condemned in any *General Council?* Would they have been content to have called the *Pope's Power of depoſing Princes, new, falſe, erronious, and contrary to the Word of God*, though not *Heretical?* For ſhame, let not Men go about thus to impoſe upon us, as though all the *difference* were about this nicety in the ſignification of a Word. It would be needleſs in ſo plain a Caſe to ſhew upon what Principles thoſe went who oppoſed the *Oath* of *Allegiance*; but I ſhall only inſtance in *Fitz-herbert*, being of our own Nation, and as conſiderable as any; he therefore inſiſts upon it, *that it is an unlawful Oath, becauſe it flatly contradicteth the* Lateran *Council, as to the Pope's Power of depoſing Princes*: But that is not all, but his deſign is at large to prove, *that it is repugnant to the Law of God in the Old and New Teſtament, to the practice of the Church, and expreſs Declaration of the Pope by three Apoſtolical Breves*; and to thoſe that object, *that the Pope's firſt Breve was obtained ſurreptitiouſly and for want of good Information*; he ſaith, *it is not only Ignorance but Malice in any to ſay ſo, becauſe the Pope publiſhed another Breve on purpoſe to declare that the firſt was not ſurreptitious, but written upon his own certain Knowledge, Motion and Will, and after long and grave deliberation had concerning all things contained therein, and that therefore the Catholicks were bound to obſerve it wholly rejecting all Interpretations to the contrary; and by his third Breve he gave Authority to the Arch-Prieſt to deprive all Seminary Prieſts under his Juriſdiction that had taken the Oath, or had taught or did ſtill teach it to be lawful to take it*: Nay, he adds further to take off that common Evaſion, *that the Pope was not duly informed, that before the Sentence paſſed againſt it at* Rome, *it was long debated in certain Congregations of Learned Cardinals, and other great Divines; wherein Cardinal* Bellarmin *had but one Voice, and Father* Parſons (whom they ſuſpect to have miſ-informed the Pope) *none at all.* Now the Pope did not condemn it meerly on the account of the Word *Heretical*, but becauſe he ſaid, *the Oath contained in it many things contrary to Faith and the Salvation of Souls.* And therefore all thoſe who have any regard to the *Pope's Sentence* in a matter of ſuch importance have other *Reaſons* to decline taking the *Oath*, ſuppoſing the Word *Heretical* were left out. But ſome Men love to pretend that a ſmall alteration in eſtabliſhed *Laws* would ſatisfie them, to try if by thoſe Arts, they could bring the *Wiſdom* of the *Nation* to yield to them in that, and when they have obtained it, then a thouſand other Objections are raiſed that were not mentioned

Fitz-herb. Reply, ch. 4.

c. 5, 6, 7, *&c.*

c. 17. *p.* 112.

before: So I doubt not but it would be in this Caſe, if the Word *Heretical* were left out, and when they had gained this point, then they would ſtart another, and another till the whole Oath were brought to Nothing, and I *A. B.* left to ſtand alone. But it is a very ſtrange thing to me, that they who can ſwallow all the other parts of the Oath, ſhould ſtick ſo much at the word *Heretical*; for if they would uſe ſome of the ſame mollifying diſtinctions that they do about the other parts of it, methinks *Heretical* might go down as glib as the reſt. Were I of their Religion, I ſhould more ſcruple *deteſting*, *abjuring*, and *abhorring from my heart*, than calling a thing *Heretical*; the other are downright and plain Words capable of no Ambiguity; but *Heretical*, is a Word, that may ſignifie this or another thing, as Men pleaſe. That is *Heretical* with one that is not with another, and *Heretical* may be meant in the Senſe of the Givers, and not the Receivers; which is Mr. *Creſſy*'s way. But beſides, what is it is ſaid to be *Heretical? That Princes which be excommunicated, or deprived by the Pope, may be depoſed or murdered by their Subjects, or any other whatſoever*; where *or* being a disjunctive Particle, if to ſay that Princes deprived may be murdered, be Heretical, though to ſay they may be depoſed be not, yet that is enough to make a disjunctive Propoſition true. This is one of *Widdrington*'s ways; but he hath yet two more, *viz.* that as *Heretical* doth not imply *equality but ſimilitude, and that they do abhor and deteſt it as much, as if it were formal Hereſie*; but the main of all is, *that a thing is not therefore Heretical becauſe the Church defines it; but becauſe it is repugnant to Catholick Faith, or which is all one to that which is revealed by God; which he proves to be the proper notion of Hereſie, from* Alphonſus à Caſtro, Covarruvias *and others: And if this were not the true notion of it, the Church would have power to make new Articles of Faith*; and therefore upon the ſame Ground that any Perſon rejects any Doctrine as repugnant to the Word of God, he may reject it as *Heretical*. I cannot therefore imagine, whatever Mr. *Creſſy* ſays, that it would give ſuch general ſatiſfaction to have the Word *Heretical* turned into *repugnant to the word of God*; for I cannot think the *Roman Catholick* Gentlemen to be Men of ſo weak Underſtandings, to be able to digeſt all other parts of the Oath, and to refuſe taking it only on the account of the Word *Heretical*. I muſt therefore beg pardon, if I be not of too eaſie a Faith in this Matter; it is eaſie to gueſs where the Oath pinches better than ſo.

Adjoynder to Fitz Herbert's *1ſt and 2d part, p.* 73. N. 106. p. 69.

§. 27. 4. But after all this, I am not ſatisfy'd with the Grounds of Mr. *Creſſy*'s Hopes, *that the taking off the objection as to their Loyalty may be ſufficient Reaſon for the Toleration of their Religion*; which is the thing aimed at in this Diſcourſe. For although the inconſiſtency of any Religion with the Civil Government be a ſufficient Ground againſt the Toleration of ſuch a Religion; yet its not being inconſiſtent is not enough for its Toleration. For the Matter of Toleration in a Nation where there is a Publick Religion eſtabliſhed by Law, hath a reſpect two ways, to the *Civil Government* and to the *Eſtabliſhed Religion*: And the *Civil Government* is bound to defend and protect the *Eſtabliſhed Religion*; becauſe it is agreed on all hands, that it is bound to defend the *True Religion*, and that is declared by the Laws to be the True, which is eſtabliſhed by them. Now, if a Party appears

Epiſt. Apol. p. 98.

active and dangerous, whoſe Principles are deſtructive to the Religion eſtabliſhed by Law, I appeal to any Man of common Senſe, whether it be ſufficient Ground for the Toleration of it, that one Objection is taken off, when the other remains in its full force? That which is then to be conſidered in this caſe is, whether ſuch a Party which is dangerous without Toleration, will grow leſs dangerous by it? Which I think needs no great Conſideration; and it will require as little, to ſhew the danger that will come to the *Eſtabliſhed Religion* by a *Toleration* of *Popery*: Not only by the diligence, induſtry and number of the Prieſts, who will be glad to make new Converts to gain new Reſidences, (they being at preſent ſo much overſtocked;) beſides their deſires to approve themſelves to the Court of *Rome* for Preferments by their Activity; and telling brave Stories beyond Seas of their Exploits againſt *Hereticks* (as a late *Miles Glorioſus* among them hath done) how many Legions of *Hereticks* they have blown away by the Power of Principles and Demonſtrations; but, by the obligation that lies upon them that receive *Preferments* from *Rome*, *to perſecute Hereticks*, *Schiſmaticks*, *and Rebels to the Pope to their uttermoſt*; which is expreſſed in the Oath they take to the Pope; as appears by the *Pontifical*; ſo that theſe Men muſt either be *perjured*, or *perſecute* when it lies in their Power. And can any Nation in the World think it wiſe or ſafe to give *Toleration* to *Wolfs* among *Sheep*; to thoſe that have ſolemnly ſworn *to perſecute to their Power all that own the Eſtabliſhed Religion?* and that look upon all ſuch as in a damned Condition that do not ſubmit to their Church? Till they abate of their Monſtrous Uncharitableneſs, till they renounce their Oaths to the *Pope*, till they can give good ſecurity of their quiet Behaviour in not ſeducing others, what pretence can there be, for their being allowed a free Exerciſe of their Religion, ſuppoſing they ſhould take the *Oath* of *Allegiance*? But as to their *dignified Clergy*, I mean ſuch of his *Majeſty's Subjects*, whom the Pope hath taken upon him to make Biſhops without his Conſent (which was not ſuffered by ſome Princes, even in times of *Popery*) it ought farther to be conſidered, what ſecurity any following Oath can give as to thoſe that have taken a former *Oath* of *Allegiance* to the *Pope*? as I have already proved it to be; as much as *King John's* was, upon the *Reſignation* of his Crown; nay yet farther, they are bound now by that *Oath to defend all thoſe Proviſions and Reſervations and Apoſtolical Mandates*, which were accounted the intolerable Grievances of this Nation, long before the Reformation.

But why may they not enjoy equal Liberty with the Sectaries? I am not pleading the *Sectaries* Cauſe, (neither would others plead it now but for a farther end) nor would I extenuate the guilt of their *Separation*; but they are blind, that do not ſee the difference between the Parties, if not as to Number, yet as to Intereſt, Foreign Dependance, and Danger to the Church of *England*: For ſurely, a Man is not in ſo much danger of being ſtung to Death by *Gnats*, as being poiſoned by *Vipers*: I mean in reſpect of the avowed Principle of *perſecuting* all Diſſenters in the *Roman Church*; which it were eaſie to manifeſt, not only from our Domeſtick Story, and the entertainment in Queen *Mary's* Days, and from the Hiſtory of the Inquiſition abroad; but from the *Cabal* at the Council of *Trent* between the *Pope's Legates* and the *Ambaſſadors of Catholick Princes, about the utter extirpation of the Pro-*

Proteſtant Religion; and the deſigns that were carried on in proſecution of this in moſt parts of *Europe*, eſpecially in *Germany*, *Flanders*, and *France*; but I ſhall not meddle with the ſecret Intrigues, but the open and avowed Principles. In *France*, *Claudius de Sainctes* publiſhed a *Book* againſt *Toleration*, A. D. 1561. wherein he pleads with all his ſtrength *for the utter extirpation of Proteſtants*; the like did *Jacobus Pamelius* in *Flanders*; and both of them anſwer all the common and popular Arguments now brought for Toleration; the ſame did *Scioppius* in *Germany*, and we all know what the dreadful Conſequences were in all thoſe Places. But this is a Subject too large to enter upon now: For my part, I am no Friend to *Sanguinary Laws* on the *Account of Religion*; and if the *Wiſdom* of our *Law-makers* ſhould think fit to change that *popular way* of publick Suffering (which the Sufferers would have ſtill believed to be for *Religion*) into a more effectual courſe of ſuppreſſing the growth of a Party ſo dangerous to our eſtabliſhed *Religion*, I ſhould more rejoyce, it may be, therein, than thoſe who are more concerned in it. Provided, that the pretence of making *new Laws* more accommodate to our preſent State, be not carried on meerly with the deſign of leaving our Church without any ſecurity by *Law* at all againſt ſo violent and dangerous a Party; for it is a much eaſier matter to repeal *old Laws* than to make new ones. And if the Objection againſt the *old Laws* be, *that they are not executed*, it ought to be conſidered whether the ſame Objection will not lie againſt others, unleſs they be ſuch *Laws* as will *execute themſelves*; and we have little Reaſon to believe that they who bid defiance to our preſent *Laws*, and make *ſport* with *Proclamations*, will be perſwaded by gentler means to obey others. And is ſuch an Affront to *Laws* a ſufficient *Motive* to *Lenity?* And we have good ground to think, that they look upon all our *Laws*, whatever they be, as things of no force at all upon their *Conſciences*, as being *null in themſelves, becauſe they are contrary to the Pope's Authority and the Conſtitutions of their Church.* And I believe if our modern *Papiſts* were preſſed home, the generality of thoſe who are obnoxious to the *Penal Laws*, would not acknowledge thoſe *Ancient Rights* of the *Crown*, which were challenged by *William the Conqueror*, *William Rufus*, *Henry* I. *Henry* II. (before his ſubmiſſion to the Pope) and afterwards by *Edward* I. and *Edward* III. viz. *No exerciſe of any Foreign Juriſdiction here without the King's conſent*; *no liberty of going out of the Kingdom, though upon the Pope's Command, without the King's leave*; and while they allow this Power to the Pope to command his *Majeſty's Subjects*, they make him *Soveraign* over them, and make them more fearful of diſclaiming his Power: *No Decrees of Popes or Bulls to be received without the King's approbation : No Biſhops to be made by Papal Proviſions out of the plenitude of his Power*, &c. Thoſe who will not reject theſe, which were challenged by the *Kings* of *England* long before the *Reformation*, as their *ancient and undoubted Rights*, with what Face can they plead for the *Repeal* of the *Penal Laws?* When the ancient *Law* of *England* makes them guilty of *violating* the *Rights* of the *Crown*. If they ſay, *the Caſe is not the ſame now upon the Change of Religion*; I deſire to know of them, whether any *ancient Rights of the Crown* are loſt by caſting off the *Pope's Authority?* If they be not, they are good ſtill, and what are they then that deny them? If they be loſt, then our *Kings* have loſt ſome of their

Revelatio Conſiliorum quæ initio Synodi Tridentinæ inter Pontificem, Cæſarem cæteroſq; Reges, Principes, &c. ſunt inita, A. 1620.

Ad Edicta Principum de licentia ſectarum. Auct. Claudio de Sainctes.

Jacob. Pamelii de Religionibus diverſis non admit. Antw. 158

Caſp. Scioppii Claſſicum Belli Sacri Ticini. 1619.

their *Soveraign Rights* which their *Anceſtors* valued *above half their Kingdoms*; and how could they loſe them by caſting off the *Pope*, if they did not receive them from him? If they received them from him, then they make the *King's Power* to be ſo far at leaſt derived from the *Pope*; for if it were independent upon him, how could they loſe any *Power*, by caſting off the *Pope's Authority*? If it be ſaid, *that theſe were Privileges granted by the Popes*, I utterly deny it; for our Kings challenged them in ſpight of the Popes, and exerciſed them in direct oppoſition to their *Bulls* and *Decrees*; even the *Decrees* of *Councils* as well as *Popes*, as is fully manifeſted in the foregoing Diſcourſe. How then can ſuch Men plead for the repeal of *Penal Laws* whoſe Principles do ſo directly contradict the ancient acknowledged *Rights* of the *Crown* of *England*? For others that will not only own theſe *ancient Rights*, but give ſufficient *ſecurity* without fraud and equivocation, of their ſincerity in renouncing the *Pope's Power of depoſing Princes*, and other Principles deſtructive to Government; ſince it was never the intention of our Laws to perſecute ſuch, they need not fear the enjoyment of all reaſonable Protection by them. But it doth not become me to Diſcourſe of ſuch Points which are far more proper for the *Wiſdom* and *Council* of the *whole Nation*: And I know no true *Proteſtant* would envy the quiet and ſecurity of innocent and peaceable Men, where there is ſufficient aſſurance, that by favour received they will not grow more unquiet. But we cannot take too great care to prevent the reſtleſs deſigns of thoſe, who aim at nothing more, than the undermining and blowing up our eſtabliſhed *Church* and *Religion*: Which *God* preſerve.

Thus much may ſerve for an Anſwer to theſe Points of Mr. *Creſſy's* Book, the reſt I leave to a better Hand.

And now, my Lord, what Reaſon have I to beg Pardon for ſo tedious a Diſcourſe: But I know your Lordſhip's Love to the Cauſe, as well as to the Perſon concerned, will make you ready to excuſe and forgive,

My Lord,

Your Lordſhip's moſt humble and obedient Servant,

Edward Stillingfleet.

FINIS.